Holy Day or Holiday? The Giddy Trolley and the Canadian Sunday, 1890-1914

Sharon P. Meen

Volume 9, numéro 1, juin 1980

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019349ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019349ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Meen, S. P. (1980). Holy Day or Holiday? The Giddy Trolley and the Canadian Sunday, 1890-1914. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 9(1), 49–63. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1019349ar>

Résumé de l'article

L'arrivée du tramway dans les grandes villes du Canada a coïncidé avec un changement d'attitudes envers le jour du Seigneur. La question de savoir si le tramway devait circuler ou non le dimanche souleva un débat public — le dimanche était-il jour du Seigneur ou jour de congé? Le présent article examine la controverse qui opposait les partisans du tramway aux tenants du respect du repos dominical. Ces derniers tentèrent de bien des façons de faire obstacle au tramway, mais celui-ci devait se révéler un ennemi insaisissable. Dès 1914, le tramway était déclaré franc vainqueur; ses troupes sillonnaient alors les rues des grandes villes d'un bout à l'autre du Canada. D'après cet article, la victoire du tramway est due à l'appui qu'il reçut de la population, des gouvernements et des tribunaux.

HOLY DAY OR HOLIDAY?

THE GIDDY TROLLEY AND THE CANADIAN SUNDAY,

1890-1914

- - - - -

Sharon P. Meen

Résumé/Abstract

L'arrivée du tramway dans les grandes villes du Canada a coïncidé avec un changement d'attitudes envers le jour du Seigneur. La question de savoir si le tramway devait circuler ou non le dimanche souleva un débat public - le dimanche était-il jour du Seigneur ou jour de congé? Le présent article examine la controverse qui opposait les partisans du tramway aux tenants du respect du repos dominical. Ces derniers tentèrent de bien des façons de faire obstacle au tramway, mais celui-ci devait se révéler un ennemi insaisissable. Dès 1914, le tramway était déclaré franc vainqueur; ses troupes sillonnaient alors les rues des grandes villes d'un bout à l'autre du Canada. D'après cet article, la victoire du tramway est due à l'appui qu'il reçut de la population des gouvernements et des tribunaux.

The arrival of the electric street car in Canadian cities coincided with changing attitudes towards Sunday. The question of whether or not street cars might run on Sunday prompted a public debate concerning the proper use of the Sabbath - should it be a Holy Day or a holiday? This article examines the nature of the controversy over the Sunday street car and the struggle between the Sunday car and its sabbatarian opponents. Sabbatarians challenged the Sunday car in a variety of ways but found it a most vexing and elusive target. By 1914, the Sunday car had triumphed, running merrily in cities from coast to coast. Its success, this article suggests, was due to support it received from the public, governments and the courts.

* * *

To Canadians seeing electric street cars for the first time, the cars, as "the electric fire flashed along the rails behind the wheels," probably did resemble "the original fiery chariots" of a newspaper reporter's description.¹ The 'giddy trolley,' as *Saturday Night* columnist Lady Gay affectionately dubbed the innovation, arrived in Canadian cities in the early 1890s.² Not only did the new form of traction revolutionize urban and

interurban public transportation, but it equally affected Canadian behavioural patterns, especially on Sunday. The question of whether or not street cars might run on Sunday prompted a public controversy concerning the use of the Sabbath. C. Armstrong and H.V. Nelles have related part of the tale in their lively account of the struggle to introduce Sunday service in Toronto³; an overview of the Sunday car's conquest of Canadian cities

from coast to coast by the First World War adds further detail to this story.

* * *

By the early 1890s, eastern Canadian street railway companies had to electrify their systems in order to combat the inadequacies of the horse-drawn systems introduced some twenty to thirty years earlier. The rapid increase of urban populations had already prompted some extension. In Toronto, for example, where the population had nearly doubled within a decade, jumping from 86,415 in 1880 to 144,023 in 1890, the horse-drawn system had expanded from 19 to 68.5 miles, placing every part of the city within reasonably easy access of the railway and advancing the development of suburban residential areas to which the more affluent citizens were moving.⁴ The Montreal system had undergone similar expansion as had those of Hamilton and Winnipeg. Profits had increased accordingly. By 1890, those of the Toronto Street Railway Company totalled \$165,562 on earnings of about \$730,000, in comparison with profits twenty years earlier of about \$25,000.⁵ On the negative side, however, were the systems' increasingly obvious limitations. Slow and erratic service, hampered by the horses' physical capabilities, was typical. In Montreal the north-south lines climbed grades as steep as eleven percent, "at what cost to the horse must be left to the imagination."⁶ In Toronto, on a hot August day in 1891, eight horses dropped dead in front of their cars from exhaustion. Even at the best of times, movement was extremely slow, scarcely better than a foot's pace. Companies

followed no fixed time schedule, and frequent stops to accommodate favoured patrons made the service even less dependable. Moreover, horse power could barely keep a street car track clear of snow and ice during the winter in most Canadian cities, and little attempt was made to do so. Two sets of equipment were thus required, horse cars and buses for summer and sleighs in winter. But even the expense and trouble of this did not constitute the "deadly considerations" of street railway operations that W.G. Ross described in a 1902 *Canadian Magazine* article:

