

Dickinson,
Dodd,
Dugas,
Dundas,
Dupont,

McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McCarthy,
McCraney,

Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Woodworth, and
Wright.—148.

NAYS:
Messieur

Guilbault.—1.

Bill recommitted and reported.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I beg leave to move that the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out clause sixty-five, which permits the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman should describe more accurately what the resolution means before it is put. I do not think that the motion describes the object of it fairly. This is a proviso which regulates that the sale of liquor shall take place on Sunday only at meal times. I am in favor of this principle, and I do not wish to be recorded as voting apparently in favor of the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday. It would be better if the hon. gentleman would describe the provision of the Bill more accurately in his motion.

Mr. ROSS. I have not the slightest objection to insert in my amendment the words of the proviso, and move that those words be struck out. Some amendments were made in this proviso last night in Committee. The Bill had been reprinted, or I would have inserted the proviso. I am quite willing to amend my amendment to that effect. Of course, any person who wishes to understand the full force of the amendment, can do so by referring to the Bill, which contains the objectionable provision that I desire to strike out.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion cannot now be changed without permission of the House. Shall it be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the nays have it.

Mr. BLANCHET. I think that the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw his amendment, and put it in another way.

Mr. BLAKE. The House has declined to allow the hon. gentleman the courtesy of withdrawing it.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,
Armstrong,	Foster,
Bain,	Fréchette,
Béchar,	Geoffrion,
Bernier,	Gigault,
Blake,	Gillmor,
Blanchet,	Girouard (Kent),
Blondeau,	Guilbault,
Bourassa,	Gunn,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Harley,
Cameron (Ipswich),	Holton,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,
Catudal,	Jamieson,
Daoust,	Kirk,
De Beaujeu,	Landerkin,
De St. Georges,	Lesage,
Dundas,	Lister,
Dupont,	Livingstone,
Fairbank,	Macdonald (King's),
Fisher,	McMillan (Huron),
Fleming,	McCraney,
Forbes,	McIntyre,

NAYS:
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,
Amyot,	Dodd,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,

Mr. LESAGE.

McCarthy,
McDougald,
McNeil,

Beaty,
Bell,
Benoit,
Benson,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Billy,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Cameron (Victoria),
Campbell (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coursol,
Curran,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Davies,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,

Farrow,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),
Ferguson (Welland),
Girouard (Jac.-Cartier),
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hall,
Hawkins,
Homer,
Hurteau,
Keefer,
Kilvert,
Kinney,
Kranz,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Langevin,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cap Breton),
Macmillan (Middlesex),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),

Massue,
Mitchell,
O'Brien,
Orton,
Quimet,
Patterson (Essex),
Pope,
Reid,
Richey,
Riopol,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Scott,
Shakespeare,
Small,
Sproule,
Tasé,
Taylor,
Tilley,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
Wood (Westm'land) and Wright.—79.

Mr. BLAKE. A few moments ago, by an almost unanimous vote, we reserved to one of the Provinces the municipal powers to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors which that Province enjoyed at the time of Confederation. I move in amendment thereto:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same, by adding to Clause 46 (a) the words following:— And nothing in this Act contained shall affect the powers conferred on the municipal authorities of any other Province by the laws in force in such Province at the time of its Confederation with Canada, to restrict or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the municipality; and these powers are hereby confirmed and continued.

I have paid my hon. friend the compliment of adopting his language.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman state what law was in force in Ontario at the time of Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot name them all, but amongst them was the following:—

"The council of every township, town and incorporated village, may pass by-laws for prohibiting the sale by retail of spirituous, fermented, or other manufactured liquors in any inn or other house of public entertainment; and for prohibiting totally the sale thereof in shops and places other than houses of public entertainment, &c."

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend has read only a portion of the section.

Mr. BLAKE. I said "and so forth," but I will read the remainder:

"Provided the by-law before the final passing thereof has been duly approved by the electors of the municipalities in the manner provided by this Act."

Mr. McCARTHY. We should consider the portion of the clause which we have extracted from my hon. friend—and which I hope he did not intentionally desire to conceal—and how it will agree with the local option clause which we have put in the Bill. If it disagrees, to put it in will be only to confuse the whole Bill. While I think we should consider what its effect would be upon the Bill, for my own part I have no objection to accept it, so far as it does not render the present clauses of the Bill with regard to local option wholly nugatory. We have already defined the manner in which this local option, if desired, can be carried out. If there is any conflict between the two, doubts and difficulties will arise in connection with the Bill, and I think we should accept either one principle or the other, seeing that there is no substantial difference between them, as in each case the question has to be submitted to the vote of the people, and they have to obtain under this section an actual and positive majority. I shall say no more until I hear the further discussion of the question, as I merely rose for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the importance of the amendment which was sprung