

on 1st of January, and applications for licenses will not be considered until March. If this clause was not inserted, or one to the same effect, the Rossin or Queen's at Toronto, and the Windsor hotel at Montreal, would be shut up. From 1st January to 1st May, there would not be a single licensed house in the country open, and all those in the trade would be compelled to commence *de novo*.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That has nothing to do with this provision. The simple question is, whether in an application for a license under this Act, in the first instance, you will regard the license which has been issued under another law altogether as a license under the meaning of this clause; or whether you will require everyone to furnish this certificate of the willingness of the proportion of the electors named to the applicants obtaining licenses. It is perfectly clear that if the latter view is not the correct one, this Act will not be efficacious, and will not apply to ninety-nine out of one hundred of the licensees to be issued under this Act until after the lapse of a number of years when the old licensees will have retired from business and new parties will have come in. As I have said, ninety-nine out of one hundred of the licensees will escape the operation of this clause by the interpretation which, to my surprise, the hon. gentleman has placed on it.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** It must be remembered that all licenses have been granted under some form of Licensing Board. In Ontario, for example, they have been granted by a Licensing Board. It is true objection has been taken to the Board's action, but not by members on the hon. gentleman's side of the House, but the objection taken was not on the ground urged by him. There has been some decision given by a Licensing Board in regard to the qualification of the parties and with respect to the houses to be licensed. A change having been rendered necessary by the decision given in the case of Russell and the Queen, why should all the people carrying on business, having proved, under the Provincial laws to be proper persons, be compelled to undergo the trouble of securing certificates of character. It does not seem to be reasonable, and although it was discussed in Committee I thought the members were almost unanimous in their decision, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman did not so understand it.

**Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).** If that was the intention of the Committee it seems to me that such words as "under any existing Provincial license law" should be inserted, because the clause, as it now stands, would apply to everyone.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That is my reading of the clause.

**Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).** This Act was passed on the theory that the existing system of licenses is illegal; consequently this word "licensee" should mean a licensee under this Act.

**Mr. BLAKE.** It is now made clear that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) was right as to what the effect of the clause was.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** It was my fault; I intended it the other way.

**Mr. FOSTER.** We may misunderstand each other, but I think we know now what we mean. I cannot see why all should not be placed on the same footing. I spoke of this matter in the Committee and I assented to this as a fair proposition: when once a person had complied with the provisions of this Act and had been licensed for a year and no complaint had been made, then he should not be put every year to the inconvenience of obtaining the signatures of one-third of the electors. But I think it is reasonable and fair that at first all should come under this Act. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said that licenses have been granted under some conditions by all the Provinces. So they have; but the only Province with a system of inspec-

tion is the Province of Ontario, and Manitoba to a certain extent; but in some of the Provinces there has been no Inspector, and the system has been remarkably loose as far as inspection is concerned. An hotel like the Rossin House, or any respectable hotel, will have no difficulty in getting the one-third, and if the house has not been well kept but is a disreputable house, the fact that it has been open for a certain number of years should have no weight.

**Mr. GIGAULT.** There was some discussion on this provision in the Committee, but at last it was understood that it should not apply to licensees or licensed premises under the present laws. I think we should keep this section as it is; but it would be a good thing to insert one-third instead of one fourth of the electors for all new licenses. In many other countries, the signatures of a larger number of electors are required for new licenses than for licenses for houses that have been inspected and reported upon.

**Mr. AUGER.** I hope the hon. gentleman will leave the clause as it is. Licenses have been obtained in Quebec on the signature of twenty-five persons, not in the electoral district, but all over the township. It is nothing but right that applicants should be obliged to secure the consent of one-third of the electors.

**Mr. McCARNEY.** I should be sorry to see any alteration in this clause, for the benefit would be nullified if any change were to be made. I trust no change will be made on it whatever.

**Mr. McCARTHY** moved that the words "or licensee under any Provincial enactment" should be inserted.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I think it was published the other day.

**Mr. FISHER.** I think we ought not to make this amendment. The clause as it stands places all who obtain licenses under the Act on the same footing; but if we adopt the amendment moved by the member for North Simcoe it will give an immense advantage to those who now have licenses in the various Provinces, as they are not forced to go through this crucial test. I believe that in Ontario at present no signatures are required to the certificate of the applicant; in Quebec only twenty-five signatures are required, and those may be obtained in any part of the municipality in question. Under this Act the licensee is obliged to obtain the support of one-third of the resident electors in the polling sub-division where he wishes to carry on business; and it can easily be seen what a very great advantage this amendment would give holders of licenses. The hon. member for North Simcoe has said that these licenses have been granted by competent authorities. No doubt this is true; but at the same time we know that these authorities have in the different Provinces exacted very different pledges; and by the new Act the hon. gentleman seeks to place all the Provinces under the same rules, but all present licensees are not on the same footing. What he wishes to do with this clause will not accomplish what he himself says is the object of the Act. I think that for these grounds, and for others maintained by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), it will be very unfortunate if the wording of the clause is changed in the direction proposed by the hon. gentleman.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Whatever may have been the original law under which these people got their licenses and the liquor regulations, the licenses were granted by competent authority, and those people who have invested their money in this trade, as soon as they come under the operations of this law, are under its regulations. They keep their houses under it; if they offend against it, they lose their licenses as a matter of course. They come under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, and under the stern eye of the stern Inspector; and the moment that they come under this law, they then, when it is in force, have their licenses. They have a right to commence business, having behaved properly and not broken the law. They