

would be to have these improvements owned by a joint stock company, who would have control and thus prevent injustice being done to anybody.

Mr. MILLER said there must be somebody who would have control of the improvements, or it would be impossible for anybody to drive logs. It was absolutely necessary that some person should have control of the slides.

Mr. PARDEE said that the object of the Bill was to meet a particular case, and to make the amendments so as to give control to any one person would defeat the object of the Bill. It would be much more fair to allow the man who made the improvements the use of them until he had driven his own logs through.

Mr. MILLER said it would be possible for parties who were ahead to wait at the dam until the logs of all parties were run down to the slides, when they could all be run through together. If the man who had control was behind this would be done, but if he was ahead, and wished to, he could run his logs through and leave the others high and dry. It might be better for the Government to have control of the slides.

Mr. COOK said it would be an unfortunate thing for the Government if they took the control of the slides in their own hands. The better plan would be to have all the companies using a stream incorporated under the Joint Stock Company's Act. This would prevent any injustice to individuals.

Mr. FRASER said that as in nine cases out of ten the logs all came down the stream together, therefore in nine cases out of ten the present Bill would not apply. In the tenth case it was probable that the suggestion of the member for Muskoka would be adopted—that was, for the men who were ahead to wait for those who were behind. There never was a law passed that a man might not theorize upon and point out where injustice might arise. It was only in a very exceptional case that the present Bill would apply, and in that exceptional case the present Bill as it stood would apply. If the Bill was amended as proposed, it would not then meet this exceptional case. Mr. McLaren was playing the part of the dog in the manger, and it was to meet just such cases as his that the Bill was introduced. The answer to the whole thing was that in the actual experience of lumbermen the present Bill would operate successfully and advantageously in the rare cases where it would apply.

Mr. MEREDITH said that at present the man who made the improvements had control of the stream, but the present Bill proposed to take that control away, and did not give it to anybody else.

Mr. NEELON thought that the Bill was a move in the right direction. Those engaged in the lumber trade had long felt the necessity for some such legislation, and the Bill would receive his most hearty support. At present people might promise to pay toll to the person who made improvements, but if they could get their logs in the stream ahead of those owned by the person who had made the improvements, there was no other course for the latter to pursue but to rush their logs through in order to get at his own, whether the promised toll was paid or not. He was of the opinion, however, that the person who made the improvements should have control of the stream, and thought it would be impossible for the Government to assume control.

Mr. CALDWELL said that if one drive was held at a dam until another came up the probability would be that both drives would be stuck, as there was much more danger of this with large than with small drives. He did not think that the proposal of the hon. member for London should be entertained.

Mr. MILLER said that if the word "control" was struck out of the Bill it would still leave the practical control in the hands of the men who made the improvements, and yet allow others the use of the improvements. He did not think that any difficulty would arise.

Mr. GRAHAM said he thought the hon. leader of the Opposition would make a very good "log roller," but would not make a very good hand at driving logs. He thought there should be some safe-guard as to how the improvements were to be used.

Mr. LEES thought that there should be some restrictions as to the amount of timber put on the small streams. If this was not done it would be impossible for anybody to run their logs or timber; and would be the cause of great loss to the person who had improved the streams. The person who made the improvements should have control of them. The Bill was obscure in its meaning, and if passed would be the cause of endless litigation. There should be provision made as to the number of men put on a drive, as very frequently there was not a sufficient number of men with a drive, which was the cause of great annoyance and loss to others.

The clause carried.
After several other clauses had been discussed the Committee rose and reported.

LICENSES.

The Bill to give increased efficiency to the laws against the illicit sale of intoxicating liquors was considered in Committee of the Whole. A series of resolutions relative to the distribution of fines for the illicit sale of liquor were considered and passed, and ordered to be engrafted into the Bill.

Mr. HARDY said the clause relative to the punishment of grocers convicted of selling illegally had been struck out.

Mr. GIBSON said the country would not be satisfied with the way Government had dealt with that matter. The feeling in the country was that the law should be enforced, and by putting off the matter from time to time they would be sure to cause dissatisfaction. If the matter was left in abeyance now it would only crop up again. It would be better to settle the question at once. That the law was not observed as it at present stood was a matter of notoriety, and he held it was useless to have a license law if it was not enforced.

Mr. ROSS said that he thought the only satisfactory way out of the difficulty was to separate the sale of liquor from the sale of all other articles of merchandize. They had tried that plan in his own town and had found it to work satisfactorily. This was the only true solution of the difficulty.

Mr. HARDY said he had no objection to adopt the plan recommended by the member for Huron, but it would require some time to put such regulations in force; and as this was a Government mea-

sure it would be wrong to make such a radical change without some due notice was given. If this was not done it would entail considerable loss upon those grocers who had already taken out shop licenses.

