

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two gallons is better.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it better?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason is this: that if a person wants a supply for his own house, it is better that he should go to a wholesale house where there would be no chance of tipping, as it is alleged there is sometimes in a retail store, and where he would get better and cheaper liquor.

On section 8,

Mr. McCARTHY. This clause is copied from the Ontario Act, and it provides under the authority of what Board licenses shall issue.

Mr. ROSS. If a license is issued to a vessel from any port to which the vessel calls, it will be good for the whole voyage, although she may go into a district where the Scott Act is in force.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the clause declaring that this Act shall not prevent the operation of the Scott Act, will prevent liquor from being sold in a Scott Act territory.

On section 9,

Mr. McCARTHY. This is to give power to the License Commissioners to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining a license, to limit the number of hotel, saloon, and shop licenses within the maximum prescribed by the Act, to declare the number of licenses that may be issued in any year, and to regulate the hotels, saloons, and shops to be licensed.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). This provides for the defining of the conditions and qualifications requisite to obtain hotel licenses. Why not saloon licenses as well?

Mr. McCARTHY. We will add the words "or saloon."

Mr. CASEY. Are the Commissioners to be allowed to prescribe additional conditions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; not contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In limiting the number of licenses, are hotels and saloons to be equally considered?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; the Board will decide that so many hotels and so many saloons will be allowed, or no hotels or no saloons.

On section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. Clause 9 provides the Board of License Commissioners may at any time before the 1st of May in each year pass resolutions for regulating and determining the qualifications and so forth. Clause 10 says the Board shall meet some day in the month of March, for the purpose of taking into consideration all applications for licenses. Should not the regulations be determined and made known before considering the applications? The applicants ought to know what conditions and qualifications the Commissioners may impose before making their application, and the Inspector should know them also, so as to make a proper report. The inhabitants of any locality should also know how many licenses will be granted in their locality, so that they may have a voice in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman puts a strong case, and we will hold clauses 9 and 10 over to settle the point.

Mr. AUGER. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to one feature in section ten. It says the Board shall meet "some day in the month of March." In Quebec the Wardens are elected on the second Wednesday of the month of March, and if the meeting of the Board in the Province of Quebec could be held after that date, there would be a new Warden. This license question interests the public generally, and very likely the election of the
Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

Warden might turn on that question. If the meeting of the Board for granting licenses took place after the second Wednesday in March, then there would be a new Warden.

Mr. McCARTHY. Practically that must be so, because the meeting cannot take place until after the 14th March.

On section 13,

Mr. McCARTHY. This section requires the applicant for hotel, saloon, or shop license, when he himself has not already had a license, or where he is applying for premises that have not been already licensed, to obtain a certificate signed by one-fourth—but the Committee made that to one-third; one-fourth is a misprint—of the electors in a particular polling sub-division in which the house is situated; that is, he must obtain one-third of the electors in order to be entitled to have his case considered before the Board.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would suggest that we insert the word "resident" before the word "electors." Those who are resident in the district are those who are particularly interested in the issuing or non-issuing of licenses, and I see that the Bill is framed with a view to meet the wishes of those who will be affected by the issue of licenses. There are quite a number of non-resident electors, and this point should be considered.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that as the Bill has been printed and distributed with the words "one-fourth" in, it ought to stand that way, because those interested in the matter have had the Bill before them with that number in it. It seems to me that one-fourth is an adequate number to require the applicant for license to obtain the signatures of.

Mr. BLAKE. It is certainly an extraordinary reason why we should keep it at one-fourth because a mistake has been made in printing the words "one-fourth." I suppose it would be a very much stronger reason for not making any change in the Bill in any respect in which the intention of the Committee has been carried out, if the hon. gentleman says that because a mistake has been made in the printing of the Bill, therefore it should stand.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member has mistaken and perverted what I said. I said because it had been published in that way, not because the mistake had been made.

Mr. ORTON. I would ask if there is any provision for granting licenses after the 1st of March, as clause 12 states every petition shall be filed on or before the 1st of March. There are many reasons why some provision should be made for granting licenses after that date, particularly in new counties.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice by this clause that all who at present have licenses on making their application, on the coming into force of this Act, are exempted from getting the signatures of one-third of the electors. Now, if one-third of the electors are to exercise a controlling power over the issuing of the license, I think they should have control over the existing licenses as well as the new ones. The very same regulations should apply to all licenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the licensee is a licensee under this Act, and not a party who has held a license under some other law.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what it should be in my opinion but on reading over the clause I was not sure it was so.

Mr. McCARTHY. We intended that those already licensed and able to obtain the Inspector's certificate, should not be put to the trouble of securing that certificate; but that those who never had a license, and whose houses had never been licensed, should obtain the certificate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be out of the question to require old-established hotels to get certificates of good character. This Bill will come into force