

tion. He would not have the penalties for the purchaser as high as for the seller. He would also exempt the informers used by the Inspector.

Mr. FRASER was not in favour of the amendment of punishing the person who bought liquor during prohibited hours, while the man who got gloriously drunk in an illicit groggery should get off scot free.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) asked for the affirmation of the principle, and admitted that perhaps it might not go far enough, but if the principle was established they could get over the objection of the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

Mr. FRASER thought the clause would act in the interest of those who sold illicitly, for it would effectually close the mouths of those who purchased in violation of the law. Every man who was a party to the violation of the law would find himself in the position of one liable to be indicted, and there would be less frequent convictions for violation during prohibited hours.

Mr. MEREDITH said he had tavern-keepers ask for a provision of this sort. They wished for some answer to give some who asked them to open their houses.

Mr. HARDY said the amendment was going further than any proposal for a sumptuary law in the Province had gone. It had never been made a part of the law that a man should not drink if he could honestly get the liquor. He was satisfied that the temperance people would not like the amendment; in fact they had studiously avoided the proposal, while the licensed victuallers had asked for it. It was quite too large a proposition to raise at the closing of a Parliament.

Mr. CREIGHTON could not see any difference between those who tempted and the tempted, and would have the unlawful purchaser punished as well as the seller. They were not legislating simply in the interests of temperance, but in the interests of morality.

Mr. WOOD was heartily in accord with the amendment. Magistrates wished to punish the men who aided the seller in violating the law.

Mr. FRASER asked Mr. Wood as a magistrate whether convictions would be more readily obtained if the informer was fined.

Mr. WOOD did not think it would help or hinder the cause. The parties who got liquor were not the most anxious to tell about it.

Mr. ROSS (Huron) thought the amendment was going a little too far. They would do more to frustrate the carrying out of temperance legislation by this amendment than the old system ever did.

Mr. DRURY was afraid if the informers were subjected to heavy penalties they would find a difficulty in proving cases.

Mr. GIBSON had not proposed his amendment to amuse himself. He had done so because he felt strongly about it. He repudiated the idea that he was acting in the interests of the licensed victuallers. If the temperance party objected to this amendment it would be only on the ground that it would interfere with the procuring of convictions. He had not the slightest doubt but if an amendment such as he proposed was carried, it would greatly reduce the amount of drinking on Sundays in the city hotels and other places. He did not desire the matter pressed if the hon. the Secretary wished its discussion deferred. He would like to see a full committee when the matter was discussed. He did not understand why the Government opposed it. He supposed that it might have come up as an amendment. If it were the prevailing opinion of the Committee that the amendment would work, he thought the Government would accept it. He would adhere to the amendment under all circumstances. If he should have to give formal notice of it he would submit, but he would rather have the matter deferred than disposed of summarily.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) feared that the amendment would fail to accomplish the object intended. He was in favour of the object, which he knew was to stop the illicit sale of liquor. If it could be made clear to him that if by this means it would prevent the sale of liquor he would vote for it, but he thought it would frustrate the only means of obtaining convictions. He could not vote for this amendment.

Mr. FRASER said he had not the remotest intention of giving the hon. member to believe that he (Mr. Gibson) was acting in the interests of the licensed victuallers. He believed the hon. gentleman was most sincere in moving his amendment.

Mr. HARDY thought this was a serious proposition. It was serious to submit to the Committee on a quiet discussion without hearing the opinions of the country on such an amendment. The hon. gentleman had not given notice. This was a big question. It would be found that the licensed victuallers had advocated this question of punishment of the man who bought the liquor, while the temperance people opposed it. He was not prepared to consider the question, and was in favour of having it delayed.

Mr. MEREDITH claimed that notice had been given of such a move. It had been mentioned at the second reading of the bill by himself.

Mr. FRASER said the result of this amendment would be that the chances of a conviction would be much less. If the law would be more respected by making it an offence to drink in prohibited hours he was with the hon. member, but he had not been convinced that such would

be the case.

Mr. MOWAT thought the amendment was one which required consideration, but he was glad the discussion had taken place. The reasons given for the motion were very strong, but at the same time it was perfectly evident that in order fairly to consider the question there must be a carefully prepared resolution. (Hear, hear.) Before they were called upon to vote upon it they should carefully consider the proposition. Hon. gentlemen who were familiar with the administration of justice had experienced great difficulty in obtaining convictions under the License Law. This amendment, he thought, as at present made, would tend to increase this difficulty. He would like to see such a motion surrounded with the proper safeguards. It was further to be observed that this was a matter which had not received much public attention. He had not seen any discussion on the subject in the newspapers. The change would be a pronounced revolutionary one. Sometimes such changes accomplished a great deal of good; but whether this amendment had been presented in full form or not he did not know, but it was a remarkable thing that those who had given great consideration to the subject of temperance, as a body were against it. He thought the House should pause before passing such an amendment, as they were not in a position to consider it.

Mr. GIBSON then withdrew his amendment.

### LIQUOR AT THE INDUSTRIAL FAIR.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN moved in amendment to the bill to include in the clause prohibiting the sale of liquor at agricultural fairs, the Industrial Exhibition, Toronto, and other fairs at London, Kingston, and Hamilton. The amendment was carried without opposition.

The Act will be known as the Liquor License Act of 1884.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

### MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT.

Mr. Fraser introduced a bill entitled the Municipal Amendment Act of 1884.

### SECOND READINGS.

The following bills were read a second time:—  
Respecting the property of married women—Mr. Mowat. To secure for wives and children the benefit of life insurance—Mr. Mowat.

The House adjourned at 12:05 till 11 a.m. on Wednesday.

### NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. French—On Thursday next—Resolution that it is desirable that the Government's attention be drawn to the discriminating legislation passed by this House against High and Model Schools in municipalities separated from the counties for municipal purposes, and that it is unjust when such schools are made free to the public generally that they should not be assisted by the county councils.