The winter upset all possibility of cleanliness and comfort; to keep people's feet warm, straw was loaded into the bottom of the sleighs, where no possible amount of renewal could keep it clean or decent; there it would lie, unkempt and unsightly, dirty and unsanitary, particularly on wet days, contributing dubious odours to the atmosphere of the cars.⁷

During this early period of urban transportation, few companies recognized the full impact that a public service could have upon the mobility habits of city residents. Company owners felt that service should facilitate flow into the city to places of employment on the week's six work days.⁸ Although the Sabbath, protected by various British statutes as well as pre- and post-Confederation Canadian laws, was the assumed rest day for all classes in Canada's pre-industrial commercial centres, few company owners considered the potential of holiday traffic. Sunday service was therefore rare, although most provinces did not forbid it. The charters of most

companies permitted, by not prohibiting, Sunday operations.⁹ Ontario was the only province to pass general legislation affecting Sunday cars. Its 1883 Street Railway Act contained a clause forbidding Sunday operations by companies chartered under the Act.¹⁰ But at least a dozen companies had received their charters prior to the passage of this Act, and the Act did not affect them. Of these companies, only two, the Toronto Street Railway Company and the Ottawa City Passenger Company, contained clauses in their charters prohibiting Sunday operations.¹¹ But, until the late 1880s, only the western cities of Vancouver and Victoria and two eastern cities, Hamilton and Montreal, had Sunday service. In the West the cars ran all day, while in the East the Hamilton Street Railway Company offered a service only at the hours of divine worship, and the Montreal City Passenger Company offered a service within the French sections of the city only.¹² In other Ontario cities, attempts to introduce Sunday service failed. In Kingston, patrons failed to materialize, and in Toronto, when a 'citizen,' William Kelly, a street railway company employee, tried to operate four unused horse-drawn buses on a voluntary basis, Inspector David Archibald, Toronto's Public Morality Officer, "swooped down and arrested him while he was driving his family to church in one of the buses."¹³ Most eastern cities were therefore wildernesses of "grim silence" on Sunday. One British visitor complained that Toronto was "one of the most unpleasantly righteous cities I was ever caught in on a Sunday." Another explained in greater detail why: "One may stand," wrote T. Hadley McGinnis,

"on a street corner looking in four directions without seeing a living person or animal. Most persons disappear for the day, as if in a shell, and as completely as if the earth had opened and swallowed them up." Lady Gay concluded that if she were a hotel guest in Toronto on a Sunday, she would "stay in bed all day."¹⁴ Winnipeg was no better: "No wheel of industry turned, no store opened, no streetcar clattered down the streets, no bread or milk was delivered, no game of any kind was played."¹⁵

The giddy trolley threatened to change all that. First, electrification effected a thorough rationalization of operations. No more were to be seen the "slow, dirty busses or sleighs, disease-breeding vehicles, confined to the condensed portion of the towns, running at intervals of anywhere from fifteen minutes to half an hour." Instead, "magnificently appointed cars" followed one after another to all parts of the cities and their suburbs at a speed unheard of before the change.¹⁶ Electrification markedly cut the per unit operating costs in addition to increasing the systems' capacity to carry passengers. Since greater speed meant a longer trip in the same length of time, it further encouraged suburban development and the dispersal of the core population. The quality of the journey now improved as well, for the trolley ride was smoother and the cars generally more comfortable. The improved service drew more patrons and thereby enlarged total revenues. Assured of sufficient profit margins, companies in the larger cities went so far as to offer lower fares to working class people, encouraging their move out

of the cities' central core. The normal fare was five cents, but by 1892 the Winnipeg Street Railway Company and others sold tickets to workingmen at the rate of eight for a quarter between 5.00 and 8.00 a.m. and 5.30 and 6.30 p.m.¹⁷

The rationalization of operations allowed street railway companies to contemplate expansion of service to attract more patrons and produce greater profits. They now realized that a large potential market lay in the suburbanization that followed expansion and improvements in quality. Such developments allowed the movement of people out from the city core not only on workdays but on holidays as well. Commenting on a proposed extension of the Toronto system to the north and east of the city in 1891, the *Globe* described its potential effects on the city's development as revolutionary. Not only would it be a "boom to the wealthy and the well-to-do" who worked in the city but lived in the suburbs, but it would also "be a blessing to the poor, who inhabit the lowly places, the slums and shanties of the ward, for they will be given opportunities they do not possess of breathing the fresh, pure air and of seeing the beauties of nature."¹⁸