Mr. ROSS said that what he asked was only to extend the power they had already given to the License Commissioners.

Mr. FRASER said that was the very reason they should not make the proposed change. They could not lay down any hard and fast line as to the number of licenses that should be granted. The best method was to do as they were doing now—to leave such matters largely to the discretion of the License Commissioners. They knew exactly what was wanted for their particular localities, and if they wished could adopt the suggestion of separating the sale of liquor from all other business.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN said he thought the withdrawal of the clause providing for the punishment of grocers selling liquor after the hours prescribed by law was wrong. As the law now stood there was no better place for the manufacture of drinkards than those very groceries. People would go there to drink who would not go into a hotel, and he thought that if the law at present in force was not stringent enough to prevent the sale of liquor after hours, more stringent regulations should be employed.

Mr. CALVIN said it was useless to make a law if they did not intend to enforce it. It would be better if the complainant got half of the fine. There would then be more convictions and less breaking of the law.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose.

AFTER RECESS.

The House still in Committee on the Bill *re* illicit sale of intoxicating liquors.

THE TORONTO EXHIBITION.

Mr. MORRIS moved that the petition of the Toronto Industrial Exhibition Association, praying that one or more licenses for the sale of liquor on the Exhibition grounds during the continuance of the Exhibition, be granted, and a clause to that effect be inserted in the License Act.

Mr. GIBSON said he thought the granting of these licenses would be an undue discrimination towards other equally large Exhibitions held in other places. If the Toronto Exhibition had the privilege granted them, the Provincial and other large Exhibitions should have the same privilege.

Mr. MORRIS said he had no objection to extending the provision so as to include other places. The reason he had mentioned the Toronto Exhibition was because the petition was from that Association. He thought it would be well if the privilege was extended.

Mr. YOUNG was opposed to the amendment and thought the law should remain as at present, and that no sale of liquor should be allowed on Exhibition grounds. The public sentiment of the country was not in favour of the change. If the privilege of selling lager was granted to Toronto it could not be refused to other Exhibitions.

Mr. HARDY spoke in favour of the amendment. It was difficult to get persons to establish first-class eating-houses on the ground unless permitted to sell lager and wines. Short licenses had been granted, it being claimed that this was legal, and the result was that good eating-houses were established on the ground. He did not favour extending the privilege to small shows, but the case was altered when numbers of people attended an exhibition at some distance from hotels and restaurants. It was only proposed to grant the license to one person, who would be bound to keep a good eating-house, and not to sell spirits.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN was opposed to the amendment. It was not desirable to place temptation in the way of the young men who gathered at Exhibitions.

Mr. LAUDER said the object of the Association was to prevent the sale of liquor without. Last year liquor was sold in every corner of the Exhibition Grounds. He was rather in favour of drinking lager beer himself, and he thought it would be better to grant licenses to sell beer than have stronger liquors sold in an underhand manner. He was certain that the Committee of the Industrial Exhibition Association would not do anything that would tend to disgrace the Exhibition.

Mr. BADGEROW thought the House should hesitate before legislating in this exceptional way. If Toronto were granted this privilege, it must be extended to other places. It would place temptation in the way of young people which might have an evil result.

Mr. ROSS thought it would be unwise to grant the petition. If they granted it, where were they to draw the line? A great many young people congregated at these exhibitions, and it was throwing temptation in their way. It would be better to leave the law as it now stood.

Mr. COOK said that there was no difficulty in drawing the line. He attended the Industrial Exhibition in Toronto, and he saw no intoxication notwithstanding that spirits were sold. He did not see why the people visiting the Exhibition should be deprived of this necessary of life. (Laughter.) If the young people wanted it they would get it at taverns and other places where worse influences prevailed.

Mr. MILLER said he did not think that there were men in the House who would support such a proposition as the proposed amendment. He was not a very strong temperance man. When he wanted a drink he took it. He did not often want it.

Mr. HARDY—I suppose when you do want it you want it bad. (Laughter.)

Mr. MILLER said he did not. He thought that it would be wrong to allow the amendment to become law. It would be better to try and enforce the present law than to give further means for illicit sale of liquor.

Mr. BAXTER said there was a growing desire that the consumption of spirits should be decreased, and he did not favour opening another door for the perpetuation of the habit. The experience of our scientific and thinking men went to show that the less drinking the better, and he should oppose the amendment.

Mr. MORRIS said he thought it was a step in the right direction, because it would be impossible to prevent the sale of liquor in or about the Exhibition grounds. It would be better to legalize the sale than to have it sold illegally. But if it was the wish of the House he would withdraw his amendment.