

was made to the hon. gentleman, and I believe that the hon. gentleman, after taking time to consider it, declined to interfere; and I presume those who were chiefly interested in the Scott Act thought it was imprudent for him to bring it again before Parliament. And so you find that even the peculiarity of the Act that is proposed to-day in this Parliament, the question that you relegated it exclusively to the jurisdiction of this Parliament is placed in the position in which that Act might be impaired at some future day, and so would be beyond remedy by those who would have abandoned it to Provincial jurisdiction. Now, it has been made clear in the discussion to-night that there is a different state of progress on the question of temperance in the different Provinces. Different modes of action on this matter have been adopted in the several Provinces. Have we not heard suggestions made as to the impolicy of obliterating in one Province what has worked well in it, and have we not heard deprecations of doing away with these local provisions in our effort to attain uniformity. An hon. member says that there is no principle of local option in Nova Scotia. I say there is a principle of local option in Nova Scotia of the most satisfactory character. The hon. gentleman says it is not one general local option, because it is applied to any particular license. But, Sir, with a law such as that which provides that no license can be granted to any individual unless he produces a petition signed by two-thirds of the ratepayers of the district, you have the most satisfactory provision for local option that can be conceived—one far more satisfactory than this, because those who are against the granting of the license have not to move at all in the matter, and the man who wants the license has to go to the trouble of securing the two-thirds. In Prince Edward Island, I understand, there is the vote of a majority; in Manitoba, 16 out of 20 are required to sign the certificate; and in New Brunswick it has been conceded by all they have a thorough provision for local option. In Quebec, reference has been made to the provision for local option in cities. But because, in these respects, many of the Provinces are in advance of Ontario, the Province from which I come, are we to run them all down to the point at which it is supposed the law will be satisfactory in our Province? Not at all. I believe we are ready and willing to advance. I believe we are prepared to go onward, and not deprive the other Provinces of that which they have got. I was rejoiced when I saw this clause in the Bill. We are told that I could not acquiesce in the clause with sincerity. Those who brought it in, brought it in, no doubt, in all sincerity, though now they oppose it, decry and condemn it. But I, in my innocence, supposed that it was a good clause, and, for holding that opinion still, I am condemned as insincere, as acting only to embarrass the Government. I was amazed at the action of the First Minister. He told us, when he moved his resolution, the other day, for the introduction of this Bill, that the House would not be asked to concur in the report of the Committee, that the Government would act upon their own responsibility, that they would bring in such a Bill as they thought fit, and when I asked him for some information, he would not tell me anything about the Bill, he introduced his Bill, and the Bill contains the clause. This Bill contains the clause, and yet the hon. gentleman says it is wrong for me to support the clause. I admit that there is a *prima facie* case against me when I support anything coming from the hon. gentleman, but I hope to be relieved from that position, because I now find he is opposed to it himself.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The propositions before the Committee are, first: the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville, in favor of a bare majority of the voters given at an open vote deciding the question; and the proposition of the hon. member for West Middlesex, that the petition should be signed by an absolute majority of the qualified electors. I am not in favor of either of these proposals. I

do not approve of the principle of local option as applied to minor municipalities; but if I may judge from the remarks made by various speakers, it is probable that a majority of the House now is favorable to a local option clause, and if that be the case, I think it should not be determined by open voting but in accordance with the usual system of voting adopted in Dominion Elections and in nearly all Provincial Elections, by ballot. I think on a question of this kind, especially, it is proper and necessary that the voting should be by ballot. In matters of this kind we cannot trust to open voting, but under the ballot, judging from our Parliamentary experience, men vote according to their honest belief; whereas under open voting they vote according to the influences surrounding them at the time. I, therefore, beg to move, as a further amendment, "that the voting be by ballot, and that instead of a bare majority being required, two-thirds of the duly qualified electors be necessary." If a vote were taken in this way we should not be passing a law against the general sense of the community, which public sentiment would not favor, and therefore could not be administered. The experience under the Dunkin Act warrants me in saying that when a majority was able to carry the law the Act became inoperative, and the cause of temperance, instead of advancing, retrograded, because there was no license and no restraint on the improper sale of liquor, and it was sold indiscriminately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. member not to press his amendment just now. The question before the Committee is open voting, or voting by petition. Let the first be determined, and motions in regard to details can afterwards be considered.

Amendment (Mr. Gigault) agreed to.

On section 55,

Mr. METHOT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, where, in districts where no licenses are granted, the fund is to come from with which to pay the salaries of the Inspectors and the expenses? In the county of Nicolet there has been no licenses issued for thirteen or fourteen years, and in that county there were no funds to pay these officers, simply because every time one came in we always succeeded in throwing him out. That county is a license district, but I do not see how they will have funds to pay the expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. You will have to issue licenses.

Mr. METHOT. That is what I am opposed to, and I am sure that if the principle of local option is left out the Bill will be received with great disfavor in my county.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman now says that the License Commissioners shall be paid out of the license fund. I say that the Commissioners will thereby be placed in a most invidious temptation, and that they will be under great temptation, which, whether they yield to it or not, they will be suspected of yielding. These gentlemen should not be put in the painful position of its being said or suspected that they give licenses to Jones or Smith or somebody else for the purpose of increasing the fund, or otherwise they would not have been paid their salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Dunkin Act came in force in our county, it was said that there would be no machinery to carry it into effect, but it was found that there were still prosecutions to be made, and that the funds arising from these prosecutions was sufficient to pay the Inspectors salaries. With regard to this question of local option, I may say that while the Dunkin Act was carried in our county by a majority of something like 900, we found, after our experience with it, that there was not a man who voted for it the second time to every fifty who voted for it the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. member for West Durham, that it would be unfortunate to