In order to cultivate this market, some companies extended their lines to link up with existing facilities while others developed recreational areas at the end of their lines. In Toronto, for example, in response to the building of a new race track in Glen Grove Park, the Metropolitan Railway Company, which connected with the Toronto Street Railway Company system, extended its lines to the park entrance. In Winnipeg, James Austin, owner of the Winnipeg Street Railway Company, purchased

51 1/2 acres of land from the Catholic Church of St. Boniface in 1889. There he built a pavilion large enough to hold 800 people, with "a strong, smooth floor suitable for dancing," and another structure containing refreshment stands, tables, and benches for excursionists. "With the proper recreational facilities established on it, as well as in River Park on the opposite shore," Austin reasoned, "the area would become a popular picnic and amusement centre. Moreover, the novelty of riding on an electric car would be a further inducement to Winnipeggers to patronize the new line."¹⁹ During this period as well, interurban companies obtained charters to begin operations. Although the primary purpose of constructing these lines was to transport the farmer and his produce to market and not the reverse, the potential of holiday traffic quickly appeared attractive. Soon, excursion trains were running on interurban lines radiating out from Toronto, Hamilton, and in the Niagara Falls area, around Montreal and Quebec City, between Vancouver and New Westminster, and in the environs of Victoria. These schemes proved enormously popular. By the summer of 1891 Austin's two electric trolleys with added trailers were strained to accommodate the eager crowds. In Vancouver, extra cars were needed to transport the crowds to Queen's Park in New Westminster on September days when the provincial or national lacrosse finals were being played.²⁰

It was thus but a small step for companies to expand their operations to include Sunday, and by the early 1890s most were eager to do so. If the same number of people rode the cars on a Sunday as on a normal working day - and

European and American patterns already indicated that in fact more people patronized the cars on Sunday than on normal days²¹ - then a company such as the Toronto Street Railway Company, whose daily load was 55,000 passengers, could hope to realize an increased yearly revenue of \$105,000 without substantial increases in cost. As companies recognized this potential, they began to introduce it. Street railways in both Halifax and Saint John started running on Sunday, and in Hamilton, the Sunday car graduated to a full day operation.

At the same time as street railway companies were changing their attitudes towards Sunday service, popular attitudes were also challenging the traditional strict observance of the Sabbath. Everywhere there were strong indications that Canadians would welcome the alternatives to church-going that a Sunday car service offered. Presumably the most enthusiastic were those who did not attend church at all. Estimates varied, but in 'Toronto the Good,' for example, it seemed that, by the mid 1880s, between one-third and one-half the population did not attend church.²² Yet it was also evident that, even among church-goers, many were coming to believe that either once-a-Sabbath church attendance was adequate and the rest of the day might be spent in pleasurable pursuits, or that a pleasure-filled interlude might come between morning and evening worship. The bicycle's overwhelming Sunday popularity provided ample proof of this trend. Despite their high cost of at least \$50 each, many bought bicycles, then quickly demonstrated their intention to free themselves from Sunday's immobility. One Toronto citizen

estimated that one thousand cyclists passed him in the course of one hour on a Sunday morning. According to the *World*, as many as ten thousand cyclists made their way through Toronto's streets on an average hot summer Sunday.²³

Behavioural patterns in British Columbian and Quebec cities indicated the type of Sunday other Canadian cities might come to enjoy. Both provinces possessed significant numbers of Roman Catholics and High Church Anglicans,²⁴ whose views on proper Sabbath observance were less strict than those of the evangelical Presbyterians and Methodists. In Montreal, American Sunday papers were available; saloons and post offices were open; people flocked to the parks in summer to pursue such activities as boating and pleasure driving; skating rinks in winter were open, and in the evening Sunday concerts and theatre provided entertainment.²⁵ In working class areas both within and without the city limits, a vigorous Sunday entertainment subculture had taken root. Crowds of people attended velocipede races, acrobatics, prize fights, cock-fighting and clog dancing events, as well as horse races on the frozen Lachine canal.²⁶ Neither the Roman Catholic hierarchy nor the civil authorities opposed these developments. As long as people did not patronize excursions organized by commercial entrepreneurs for profit, the hierarchy approved the pursuit of amusement after mass. The Quebec Legislature encouraged the wider use of Sunday as a holiday by amending Montreal's city charter in 1899 to allow the Sunday sale of candies, fruits, and other refreshments in the city and on St. Helen's Island.²⁷ In the west, in addition to the religious makeup of

its population, British Columbia, with a resource-based economy and a male-dominated society,²⁸ lacked the established agrarian tradition of strict Sabbath observance that Ontario had. Many British Columbians thus made no distinction between the Sabbath and other days. Teamsters, miners, and stockmen worked; freight trains ran; the interurban between New Westminster and Vancouver ran every few hours, patronized by hundreds of excursionists; steamboats carried ordinary passengers, excursion parties, and freight; all post offices were open, as were many stores; saloons were wide open except in Vancouver; a large number of people hunted or fished, or played all sorts of open air games, and both Victoria and Vancouver enjoyed Sunday newspapers, produced on Saturday night for sale early Sunday morning by editors who preferred to let their employees have Sunday free rather than spend it preparing the Monday edition.²⁹

