

the Scott Act, but I think it is quite unnecessary to import a discussion of that kind into the consideration of this Bill. Doubtless all the arguments against the Scott Act that could be urged have been already submitted to Parliament, but in the face of those arguments the Legislature was convinced that it was a wise and proper measure, and it was allowed to become law. We have not now to deal with it, as it is on the statute book, and we are only asked—applying the very appropriate simile of my hon. friend from Sarnia—simply to grease the wheels, that certain cogs, or certain bearings of the machinery have been found out of gear, and we are asked to set that right, and I think it is the duty of Parliament to do so. It is only just that errors which have arisen from the Act of Parliament should be set right by Parliament itself without touching the principle involved in this measure. I do not wish to be at all misunderstood on the views that I hold with regard to the Scott Act; this is not a question as to whether the Scott Act is based only on sound and just principles; it is simply to correct errors that have been discovered in the actual working of the law. I will support the measure that my hon. friend has introduced, although there may be some trifling amendments necessary when it goes into committee of the whole. With regard to the forms which have been referred to I think that that expression, or a somewhat similar expression, “other forms may be framed in accordance with the Temperance Act,” will be found in some other Acts of Parliament. To my mind the forms are most essential particulars to be elaborated before the Act is administered. It is almost impossible to frame forms that will exactly suit the circumstances of every case, and where there is a hostile opposition, the forms will be criticized with particular severity, and therefore it is necessary to make a statutory form which by being on the statute book is known to be good, and will be held to be good and sufficient. A general form for information was necessary, and forms for lawful sale in different cases, forms of permit for manufacturing native wines, etc., varying according to the facts; a general form of summons of witnesses, a form of conviction for first offences, a form of conviction for second or

subsequent offences, a form of warrant for commitment—all are necessary forms. They will save those who have the enforcement of the Act from possible danger, and save the magistrate possibly from trifling errors that he might make; save the officers who execute the processes from having actions instituted against them; save the courts from loss of time, and the parties the expense of having questions that arise settled by a judicial tribunal. Those forms have that object in view; they are in keeping with the general provisions, and none of them enlarge substantially the scope of the Act. I shall have great pleasure in voting for my hon. friend's Bill.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not altogether share the view which my hon. friend from Barrie has taken, or my hon. friend from Sarnia has taken, with respect to this measure. I highly respect the zeal and sincerity which have characterized all the movements of my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Vidal) and the candor he has exhibited. I have had but one opinion of the Scott Act from the time it was passed. I opposed it then, and voted against it in the House of Commons, but since then I have always taken the position that, the Bill having become law, any clerical error or mistake in the Act should be corrected. However, this is a different matter altogether. The point in this Bill is the 9th section. That section goes outside of the Scott Act to repeal an important clause of another Act, which has been sanctioned by Parliament, but which has not yet been put in force. An appeal upon it has been taken to the Privy Council. I understand that there is a Bill now pending to suspend the operation of that Act for the present, until the decision of the Privy Council on the appeal could be obtained. I do not feel willing, pending that legislation, to interfere with that Act. It is not necessary that it should be interfered with, because although it might clash with the Temperance Act of 1878, if it were in force, it cannot clash with it if it is not operative, or made operative. As I understand, by the legislation which has been introduced in another place, and which will undoubtedly become law this session, the operation of the questionable clauses of the Liquor