

may be kept open on Sunday, because, although the Parliament of Canada is entitled to legislate on the first proposition, that is to restrain the sale of liquors on given days and within given areas, and at given times, because it is in accordance with peace and the good government of the country, under the provisions of the British North America Act, which refers to the prerogative—they can legislate at all times in that direction; but they cannot legislate in the opposite direction. The Parliament of Canada may restrain the traffic in liquor by grocers, and all who sell any other article; they can prevent the local legislatures from licensing grocers, because they can make it illegal for a grocer, selling any other article to sell liquors, and thereby they will confine the sale of liquors to those only who deal in that article alone. They may prohibit the sale of liquors to women and children, and they may prohibit its sale within a defined distance around our schools and colleges, and make the sale of it to students illegal. They may prohibit its sale at or near railway depots, or to engineers or train-men, and they may say it shall not be sold on board vessels or to masters and mates; thus giving increased security to the traveling public. Its powers to do good in that direction have no limit, for these laws are all in the direction of peace, order, and the good government of Canada, and as such they fall within the purview of the Federal Parliament. But in localities where no prohibition law exists, the Parliament of Canada cannot legislate on the source of licenses. The Parliament of Canada cannot grant licenses, and if they cannot grant licenses, they cannot say from whom those licenses shall spring,—whether from the municipalities or from the local governments. They cannot legislate on the details of licenses, or their terms. They cannot regulate the number of licenses that may be issued in proportion to the population of a community. They cannot fix the amount payable for licenses, nor can the Parliament of Canada say how the license fee shall be distributed,—whether wholly to the municipality or wholly to the local legislature. It cannot provide for the number of stalls in a livery stable, which is an incident to a license. Certainly when I heard the word saloons put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General, in de-

livering the Speech, I felt that we were called upon to consider a subject that had never before been discussed in Parliament. I felt it to be a new thing that His Excellency should call upon Parliament to discuss matters connected with saloon licenses, and it seemed to me a little undignified to say the least of it; it sounded unpleasantly upon my ears, as was probably the case with the hon. gentlemen. If a municipality decides not to issue licenses, as they do in some parts of Nova Scotia, the Parliament of Canada cannot interfere; it cannot restrict the Saturday night law, and it cannot in violation of the license say that liquor may be sold on Sunday. It can do a great many things that are in the direction of prohibition and of the restriction of the liquor traffic, but I do not think it can enlarge it. The clause professes to be based on the assumption that some abuse had to be remedied; now I was not aware that there was a condition of things in the Dominion that called for such interference by this Parliament. My impression was that the temperance education of Canada was rapidly growing, and that temperance was spreading very rapidly in this country. We have proofs of it, but I will not detain the House now by stating them—there may be a more fitting occasion when details of this kind can be gone into—but I know of no petition that has been presented to Parliament asking us to intervene in the direction indicated in this paragraph. The only knowledge I have that the attention of the Government was in any way called to it, was in the conflict that was alluded to by the seconder of the resolution in answer to the Speech, which conflict occurred in the Province of Ontario, and arose I believe, in consequence of a deputation of licensed victuallers waiting on the head of the Government, and asking that they might be relieved from some restrictions imposed on them, under what is known as the Crooks' Act, in Ontario. The language of the Speech would lead us to assume that there was in some part of the Dominion an unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors, and that there existed a need of better supervision. Now, I have not heard that the local authorities of the various sections of the Dominion had been at all indifferent to the restraining of the liquor traffic; on the contrary, I think