The electric street car thus contributed to the late nineteenth century debate about the quality of life in an urban and industrial society. Indeed, it prompted a public controversy that focussed on the moral and social implications surrounding the introduction of pleasure transportation in urban centres in which the discipline of an industrializing economy restricted leisure time for the majority to one day of the week, Sunday. The central issue in the debate was the use of this weekly day of rest: should it be a Holy Day or a holiday? Should it be a day devoted solely to the health of the soul by twice-a-Sabbath church attendance, accompanied by private prayer and contemplation, or should it be partly devoted to that end

and partly to the recreation of the physical body? Sunday car supporters - street railway owners, businessmen, real estate developers, among others - argued that the changing circumstances of urban life, both the dispersion of population to the suburbs and the continuing crowded core, demanded a cheap transportation system seven days a week as an important social and moral condition of city life. Sunday service was entirely a matter of choice for both employee and patron. The man who worked on the streetcars was at liberty to leave his job if he so chose. The patron, for his part, was also at liberty to refrain from riding the cars on Sunday if his religious convictions directed him to do so. But Sunday service should be available. The Sunday car would, moreover, be of social benefit, placing the poor in a position of equality with the rich man and his carriage. It would occasion proportionally less labour than already existed among coachmen and cabmen, and it would not rob the street railway employee of his day of rest, as companies were willing to guarantee employees another day in the week as a rest day. The Sunday car promised to effect social reform as well. Working class people, whether or not they attended church, would have the opportunity to spend part of their day of rest in the open air. The Sunday car would allow those who lived in working class districts to escape the unhealthy environment in which they both lived and worked. Was it possible, queried Goldwin Smith, a car supporter, to serve the interests of either humanity or of Christianity "by mewing men, women and children up in a small room or compelling them to sit on a doorstep in the close air of the city during a sultry afternoon,"

when they might be enjoying the air "with a thankful heart not alien to religion."³⁰

Sabbatarians, organized into provincial associations under the aegis of the Presbyterian church, rejected these arguments. Although they agreed that the Sabbath should be a day of leisure, they wished it to be a day totally devoted to cultivating the religious spirit. Like their British counterparts, Canadian sabbatarians "saw Sunday as a Christian and rural interlude of class harmony amidst the hectic rush of a materialistic, competitive, and urban society."³¹ To them, the Sunday car was "a moral and industrial plague," whose contagious character they sought to eradicate.³² As the forerunner of a great deal of Sunday business, concerts and spectacular exhibitions, the Sunday car would inevitably open the door to Sunday labour. It would be but the first of a never-ending string of Sabbath secularizers. After it would come worse evils: the ice-cream parlour, the shoeshine and the barber shop, and worst of all, the Sunday newspaper. Not only would the Sunday car facilitate visits to the beds of the sick and the graves of the dead, but it would also encourage social visitings to parks and amusement areas. Thus, the Sunday car would bring neither moral nor social benefit to the community. In particular, the sabbatarians denounced the argument that the Sunday car might add to the churches' influence by facilitating parishioners' old church affiliations once they had moved to the suburbs. It would lure more from the churches than it would lead to them. The churches, they argued, had a better distribution of strength without the Sunday car. Further, the Sunday car would not

aid the workingman. In cities where the Sunday car was already running, sabbatarians insisted, it failed to provide relief to those in the city core. Instead, by robbing the workingman of his day of rest, the Sunday car shattered his home life.³³

Sabbatarians variously challenged the Sunday car but found it a most vexing target. Citizen protests brought little or no relief. In Hamilton appeals by car opponents to municipal authorities to halt the Sunday service proved of no avail, since the company was not operating illegally. Its charter, received prior to the 1883 Street Railway Act, did not forbid Sunday operations.³⁴ In Toronto, where Inspector Archibald's activities had kept the streets quiet during the 1880s, the charter of the new Toronto Railway Company, formed in 1891, allowed Sunday service once a majority of the city's ratepayers approved.³⁵ Three plebiscites were necessary, but in May 1897 "Toronto the Good," stronghold of evangelical Protestantism, welcomed the Sunday car. Ottawa citizens, in contrast, approved the Sunday car in their single plebiscite on the issue a year and a half later. Their alacrity reflected both the high number of Catholics in the city's population and the fact that Sunday service in Toronto had not resulted in mass public immorality among its citizens.

