

in Canada, that we shall not wait until this evil has acquired the magnitude and the volume that it has acquired in the United States, and has got beyond control; but that we shall throttle the monster in its cradle, and prevent its obtaining a foothold in this country so as to pollute our public life and endanger the stability of our institutions. This is the reason why, in my estimation, we should go for national instead of local control in dealing with this matter of Sunday newspapers.

The second section of this Bill provides that the Dominion Government itself shall not be a Sabbath-breaker, provides for the closing of the Dominion canals which are exclusively under the control of the Dominion Government on Sunday from six o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night. It may be possible that conditions exist on some of our canals which would render the strict enforcement of this regulation of doubtful advantage or propriety; and every person in favour of Sunday rest who takes an intelligent and liberal view of the question, of course recognizes the necessity of permitting what are legitimate works of necessity or works of mercy. I say it may be that a strict adherence to the provisions of this section would not be in the public interest. However, this is a question that can be considered later on in committee, and if it is impossible to close such canals as the Sault Ste. Marie Canal throughout the whole of Sunday, why the matter might be left with the Governor General in Council to regulate it in exceptional cases. But the principle is a sound one, and should be embodied in the Bill.

Sections 3 and 4 of this Bill relate to railway traffic. Of course, it is unnecessary to say that the matter of the regulation of railway traffic is one beyond the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures, and that it must be dealt with here if dealt with at all. I felt so great an interest in this matter, and was so anxious to avoid prejudicing the interests of railways, that on Sunday last I visited Montreal for the purpose of interviewing the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway with regard to the provisions of this Bill as they might affect railway traffic. I first saw Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk Railway. I had sent Mr. Hays a Bill last session, so he was not unfamiliar with its provisions. He informed me that he had no objections to the provisions of the Bill, would offer no objections to its becoming law; that he thought the Bill was one the provisions of which were justifiable, and would meet with the acceptance of railway authorities. The Bill, of course, makes no attempt to curtail through business, it would be ruinous to the interests of the roads to do so. But it has a proviso that whenever the United States Government shall prohibit the running of freight trains upon the Lord's Day, the same provisions shall at

Mr. CHARLTON.

once go into force in Canada, under the operation of this Bill. I then went to Sir Wm. Van Horne, and practically he made little objection to the Bill. He said with regard to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal that he would like to see embodied in that section a provision that the arrangement with regard to that canal might be suspended by Order in Council if it was found prejudicial to the public interest at any season of the year. That, and one minor matter about making up freight trains, were all the objections that he offered to this Bill. So I may say to the House that the managers of these two great railway corporations are quite willing that this Bill, with these provisions in regard to railway traffic, shall become the law of Canada; and in committee we will see that Sir Wm. Van Horne's suggestions with regard to the Bill receive due consideration.

I promised when I commenced, that I would not detain the House long. I have endeavoured to present briefly and as pertinently as possible the reasons which, in my estimation, warrant this House in giving its assent to the provisions of the Bill now under consideration. I feel very deeply that this is a matter of vital importance to this country. We cannot afford to treat this matter as one which is of very little consequence to us. The course which this country make take in reference to this matter will tell very seriously upon our future. It is time that the Government of Canada should place itself upon record in recognizing the soundness of the principle of Sunday rest. It is a civil right which should be secured to the labourer so far as the enactment of the provisions of this Act can secure that right to him. Labour, Sir, should be protected, the labourer should be protected—should be protected in his rights of conscience, and can be protected in those rights of conscience only by the intervention of law, and by the kind offices of those who make the laws in this Parliament. Broad considerations of public welfare should govern our action in this matter. We should divest ourselves of prejudices. We should never for a moment allow ourselves to think that we are enacting religious laws, when we are merely securing for the labourer a right to enjoy what is a civil privilege, the right to rest from labour upon a day which not only we are told in the Decalogue is a day of rest, but a day which it is admitted is a necessary day of rest by all authorities that have dealt with the question. The state in this matter should be upon the side of justice. It is a matter of mere justice that the labourer should be protected in the enjoyment of this right, that the state should be on his side. The state should protect him, the state should secure him from being deprived of that right which is so essential to his material, his moral, his social and his religious well-being, and which has also so