

and was adopted. Consequently we cannot go into a discussion of the matter at this moment.

Bill reported.

Mr. CARON moved that the Bill, as amended, be now taken into consideration.

Mr. ROSS. I have to propose an amendment. The House is aware that although canteens are established under the Queen's Regulations and Orders, and that notwithstanding the general impression that malt liquors are not sold there, they are sold to a great extent, and in order to prevent the demoralization of the force and to prevent our young men falling into the way of temptation, I think an effort should be made to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquor in camp. I am not prepared to say that anything serious has arisen on this score, but I think it is highly desirable to remove all danger. The matter was brought up the other night by one of the members from British Columbia and the hon. member for West Durham read from the Queen's Regulations to the effect that no spirituous liquors should be sold at the home stations. I think that regulation does not go far enough, and beg to propose in amendment:

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same, by inserting after the word "army" in line two, section sixty-four, the following words:—"but nothing in the said Regulations and Orders, so far as they relate to the establishment of canteens, shall render lawful the sale of beer or malt liquors of any kind whatever."

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman must understand that it is in the interest of commanding officers to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in camp. In the camps held last summer the orders were that no intoxicating liquor would be allowed in the different canteens. We cannot go beyond that. We have no control more than giving instructions to the commanding officers. I think the amendment is a step in the right direction, but I do not think we could legislate in a Bill of this kind upon that question in the manner the hon. gentleman now suggests.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not agree with the view of the hon. gentleman. The Queen's Regulations prohibits in the home canteen the sale of hard spirituous liquors, but not the sale of malt liquors. The Bill proposes the Queen's Regulations shall apply. The Regulations permit the sale of malt liquors, and that is proposed to be our regulation. Now, all that my hon. friend proposes is to recognize the provision which exists under the Queen's Regulations. That seems to me to be quite reasonable. The Queen's Regulations permits the one but prohibits the other; we want to prohibit the sale of both malt and spirituous liquors.

Mr. CARON. I did not say that malt liquors would be prohibited; I said that spirituous liquors would be, and the experience of the camps in the different Provinces has shown that no spirituous liquors were sold. I think we cannot introduce the amendment the hon. gentleman proposes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of the first resolution (April 13th).

Mr. BLAKE. I would like some explanations as to the hon. gentleman's policy on the item of books—a little more in detail than he gave in his Budget Speech, and with reference to several suggestions which have just been made. For my part, I feel some difficulty in understanding what the interpretation of the clause is: "books bound, which shall have been printed more than seven years." Whether the hon. gentleman means the first publication of the particular

book, or whether it is the specific book which has been printed more than seven years? I suppose what the hon. gentleman meant was a book of which any edition has been printed more than seven years. I doubt, however, whether that is distinctly carried out by the clause. Objections have been taken by the trade to this provision. It is said, as the hon. gentleman is, no doubt, aware, that it is a very ordinary practice now to print books without any date at all, and that the ascertainment of the date, even of the particular volume, may be a question of uncertainty in the case of a particular book which is imported. But beyond that, if it is intended, as I presume it is, that the question to be considered shall be, when was any edition of that book first published? That, of course, is not made to appear upon an old or recent edition of the book, and therefore, evidence has to be resorted to; one has to ascertain from other sources whether this is a book that is more than seven years old, or a later one. It is suggested that in many of the outports much greater difficulties have existed in this regard than in some larger places where there are skilled persons, having an extensive knowledge of books, who would be accessible, and that the result might be to lead to an undue advantage to importers who enter their books in some of these outports than in other places. It is also suggested that it will involve a considerable amount of difficulty and trouble with reference to invoiced books which come out together, some being subject to the 15 per cent. duty, and some being free, and the discrimination that will have to be resorted to, will produce additional difficulties to the trade. I have received statements from persons engaged in the trade, setting forth these difficulties, and stating that it will be found difficult for Customs officials to decide as to how long books have been published, and the majority of these officials will be guided by booksellers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am quite prepared to admit there will be some difficulty in carrying this arrangement into effect on the part of the Customs Department, and probably in some places, for a short time on the part of importers. But there appeared to be such an expression of public opinion in favor of a reduction of the duty on a certain class of books, such as books imported for certain public institutions, that the Government were exceedingly anxious to meet their views as far as possible. Under these circumstances it became a question of what steps could be taken to give them relief. If we could have said that all books should be free, that, of course, would have settled the question, but we were not in a position to say so, and therefore, we took the next best means to give them as liberal an arrangement as possible. In the United States books that have been published over twenty years are free; therefore we decided that it would meet very largely the case under consideration to say seven years, and the Government would then take means to ascertain, although it is surrounded with some difficulty, which books were subject to the duty and which books were not. Now, the hon. gentleman asks a question whether it is intended to apply to the book published seven years ago or to a book published twenty years ago, but printed only six years ago. Say originally it was published twenty years ago and now printed but six years, that will be subject to the duty. All books, no matter when they were first published, if they are printed within seven years, are subject to the duty. The point is the printing of them. Then another difficulty arises from the fact that all books do not bear the date upon which they are printed. The hon. member says there may be great difficulties in distinguishing 15 per cent. books from free books coming out that may be invoiced before the passage of this. The agent of the party will be asked to state on the invoice, that the books have been printed seven years, and the entry will be made accordingly. It will undoubtedly involve labor on the Customs Department, but the Government thought it better to throw that labor on the Department,

Mr. CARON.