Lobbying of provincial governments also achieved but limited success. Saint John citizens sought in vain for a legislative remedy to their Sunday car problem. In Nova Scotia, the Legislature amended the 1851 Act, "Of Offences Against Religion," to make it illegal for a corporation to employ or direct a person "to

perform servile labour on Sunday."³⁶ But the sabbatarian association had to assume the responsibility of bringing action against the Halifax Electric Tramway Company for violating this Act. In Ontario a provincial Lord's Day Alliance, founded in 1895 specifically to combat the Sunday car, experienced both success and failure in its dealings with government. The Ontario Alliance pressed for two forms of legislation: an amendment to the 1845 Lord's Day Act of Upper Canada to prohibit the Sunday operations of industrial and business corporations and general legislation similar to the 1883 Street Railway Act to ban Sunday traffic on the new electric interurbans. The Ontario Legislature at first responded favourably by including a Sunday prohibition clause in the 1895 Electric Railway Act and by amending, in 1897, the 1845 Act to forbid the Sunday operation of street railways and interurbans.³⁷ But exemptions to the latter clause permitted companies already operating on Sunday to continue to do so. Sunday service thus continued in Hamilton, St. Catharines, Windsor, Niagara Falls, and Berlin. The Ontario government also allowed votes on the issue to go forward in Toronto and Ottawa. The Manitoba Legislature pursued a similar course of action. In 1895 it passed legislation prohibiting Sunday operations on any street railway in the province. By 1902, however, it had amended this legislation to permit citizens of large urban centres such as Winnipeg to decide the question themselves.³⁸

Court challenges proved especially frustrating to the anti-Sunday car lobby, overwhelming it

in the end. The Courts raised the unexpected question of jurisdiction over Sabbath observance legislation, thus plunging the issue into a lengthy process of litigation and leaving the sabbatarians quite helpless. Both the federal and provincial governments had assumed that Sabbath observance belonged to provincial jurisdiction.³⁹ In 1898, however, the Nova Scotia Supreme Court concluded otherwise, deciding, in *R. v. Halifax Electric Tramway Company*, that the 1891 amendment to the 1851 Act had been *ultra vires* the provincial jurisdiction.⁴⁰ By casting doubt on the validity of all provincial legislation concerning Sabbath observance, this decision affected judicial proceedings in other provinces. Ontario courts had already upheld the right of street railway companies to operate on Sunday,⁴¹ often expressing their hostility to the sabbatarian cause. Justice G.W. Burton of the Ontario Appeal Court, for instance, found it painful to find anyone in the nineteenth century grudging the enjoyment by poor families of their only day of leisure.⁴² But, with the Nova Scotia ruling, the Ontario government had to resubmit the Sunday car issue to the courts to decide whether it had had the right to pass the 1897 legislation amending the 1845 Act. When, in 1902, the Ontario Appeal Court ruled that the provincial Legislature had had the right,⁴³ its decision directly contradicted the Nova Scotia ruling. As a result, the Sunday car issue proceeded to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for final interpretation of the question of jurisdiction. In July 1903, the Committee reversed the Ontario Appeal Court decision, declaring Sabbath observance a matter of federal jurisdiction

alone.⁴⁴ In 1905, when the Canadian Supreme Court confirmed this interpretation,⁴⁵ the Laurier government assumed responsibility for the introduction of a Lord's Day bill to Parliament.

During this ten year period of litigation, the Sunday car made irreversible gains in its conquest of the Canadian landscape, aided and abetted by governments, courts and the public. For instance the Ontario government refused to respond to sabbatarian lobbying to halt Sunday service while the question was *sub judice*. It also refused to take action against companies that defied the 1897 legislation once the courts had declared in favour of the street railway companies. As the twentieth century dawned, it was clear that most Ontario cabinet ministers supported Sunday cars in large urban centres, although they favoured plebiscites on the question in towns along interurban lines.⁴⁶ The courts supported the government's stand and the companies' defiance. In a 1904 case involving the Kingston, Portsmouth, and Cataraqui Railway Company a court ruled that the firm was not only authorized to run daily but was also in duty bound to do so since its charter read, "The cars shall run daily." If they did not do so, the court concluded, the company might well lose its charter.⁴⁷ For its part, the public demonstrated its appreciation of Sunday service by its patronage. Toronto Railway Company records indicate that by 1898, only one year after the introduction of Sunday service, people travelled as much on Sunday as on any other day of the week.⁴⁸ By 1906, then, the Sunday car was running at will in most eastern provinces as well as in British Columbia. Only in Winnipeg

did the city's sabbatarian association obtain a victory when it defeated the Sunday car's bid to run in a 1902 plebiscite. The victory, however, was only temporary and was secured with organized labour's support. This support would vanish once the street railway company guaranteed its employees a weekly day of rest.

