

licensee would not be able to keep order in his house. I think when the liquor is drank the man will be drunk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a clause which appears in all Acts of this kind?

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this case, and members from New Brunswick will understand it. The county of St. John is not under the Scott Act. A steamer leaving St. John would pass through three or four counties up the river which are under the Scott Act; she might travel 120 miles up the river, and be under the Scott Act all the way to her destination. The vessel having obtained a license in the county of St. John, will those on board have liberty to sell liquor after they pass outside the boundaries of the county of St. John and through the counties where the Scott Act is in operation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think they will not have that liberty. They are within boundaries where the Scott Act is in force, and the Scott Act does not permit any license to be granted.

Mr. JAMIESON. I want to call attention to sub-sections *a* and *b*. It is not, I suppose, the intention to make this Act conform to the Crooks Act; but I desire to point out that the definition of hotel license in that Act is somewhat different from what it is here, and the definition of shop and hotel licenses in the Crooks Act is somewhat different from what it is here. This permits the sale of liquors in quantities not exceeding one quart, while in the Crooks Act, if I recollect aright, the quantity is less than one quart. Why the change should be made, I do not know.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is the difference?

Mr. JAMIESON. It may be said to be a distinction without a difference, but still there has been some object in placing it in the Crooks Act in that way; and I think it really ought to be amended. As far as shop licenses are concerned, in the Crooks Act holders are allowed to sell in quantities not less than three half-pints. I observe that here the quantity is reduced to one imperial pint. I confess I do not like the change; and I think we ought to adhere to the Ontario law. I do not know how the law is in other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman why the change was made?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was made at the suggestion of a member of the Committee, who thought that liquor ought to be sold in bottle this way, as it is put in bottles in that quantity, and that consequently it would not be improper to so authorize its sale. For instance, a pint of Bass' ale, a pint of claret, &c. It is not to be drunk on the premises, and there seems no particular reason why this should not be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Ale and claret are the principal liquors to be dealt with.

Mr. CASEY. This will prevent a man, holding a shop license, from selling an ordinary pint bottle.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is as near as we can get to it, at all events.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me, if the hon. gentleman framed a clause with reference to ale and claret, he was looking after the anise and cumin, and was not taking charge of the weightier matters of the law. It is the stronger liquors which are sold in different measures, and not with reference to imperial pints; and where a considerable diminution is thus made in the quality saleable under a shop license.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there is not much difference; and the hon. gentleman knows that, whether wine, beer or spirits, they are now put up in Imperial quarts

Mr. AUGER.

and pints. The old provision in the Crooks Act relating to three pints means the old wine measure. This is not quite so large a quantity, but is considerably more than one pint, though less than three half wine pints; but it is a convenient measure both for wine, beer and spirits.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think that this facilitates or rather encourages the sale of small quantities in shops, which I think the Bill should not do. The Ontario law permits the sale of three half-pints; the Quebec, of one pint; Nova Scotia, one gallon; Prince Edward Island, one pint; and Manitoba, one quart; and in British Columbia, the quantity is defined by the Commissioners. I prefer the old law of the Province of Ontario certainly. It is nearer the average standard described by the various Provinces, and I think that it is a retrograde movement to allow so small a quantity as one pint to be sold in shops, encouraging the running to shops for a small bottle on every conceivable occasion, whereas a larger quantity would not be purchased so readily; and perhaps not so much would be drunk, if a larger quantity was the standard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In other words, we should not allow a person to buy a one-pint bottle of spirits, in a shop, but compel him to go to a tavern, where he can get it.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman will observe that under his Bill, a man has two chances for getting a pint bottle, while, in the other case, he can only get it at the tavern. Here he can get it at the tavern and shop both. I do not want two temptations to be presented, but only one temptation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that three half-pints are afterwards defined in the Crooks Act to be five quarter-pints; so we are fighting over one-quarter of a pint.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A small pint, that.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean anything else than an Imperial quart; one quart in *a* and one Imperial pint in *b* make it rather ambiguous. If he means the Imperial measure in both, he should put it so in both, or omit it in both.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the law in this respect applies to our standard of measurement, which is Imperial; and it must be meant, as it is the only legal measure. The quantity of three half-pints was stipulated before, I think, because ordinary bottles generally contained three half-pints; but the Imperial measure is twenty ounces in pints, and three and a half wine pints make twenty-four ounces; so there is only a difference of four ounces, and as bottles are usually now made to conform to the Imperial measure, I think it would be better to leave it as it is.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Committee saw the pint clearly. Really, none of the ordinary pint bottles contain an Imperial pint, and if the words "Imperial pint" are left in, it forces a man, who only wants to get a bottle, to buy two, or a quart, which holds about three half-pints. I do not think there would be any objection to altering it to a so-called pint bottle. There is no object in compelling a man to buy more liquor than he wants. If it is taken off the premises to be drunk, temperance men, at all events, ought to reduce the limit as far as possible, and not oblige a man to buy more than he really wishes. It will give rise to a great deal of difficulty if the words "imperial pint" are left in.

On sub-section *c*,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I desire to support the motion regarding this proviso. I think that instead of doing any good even to temperance, it will possibly do harm, if it