

the printers' hands, and just as soon as it was printed it would be brought down. But the necessary information was chiefly to be obtained from the observations of hon. gentlemen themselves as to the working of the law in the several constituencies. He believed that there was not an hon. member on the floor of the House but knew perfectly well how the law was operating in his own section of the country. Not only so, but people outside the House were by this time pretty well convinced as to how far the Act of last session had proved to be a success. (Hear, hear.) While there had been a good deal of complaint in the speeches so far made on the subject, it was noticeable that it was not the Act itself that was found fault with, but, on the contrary, nearly all the complaints were as to some shortcoming on the part of some Board of Commissioners or some Inspector. It would indeed have been a matter of the very greatest surprise if, out of the 200 Boards of Commissioners, there had not been some individual cases of wrong doing. (Hear, hear.) The same was true with regard to the Inspectors. It would be a perfect act indeed, with the operation of which no member of the House, and especially no member of the Opposition, would find fault. There might have been errors of judgment on the part of the Commissioners, but he believed that as between the two political parties they had shown the utmost fairness. (Hear, hear.) Another complaint was that the law had proved expensive. That, too, had been expected by the Government, and by their friends in the House. But they had been told by the temperance people—and he believed the people in general were of the same opinion—that they were willing to incur the expense, if they could thereby lessen the evils of intemperance. (Hear, hear.) They had stated that if it was necessary to spend the whole of the license funds for that purpose they would willingly do so. He knew that the people were opposed to unnecessary expense; so were the Government; but they had anticipated that there would be a good deal of expense, especially when the law was first put into operation. In many parts of the country the people themselves had passed the Dunkin Act, thus voluntarily depriving themselves of the whole amount of the license funds. With regard to the complaint that there were Commissioners and Inspectors in the counties where the Dunkin Act had been passed, he might say that the very persons who had urged the Government to appoint these officers were those who had carried the Dunkin Act. (Hear, hear.) Other hon. members had complained of the irresponsibility of the Commissioners. The great complaint with regard to the old Act was that the municipal bodies were not independent enough, and this was urged as a reason for placing the licensing power in the hands of a body who were not dependent upon the people for their offices. Every one knew the immense influence wielded in many municipalities by the liquor dealers, and that in very many cases it was almost impossible for a candidate who threw down the gauntlet of defiance to this class to be elected. (Hear, hear.) And although the Commissioners were not directly responsible to the people, still they were amenable to public opinion; they knew that they were being watched by their friends, and that they had their good name and reputation at stake. As a rule, the Commissioners had done their duty well. (Hear, hear.) Much depended for the success of the law upon the temperance people, who too often stopped half way in their efforts. Even after going so far as carrying the Dunkin Act, they would not interest themselves in prosecuting those who violated the law. If the Government were to carry the license law out successfully, they must have the co-operation of the advocates of temperance. He might add with regard to the cases of the alleged wronging on the part of Commissioners or Inspectors, that he would inquire into them and that so long as he had charge of this branch of the Department he would endeavour to his utmost to prevent the recurrence of such cases, if there had been any. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

Mr. DAWSON said that the men who had been appointed in his constituency as Commissioners and Inspectors were men of high moral standing, and he believed that they had honestly performed the work entrusted to them. So far as he could observe, the Act was a very great improvement upon the old one, and had proved sufficiently successful to warrant a longer trial.

Mr. CODE said that there were many

points in the law which were rather obscure, and he thought the Government should make them clear. The revenue had been very largely diminished in his riding by the operation of the Act. He complained also that political influence had been brought to bear upon the working of the Act, and said that the Inspectors too often were the means of fining those who were undeserving of blame. He wished to know if those municipalities which had passed the Dunkin Bill were liable to pay their share for the operation of the Act.

Mr. CROOKS said they could be compelled by a mandamus to pay two-thirds of the expenses.

Mr. MACDOUGALL complained that the Government had brought on a discussion upon this subject without having laid before the House the necessary official information. These returns should be before honourable members prior to any changes in the law. There were some clauses in the Bill which he believed would be found to be unconstitutional, as many Bills were found to be every session. There were a good many clauses in the Act which to any person who agreed to the policy of the Bill were right enough. But with regard to several which related to criminal procedure, he feared they were going within the province of the Dominion Government. While the House might provide for the punishment of offences against the laws they passed, he believed they had no right to regulate the mode of procedure. The Local Legislatures were not allowed to interfere with questions affecting the commerce of the country, and he feared that this liquor question was one which would come within that category when it came before the proper tribunal. They were without full information on the subject, so that they could not say whether this interference with the revenue and with the freedom of the people had been justified or not. He had reason to believe, too, that the combined operation of the Dunkin Bill and the License Act had not been very favourable in Prince Edward county, where it had everything in its favour. He was disposed to see the law fairly tried, and this could not be done in one or two years. He saw the same difficulty which the Provincial Secretary had mentioned, viz., that the temperance sentiments of the people were not kept alive in order to assist in carrying out the law. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HODGINS referred to a judgment given by Chief Justice Richards in 1871, and said that it had settled favourably to the Province the question of the constitutionality of those portions of the law which referred to its criminal enactments. He believed that so far the law had been a success.

Mr. WIGLE was in favour of the Act, but believed there had been more drunkenness in his riding since it was passed than there was before.

Mr. GRAHAM said the only complaint on the part of the Opposition seemed to be that one or two inspectors had not done their duty. As a matter of fact, the Act had worked well. He approved of the provision to continue the exercise of the powers conferred by this Act in counties which had adopted the Dunkin Act.

Mr. FLESHER believed that this Act had not had the effect which had been expected in reducing the sale of liquor, while it had increased the illicit sale of liquors. He thought the law ought to have a longer trial before it was amended.

Mr. STRIKER denied that the Dunkin Act had been a failure in Prince Edward County. The law had been generally respected in the rural districts, but it had been violated in Ploton, because there was some doubt as to the legality of the by-law. That had now been decided, and the law would be properly enforced if they had a proper machinery, such as there was under the Crooks Act.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) said that he did not think that the Act contemplated that the Inspectors should act the part of spies or informers. He found from an advertisement in a newspaper published in Prince Arthur's Landing that the Inspector there was a druggist who sold wine and liquors. He thought this was rather inconsistent.

The motion was carried, and the Bill read the second time.

RETURN.

Mr. WOOD presented a return of copies of the report made by the Provincial Secretary and the Inspector of Prisons regarding the internal management of the Central Prison, and copies of the evidence taken at the inves-