The Lord's Day Act of 1906 retained federal jurisdiction over steam railway operations but made street railway legislation a matter of provincial jurisdiction.⁴⁹ Ontario and Manitoba consequently re-enacted their previous statutes with the accompanying exemptions, and the new prairie provinces included clauses in their railway acts prohibiting Sunday operations.⁵⁰ Yet the Sunday car continued, virtually unimpeded, its conquest of Canadian cities. Several Ontario street railway companies that had been offering a service since the 1903 Privy Council decision had rendered all existing provincial legislation null and void received government sanction of their action. Other companies sought permission to begin Sunday service by organizing plebiscites. Again the government approved this development. In 1908 the Port Arthur street railway company organized votes on a proposed service between Port Arthur and Fort William and in their environs. The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board reinforced the support shown in the vote by refusing to press charges against the company for illegal action. The Ontario government, in turn, did not challenge the board's decision.⁵¹ The story was the same in other provinces. The 1906 charter of the Charlottetown Electric Transit and Power Corporation required the company to operate every weekday, and the City

Council rejected, by a vote of eighteen to eight, a proposed amendment to prohibit Sunday operations.⁵² In the same year, Winnipeg citizens, satisfied that the company had guaranteed its employees a fair deal, joined labour in voting for the Sunday car. In addition, the Manitoba Legislature granted other municipalities the right to vote on the issue.⁵³ Alberta followed suit by amending its Railway Act to permit Edmonton, Calgary and Strathcona to vote on the question. Edmonton and Calgary immediately organized plebiscites, and Sunday service began in each city.⁵⁴ Ontario adopted the local option principle as policy in 1909, restricting the right to vote to cities with a minimum population of 50,000.⁵⁵ Four years later, Saskatchewan too fell in with this plan. The *Regina Morning Leader* of Monday, June 23, 1913, declared the previous day's adventure into Sunday service a success.⁵⁶

And so one leaves the Sunday car in 1914, triumphant. Sabbatarians still grumbled about the adverse impact of the Sunday car upon the morals of its patrons, but their complaints fell on deaf ears. Ministers by the score were among the Sunday car's patrons. It was clear to them that an activity that was perfectly moral six days of the week was equally so on the seventh. For Canadians, Sunday had become part Holy Day, part holiday, and the giddy trolley's distinctive atmosphere continued to work its magic upon them:

The men with their flowing moustaches, and the young blades decked out in fancy striped jackets, sailor straw hats or derbies, was a sight long to be remembered. The teen-aged girls donned their

best ankle-length dresses, starched shirt-waists, feather or flower-trimmed hats with a bird or two perched on top. The homeward ride, usually at night, was an exhilarating experience as these old cars gathered speed through the open country, lurching from side to side as they sped down the rails. If it were a closed car, the windows would rattle, with the motorman stamping his foot on a gong when approaching a crossing. The journey ended with mothers awakening their sleeping youngsters and everyone bodily tired, but it had been a happy day.⁵⁷

* * *

NOTES

- 1 Cited by John Mills, *Cataract Traction: The Railways of Hamilton* (Toronto: Canadian Traction Series, 1971), p. 75.
- 2 *Saturday Night*, 1 September 1894. Victoria, British Columbia, was the first major Canadian city to have electric traction, when the National Electric Tramway and Lighting Company Ltd. started service on February 22, 1890. Other large Canadian cities quickly followed suit: Vancouver, June 1890; Ottawa, 1891; Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, and Winnipeg, 1892; Saint John, 1893; Halifax, 1896; Quebec City, 1897. Canadian street railway companies were electrified but a few years after American systems, which had begun to electrify in the late 1880s. In contrast, British street railway companies did not adopt the

- new traction until the early 1900s. See John McKay, *Tramways and Trolleys: The Rise of Urban Transport in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976); and T.C. Barker and M. Robbins, *A History of London Transport: Passenger Travel and the Development of the Metropolis* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1963), vol. 1: *The Nineteenth Century*, pp. 297-9.
- 3 Armstrong and Nelles, *The Revenge of the Methodist Bicycle Company: Sunday Streetcars and Municipal Reform in Toronto, 1888-1897* (Toronto: Peter Martin & Associates, 1977).
 - 4 Peter Goheen, *Victorian Toronto, 1850-1900: Pattern and Process of Growth* (University of Chicago: Department of Geography, Research Paper No. 127, 1970), pp. 72-3.
 - 5 Armstrong and Nelles, *The Revenge*, p. 29.
 - 6 John I. Cooper, *Montreal, A Brief History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1969), p. 104.
 - 7 *Canadian Magazine*, XVIII (January 1902), pp. 276-7. See also M.F. Campbell, *A Mountain and a City: The Story of Hamilton* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966), pp. 162-4.
 - 8 Goheen, *Victorian Toronto*, p. 73.
 - 9 See, for example, the charters of: the Saint John People's Street Railway Company, 30 Vict. (1866), c. 35(N.B.); the Halifax Street Railway Company, 47 Vict. (1884), c.62(N.S.); the Vancouver Street Railway Company, 49 Vict. (1886), c.31(B.C.); the Harrison Hot Springs Tramway Company, 51 Vict. (1881), c.47(B.C.).
 - 10 45 Vict. (1883), c.16(Ont.).
 - 11 City of Toronto, *Minutes of Council*, 1861, Appendix, By-Law No. 353, cited by Armstrong and Nelles, *The Revenge*, p. 187, n.17; re Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company, see 29-30 Vict. (1886), c.106 (Ont.). For charters of Ontario companies chartered between 1867 and 1883, see Ontario, Legislative Assembly, *Statutes*, 1867-1883.
 - 12 K. Jenkins, *Montreal: Island City of the St. Lawrence* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966), pp. 386-7.
 - 13 Presbyterian Church in Canada, *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly*, 1879, p. cxlix; Armstrong and Nelles, *The Revenge*, pp. 202-3.
 - 14 Douglas Sladen, *On the Cars and Off* (London, 1895), cited by Jean Burnet, "The Urban Community and Changing Moral Standards," in *Urbanism and the Changing Canadian Society*, edited by S.D. Clark (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 85; T. Hadley McGinnis, *Canadian Notes* (1893), cited by John Gray, "They're Fighting to Save What's Left of Sunday," *Maclean's Magazine*, 15 February 1955, p. 32; *Saturday Night*, 1 September 1894.

