

neither one thing nor the other. You provide by it that a man shall have to observe the Sabbath during certain portions of the day, and you allow him to violate it during the remaining hours. The Bill provides also that one milk train may be run on the Sabbath. Well, is a milk cart to be prohibited? If it is necessary that the people residing in a city should have the milk brought to them on a train on the Sabbath day, is it any more wicked that a farmer living immediately adjacent to the city should bring in a supply of milk in his cart to the doors of the consumers? Then I find no provision in the Bill for the closing of post offices or telegraph offices on the Sabbath day, though they are open now during certain hours. My principal object in rising was to point out one or two objections to the Bill, and to congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the 7th clause. He has evidently become a convert to the principle which in the past he has condemned most vigorously in this House. The moiety system of distributing fines and penalties among informers is one for which the Government, and more especially the Customs Department, have been most severely censured and condemned by the hon. gentleman. However, he has now carried that principle a little further in this Bill than the Government have ever gone. While he condemns the distribution of the penalties imposed for violating the Customs Act by giving the informers one-third, and thereby creating an incentive for them to inform, and to become, as they have been repeatedly described by hon. gentlemen opposite, spies upon the business people of this country; the hon. gentleman provides in his Bill that the informer in the case of a violation of this law shall have one-half the penalty. The hon. gentleman has carried the moiety principle much further than the former Government or the present Government ever attempted. If it be wrong to provide an incentive to people to inform on violators of the law, in respect to the Customs Department, surely it must be equally wrong to compensate informers in respect to this law. At least, I am unable to discover where the virtue is in informing upon a man who happened to deliver a pound of meat on the Sabbath day, or sell a newspaper, and give the informer one-half the penalty, while it is said to be wrong to give one-third of the penalty to the informer on a man who had violated the law by smuggling goods into the country on any day, whether it be a Sunday or a week day. However, in this, as in most things, I am afraid some gentlemen in this House, as well as out of it, are too apt to argue the principle involved in this clause, more for the purpose of finding fault with the Government of the day than for the purpose of expressing an opinion against the principle itself. If it is wrong in one case, it is wrong in the other. However, I am of the opinion that it is quite right, if this Bill should become law, that there should be an incentive to those who desire to have it enforced by informing upon the law-breakers. If this Bill is to become law, let us have it a little more stringent than it is now, or throw it out altogether.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.
Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I was much pleased when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) first introduced his Bill last session, because I believed it was a good Bill. The aim of the Bill was not to interfere with any man's religious convictions, be they what they may; neither did it aim at compelling any man to observe the Lord's Day. The chief aim of the Bill, I think, was to secure to the employes of the Government, on railways and canals, in the Post Office Department and in the public service generally, the whole Sunday rest. It has been contended that this Bill was unnecessary, that it encroached upon provincial rights; but if this question is to be dealt with, so far as it relates to our railways, our post offices and our canals, it must be dealt with by this House and this Government. If the Bill as originally introduced had been enacted, I have no doubt it would have been a great boon to thousands of Government employes who are now robbed of their Sunday's rest, that rest which is so essential to their physical well-being, and deprived of all opportunity of attending Divine worship and receiving religious instruction. Many of these employes have been long anxiously looking for the relief promised by this Bill. They know by sad experience that a continued round of toil and drudgery, without a Sunday's rest, is not only disastrous to their physical well-being, impairing their health and shortening their lives, but is demoralizing in all its tendencies, and deprives them of many comforts and blessings which would otherwise brighten their lives and make them better and purer. Now, with this Bill as amended, and as proposed to be amended, I must say I have very little sympathy. If it is to be cut down to section 2, the title of the Bill becomes a misnomer. It does nothing whatever for the employes, but leaves them exactly where they were before. As I understand, the canals are now closed during a portion of the Lord's Day, under an Order in Council, and this Bill will simply provide for closing the canals during a portion of the day, and keeping them open during another portion. It does nothing to advance or promote the interests of Sabbath observance, and what is worse, it completely ignores the Sunday labour and Sunday desecration which is carried on now on our railways and in other departments of the public service. My contention is simply this, that it is our duty to see that the employes of the Government are protected in the enjoyment of a complete Sunday rest, and I think we should beware how we ignore or trample under foot the Divine law by depriving our fellow men, so many of them, of that day's rest which God has given them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This question may be viewed from one of two aspects, the aspect of christianity and the aspect of social economy. So far it has been almost entirely discussed from the aspect of christianity. While I hope the day may never come when the teachings of christianity will cease to be the ruling spirit in both Government and the people of the British Empire, at the same time I may point out to the hon. Minister of Militia that there is no principle from which, if pushed to unreasonable lengths, a *reductio ad absurdum* may not be drawn. His argument may be illustrated in this way. He himself, I am sure, would not allow those in his employ in private life to do any unnecessary work on Sunday; but at the same time