

upon us without, I think, a very full, fair, or candid explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of the hon. gentleman must be obvious to every supporter of this Bill—to everyone who desires to see a good License Act made operative throughout the Dominion. The amendment is introduced for the purpose of destroying this measure; but I believe the majority of this House are not so blind to the interests of the country as to play this little game for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. It seems to me that this amendment is simply a logical consequence of the one which has been adopted. The same difficulties which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said might arise with regard to Ontario are just as liable to take place in the other case. I wish to point out, however, that this is a matter which is not confined simply to Ontario and Quebec, because there are other Provinces in this Dominion, and if the Bill passes in its present shape it will produce chaos in the License Laws of some of these Provinces. For instance, in the Province of Prince Edward Island there is no provision in the Bill to regulate the licenses there—no provision by which the voice of the people can be obtained in any way. The amendment of the hon. member for West Durham amounts to this: That inasmuch as Parliament has failed to make any provision for that Province or other Provinces the laws which were in force when we joined the Confederation, and which gave universal satisfaction, both to those engaged in the traffic and to the temperance people, shall remain in force.

Mr. BRECKEN. I have simply to say this: That I am afraid my hon. colleague is trying to make a little cheap popularity. The Scott Act is in force in Prince Edward Island from one end to the other, and this law cannot possibly have any effect upon the temperance people or upon the grog-drinking people of Prince Edward Island until this Parliament meets again.

An hon. MEMBER. Suppose the Scott Act is repealed.

Mr. BRECKEN. The Act must be in force for three years. There is not the slightest chance of its being repealed. There is no action of the kind contemplated in the Province.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg your pardon. In Prince county there is a petition to repeal it now.

Mr. BRECKEN. There is not the slightest chance of its being repealed; and even if this Act can possibly have any bearing on Prince Edward Island, the Dominion Parliament will have the opportunity of making any provisions for Prince Edward Island that are not included in this Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the answer the hon. member for West Durham gave to my question, and his omission of the most important part of the answer he ought to have given, was hardly creditable to him, and was certainly not satisfactory to this House. The gentleman's amendment may appear on its face to be a logical sequence to that which we have already adopted by a practically unanimous vote; but the difference is as manifest as it can be. In the Province of Quebec, there are laws in operation at this moment, passed before Confederation, under which the municipalities are regulating the liquor traffic to-day, which, by this law, if it had passed without the amendment of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), would have been repealed; and as a consequence of that repeal, powers which these municipalities at this moment possess, and are exercising, would have been taken from them. The full significance and effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Laval was simply to continue these powers to the municipalities in the Province of Quebec. Now, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do with regard to Ontario? To revive

laws which have been repealed by the Acts of the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE. To revive laws which are not in operation. The Crooks Act, of which hon. gentlemen boast so much, is an Act of the Province of Ontario to-day. They tell us, when this House undertakes to deal with the license question, that we are going to do away with the wholesome restrictions of the Crooks Act; and yet the hon. gentleman asks us to revive laws which the Legislative Assembly of Ontario have practically wiped out of existence, and which the municipalities are not at this moment exercising powers under. That is the distinction between the two cases. In the one case, the effect of this law would have been to repeal Acts now in operation, to deprive the municipal councils of Quebec of powers they now exercise; in the other case, there is an attempt to revive laws which are not more restrictive, but less restrictive than this Act, and which, if revived, would simply have the effect of giving greater freedom for the sale of intoxicating liquors. But I think we may fairly infer that the hon. gentleman was not candid, at any rate in this House, when he deliberately made—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I ask you, Sir, whether it is in accordance with the Rules of the House that I should be charged with want of candor?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is exactly right that an hon. member should charge another with want of candor.

Mr. WHITE. I said the hon. gentleman was not candid. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. Want of candor is an imputation against a member of wanting to mislead the House, against which I ruled the other day.

Mr. WHITE. Then, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is this, accepting your decision entirely, that the hon. gentleman was not fair to this House when he deliberately, as a lawyer, read portions of that Statute, and left portions of it out—if that was fair to this House, then I do not know what fairness is, coming from the hon. gentleman occupying the position which he occupies on the floor of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that I may be allowed to say, Sir, that if I had the slightest impression that I should mislead this House by not reading the whole of a clause—of which I distinctly said that I was not reading the whole—I distinctly said, "and so forth"—

Mr. WHITE. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman denies it; but once again he is out of order. I repeat that I did say "and so forth." I was perfectly aware that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that dozens of hon. members in this House, knew what the Municipal Act of Ontario of 1866 was, and what I was wanting to show was that there was a clause in it for restricting the sale. It would have been a ridiculous and absurd thing for me to suppose that I could mislead a large number of hon. members of this House, even if I had been disposed to do it by such a paltry attempt as reading a portion of a clause instead of the whole of it. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have such a low notion of the acquaintance of the members of this House with the Statute Law of the country as to say that I could mislead them. The hon. member for Cardwell asked what clause I was reading, and I read enough to show that it was a prohibitory clause. I did not want to waste time reading the whole of it, but I was perfectly willing to read the rest if he had asked for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not intend to make a speech on this matter, nor to discuss what the legal effect of the amendment may be, and the only reason I rise now is to