- 15 James Gray, *Red Lights on the Prairies* (Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library (Signet), 1973), p. 49.
- 16 *Canadian Magazine*, XVIII (January 1902), pp. 276-7.
- 17 City of Winnipeg, By-Law No. 543, s.5 in 55 Vict (1892), c. 56 (Man.), Schedule "A". The Toronto Railway Company offered the same fare. See L.H. Pursley, *Street Railways of Toronto, 1861-1921* Interurbans Special No. 25 (Los Angeles: Electric Railway Publications, 1958), p. 16; see also charter of Ottawa Electric Railway Company, 57 Vict. (1894), c.76, s. 39 (Ont.).
- 18 *Toronto Globe*, 15 May 1891.
- 19 A.S. Thompson, *Spadina: A History of Old Toronto* (Toronto: Pagurian Press, 1975), pp. 162-4.
- 20 Ian F. Jobling, "Urbanization and Sport in Canada, 1867-1900," in *Canadian Sport: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by Richard S. Gruneau and John G. Albinson (Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley (Canada) Ltd., 1976), p. 68.
- 21 McKay, *Tramways and Trolleys*, p. 226; Barker and Robbins, *A History of London Transport*, vol. 1, pp. 204-7; George M. Smerk, "The Streetcar: Shaper of American Cities," *Traffic Quarterly*, XXI (December 1967), p. 68.
- 22 From a survey conducted by the *Toronto Globe* in February 1882, one can conclude that 55 percent of Toronto's population did not attend church (*Toronto Globe*, 7 February 1882). In 1888 the *Christian Guardian* estimated that "a vast population of from forty to fifty thousand [i.e., 25-30 percent] of Toronto's population ... go to no church." Cited by S.D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948), p. 393.
- 23 *Saturday Night*, 1 May 1897; *Toronto World*, 8 April 1897.
- 24 In 1891, British Columbia's total population of 98,173 contained 23,619 Anglicans (24 percent. No further breakdown between High and Low Anglican is possible.); 20,843 Roman Catholics (21 percent); 15,284 Presbyterians (16 percent); and 14,298 Methodists (15 percent). In Quebec's population of 1,488,535, Roman Catholics numbered 1,291,709 (87 percent); Anglicans 75,472 (5 percent); Presbyterians 52,673 (4 percent); and Methodists 39,544 (3 percent). In contrast, Ontario's population of 2,114,321 contained 453,147 Presbyterians (21 percent); 654,033 Methodists (31 percent); 385,999 Anglicans (18 percent); and 358,300 Roman Catholics (17 percent). *Canada Year Book*, 1912, p. 32.
- 25 Presbyterian Church in Canada, *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly*, 1889, Appendix No. 14; *ibid.*, 1891, Appendix No. 32; also *Christian Guardian*, 16 December 1891.
- 26 Alan Metcalfe, "The Evolution of Organized Physical

