

Mr. MATTHEWS: Yes, that is a reduction of the penalty from \$200 to \$100.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 170 and 171 agreed to.

On section 172—Amount of bond.

Mr. HANBURY: On two previous occasions the minister was asked as to the conditions of bonds. I wish he would place on record what changes there have been.

Mr. MATTHEWS: This section corresponds with section 194 of the existing act. The clause "in such sum as the minister may determine but in no case shall such sum be less than \$2,000" is substituted for the words, "in the sum of two thousand dollars," as the basis for fixing the amount of security to be given by licensed brewers. In small breweries \$2,000 is probably adequate but as the duty upon malt has been increased it is felt that perhaps in some cases larger bonds may be advisable, to secure the full amount of duty at stake.

Section agreed to.

Sections 173 and 174 agreed to.

On section 175—duties.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These are new duties are they?

Mr. HACKETT: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 176 and 177 agreed to.

On section 178—Beer brewed for private use.

Mr. VENIOT: This seems to be a new section.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, it is.

Mr. HACKETT: Arising out of the budget.

Mr. VENIOT: I understand that section 178 is entirely new.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Section 178 takes the place of section 195 in the existing act. It has been rewritten in the interest of clarity and to remove any possible doubt as to the fact that home brewing is a privilege which may be refused, suspended or revoked for cause.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Let us suppose that someone would like to brew some wine at his own home,—dandelion wine, for instance—would that come under the same provision? I am referring to wheat or bee wine.

Mr. MATTHEWS: This takes away no right of home brewing, but has to do only with the brewing of beer.

Mr. VENIOT: The home brewer, no matter what he brews, must have the consent of the collector; is that correct? The position ought to be made clear. For instance, if I wish to brew blueberry or dandelion wine or sarsaparilla, some very healthful preparations, have I to obtain consent?

Mr. MATTHEWS: There is nothing in the Excise Act providing for that.

Mr. VENIOT: But it is being enforced. People in my county are being imprisoned for making sarsaparilla. I know of an old lady of 78 years who was sent to prison for three months for such offence. The mounted police made the seizure, and there was alleged to be a violation of one of the federal acts; whether it was this one or some other, I do not know. Let me outline a case with which I am familiar, having to do with a woman who was making beer for the household.

Mr. HACKETT: Is that not under provincial legislation?

Mr. VENIOT: No, dominion. The mounted police came in and seized it. The young man of the house took the responsibility for the violation and was sent to prison for three months. I must say that I do not know whether the charge was laid under a federal or provincial statute; I must be fair in that regard. The reason a charge was laid was that no permission was given.

Mr. MATTHEWS: This section deals with beer. Anyone who wants to make home brew can give notice and receive a letter of consent from the collector.

Mr. VENIOT: That is what I want made clear. Once the notice is given, they are all right? Is the minister aware that the provincial authorities of New Brunswick, the liquor control board, will not recognize that permit?

Mr. MATTHEWS: I have no information on that.

Mr. VENIOT: Suppose the New Brunswick liquor board refuses to recognize that permit and prosecutes?

Mr. HACKETT: It is a case for the courts.

Mr. VENIOT: A provincial act cannot go contrary to the federal act.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Just on that last point, the provinces do say they do not recognize any permit given under this act for making