

keeper to ascertain the age of every person who would call upon him for a glass of liquor. Why, it would be necessary for all young men to carry in their pocket a card certifying to their age, if such an amendment was carried. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. LAIRD said the hon. member for St. Peter's (Mr. Rielly) thought if the citizens of Charlottetown required such a law they should have petitioned for it; but he (Mr. Laird) looked upon this as a progressive measure, and one that would apply to the country as well as to the city. As to the objection raised by the hon. member (Mr. McCormack,) he would only say, if the parties to whom liquor might be refused, under the provisions of this bill, were thirty years of age, he did not know that any serious injury would be done to them. He believed the amendment proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Bell) would have the effect of preventing young people from getting into the habit of drinking, and whatever those opposed to it might say, he felt satisfied posterity would approve of the measure.

Mr. REILLY found by referring to the bye-laws of the city corporation that there was an act there similar to the provisions of the amendment. He still considered it would be better to let the matter lie over until the whole of the license laws could be revised, which would, in his opinion, be preferable to such hasty legislation.

Mr. BRECKEN.—It was true there was such a bye-law as the hon. member referred to, but it had not been put in force. There was this difference, if this law passed, it then became the statute law of the land, and the courts would have the power to deal with its violaters.

Mr. McCORMACK.—Yes, but when a tavern keeper was fined under this law for selling to a man, how were you to prove his age? That was the point he would wish to have explained. Again, a man might go to a tavern keeper and represent himself to be older than he really was, buy and pay for some liquor, and then turn round and fine him for selling it to him. He hoped the committee would consider well what it was doing in the matter. Rather than have such a law, he would prefer doing away with the sale of spirituous liquors by license altogether. If it was right to have it kept from minors, it was wrong to allow it to be sold to those who were older.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said the hon. member was astray in supposing that under such circumstances a tavern keeper would be

fined, for if it could be proved that he *bona fide* considered the man of age when he sold him the liquor, an action could not be sustained against him.

Dr. JENKINS thought that an amendment embracing such an important change should not have been introduced until notice thereof had been given in the order book. It appeared strange to him, to give power to the City Council to grant licenses and then to place the power of annulling them in the hands of another body. A grand jury might be composed of men in favor of temperance principles, and might, therefore, be induced to take unnecessary pains to find out the errors of those who kept licensed taverns, as by the adoption of such an amendment full power would be given to that body to do so. He thought no tavern keeper could guard against being fined, at times, if parties were disposed to watch him closely, for the restrictions already thereon were such as rendered their observance at all times next to impossible. He had been in several parts of the world, and was pretty well acquainted with the working of hotels, and was convinced the taverns in Charlottetown, as a whole, would compare favorably with those in any other country. When a man went to the expense of opening such a house, the reasons should be strong which would justify any body of men in taking away his license. He, however, knew the evil effects arising from the abuses complained of, and would be happy to aid in having the cause removed, but did not think the amendment proposed would meet the difficulty.

Mr. BRECKEN had not much time to devote to the consideration of the question embraced in the discussion, but did not hesitate to say that when he heard those parties against whom the grand jury made presentments had their licenses renewed by the Mayor's Court, he felt ashamed of the action of the representatives of the corporation of his native town. He was aware that a tavern keeper could not adhere, on all occasions, to the literal requirements of the law; but when he knew there were four times as many licensed taverns in the city as were required, he could not but conclude that other motives than those which the accommodation of the public required, led to the granting of so many licenses. If the Mayor and his Council did so for the purpose of raising a revenue, they did so at a terrible cost—even the ruin of the morality of the youth of the city (hear); and when he reflected that they had quadrupled the requirements of the city, he considered the