- Recreation in Montreal, 1840-1895," *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, XI (May 1978), pp. 163-4.
- 27 52 Vict. (1889), c. 79; ss.8-11(Que.); re the Catholic hierarchy's attitude see Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1895, cc. 764-5.
- 28 In 1891, only one third (26,270) of British Columbia's residents were female, compared with the more balanced proportions in Ontario's population (805,431 females, 822,433 males). Canada, *Census*, 1911, vol. VI, p. xii.
- 29 Presbyterian Church in Canada, *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly*, 1889, Appendix No. 14: re Sunday newspapers in British Columbia, see Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1894, c. 3423; *Ibid.*, 1898, c. 2418.
- 30 *Toronto World*, 14 June 1893; see also Citizens' Pro-Sunday Car Committee, "Manifesto," *Toronto World*, 29 April 1897.
- 31 Brian Harrison, "State Intervention and Moral Reform in Nineteenth-Century England," in *Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England*, edited by Patricia Hollis (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1974), p. 295.
- 32 Ontario Lord's Day Alliance (hereafter cited as OLDA), "Memorandum concerning the formation of a Provincial Alliance for the better observance of the Lord's Day," 15 February 1895, in OLDA, Scrapbook 1892-1900, Lord's Day Alliance of Canada Papers (hereafter cited as LDACP), University of Toronto, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Room.
- 33 Citizens' Anti-Sunday Car Committee, "Manifesto," in *The Toronto Book*, edited by William Kilbourn (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1976), pp. 71-2; also *Toronto Mail and Empire*, 1 May 1897.
- 34 33 Vict. (1873), c.100(Ont.).
- 35 55 Vict. (1892), c.99, ss.1, 4(1), 19(1), 21.
- 36 54 Vict. (1891), c.32(N.S.).
- 37 58 Vict. (1895), c.38, ss.9(2), 136; 60 Vict. (1897), c.14, s.95(Ont.); R.S.O. (1897), c.246.
- 38 R.S.M. (1891), c.90, s.143; 1-2 Edw. VII (1902), c.7, s.73a.
- 39 Since Confederation, both Conservative and Liberal federal governments had declared Sabbath observance a matter of provincial jurisdiction. See Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 1891, c. 764; *Ibid.*, 1898, c. 2429. The provinces and the territories had asserted their supposed competence by passing various statutes and amendments: see 48 Vict. (1885), c.44(Ont.); 54 Vict. (1891), c.32(N.S.); C.S.N.B. (1877), c.99, s.96(35); R.S.M. (1891), c. 90, s.143; C.S.B.C. (1888), c.108; *Ibid.*, c.88, s.87(65); R.O.N.W.T. (1888), c.39.

- 40 30 N.S.R. 469; 1 C.C.C. 424 (C.A.).
- 41 18 O.A.R. 459; *A.G. [of Ontario] v. Hamilton Street Railway Company*, 27 O.R. 49; *A.G. [of Ontario] v. Hamilton Street Railway Company*, 24 O.A.R. 170.
- 42 18 O.A.R. 459.
- 43 O.W.R. 312; 54 C.C.C. 344.
- 44 (1903) A.C. 524.
- 45 "In re Jurisdiction of a Province to Legislate Respecting Abstention from Labour on Sunday," 35 S.C.R. (1905), 581.
- 46 *Toronto Globe*, 29 March 1899; A.E. O'Meara to Rev. H.R. Horne, 1 May 1899, LDACP, Letterbook 1899-1900, p. 519.
- 47 *Lord's Day Advocate* (October 1904); OLDA, Minutes of Legal Committee, 8 November 1904, in OLDA, Minutebook of Legal Committee 1903-1912, LDACP; see also Company charter, 56 Vict. (1893), c.91, s.16(c).
- 48 Figures are based on population figures for Toronto, the revenue passengers of the Toronto Railway Company, and the number of operating days in the years 1896, the last year before Sunday service, and 1898, the first full year of Sunday operations. Figures are found in Pursley, *Street Railways of Toronto*, p. 144:
- 1896:
population -	178,185
revenue passengers-	23,537,000
operating days -	313
=	.4220 revenue passengers per capita per operating day.
- 1898:
population -	186,527
revenue passengers-	28,710,000
operating days -	365
=	.4217 revenue passengers per capita per operating day.
- Had the same number of people not used the cars on Sundays as on a weekday, the 1898 figure would have been 15 to 20 percent lower than the 1896 figure.
- 49 See Rev. J.G. Shearer to A.B. Aylesworth, 13 October 1906, LDACP, Letterbook 1905-6, p. 725: "...when the Lord's Day Act came to be drafted by us, before it was submitted to the Government, we determined to leave Electric Railways out of its scope knowing that there is a great difference as between the different Provinces, and that it would be a very difficult question to legislate upon...."
- 50 5-6 Edw. VII (1906), c.51, s.22A(Man.); 6 Edw. VII (1906), c.30, ss.193, 197(4)(Ont.); 7 Edw. VII (1907), c.8, s.241(Alb); 8 Geo. V (1910-11), c.41, s.3(Sask.).
- 51 *Lord's Day Advocate* (September 1908).

- 52 6 Edw. VII (1906), c.30, s.33(P.E.I.); *Lord's Day Advocate* (June 1906).
- 53 5-6 Edw. VII (1906), c.41, s.22A(Man.); also 6-7 Edw. VII (1907), c.27, s.12(Man.).
- 54 9 Edw. VII, c.4, s.16(Alb.); LDAC, "Annual Report, 1909," LDACP.
- 55 9 Edw. VII (1909), c.68(Ont.). All Ontario cities with that population already had Sunday car service.
- 56 Cited by Colin K. Hatcher, *Saskatchewan Pioneer Streetcars: The Story of the Regina Municipal Railway* (Montreal: A Railfare Book, 1971), pp. 26-7.
- 57 Mills, *Cataract Traction*, p. 27.