

be obtained at a public meeting of the inhabitants. There was also a prayer in some of the petitions that the pint license should be placed under the same restrictions as the tavern license. The petitions were very numerous signed, and deserved consideration. Those who prayed that the signatures should be obtained at a public meeting had not stated their reasons for requiring that such a meeting should be called; but he presumed that their object was to have the matter of granting a license in the district discussed. He was not certain this would be the most advisable course. Meetings were not the best place to arrive at correct conclusions on all subjects. A person who was asked in his own house, with his children around him, to sign in favor of a tavern license, would be as apt to take a proper view of the case as amid the excitement of a public meeting.

Hon Mr DAVIES said that the License Act was amended two years ago, and he thought it had given general satisfaction. He did not think any benefit would result from giving effect to the suggestions of the petitioners, except it might be in regard to the pint licenses.

Hon Mr LAIRD thought that if pint licenses had to come under the same restrictions as tavern licenses, very few would be allowed to sell by the pint. The petitions might be respectfully signed, but other people ought to be permitted to enjoy their opinions as well as Temperance men.

Mr HOWLAN said he was not in favor of one part of the prayer of the petitioners, namely, that in regard to holding public meetings. Parties, however, were often induced to sign their names to papers without a very good understanding of their object, and about the first thing they heard would be that a tavern was opened in the district; and once opened the license could be renewed without the householders assent. This was a feature in the present law which he considered objectionable.

Mr HOWAT was going to submit a short resolution. The Session was becoming advanced, and this was a very difficult question. He did not know where Temperance men were inclined to stop with these petitions; he believed nothing would satisfy them short of total prohibition. He would not assert that they were wrong in this movement, but was the country prepared to carry out the prayer of these petitions? We ought to have time to consider the matter. The resolution which he had to propose was as follows:—

**Resolved**, That a Special Committee be appointed to report by Bill or otherwise at the next Session of the Legislature, on the Petitions praying for amendments to the present License Act.

Hon Mr LONGWORTH said it was true that the License law had been frequently before the House, and often amended; but that it did not give satisfaction was evident from the very large number who had signed the petitions before the Committee. The petitioners all agreed on this point, namely, the desirability of requiring parties before they renewed their license to obtain the sanction of the majority of householders in the district, just in the same manner as at first. Some of the petitions advocated the holding of public meetings, where the subject of consenting to the license might be discussed; but they were not agreed on this point. He thought from the respectable number of signatures to the petition the matter should not be delayed. It would not take long to pass a short Bill through the House. He would therefore submit the following amendment to Mr Howat's resolution:—

The Hon. J. Longworth moved, to amend the same by leaving out all after the word "Resolved" and substituting the following: "That it is desirable further to amend the Laws regulating the sale by License of Spirituous Liquors, by vesting a power in the Executive Government, to annul or vacate any existing Tavern License, at the instance or request of a majority of the Householdors, resident in the School District in which the Tavern complained of shall be situate, provided such request be signified by Petition to the Executive Government, signed by a clear majority of such Householdors, and verified by an affidavit of some credible person or persons as to the genuineness of the signatures attached to such Petition.

After a few of the hon members had expressed their views, the question was put, and Mr Howat's motion carried 14 to 6.

When the House resumed, and the question was about being put on Mr Howat's resolution, Hon Mr Longworth again submitted his amendment, and the House divided:

*Yeas*—Hons Longworth, Gray; Messrs Green, McLennan, Montgomery, Yeo, Haslam—7.

*Nays*—Hons Messrs Davies, Coles, Col Secretary, Pope, Laird, Kaye, Kelly, Whelan, Warburton, Haviland, Hensley; Messrs Duncan, Brecken, Howat, Conroy—15.

So the amendment was lost; and Mr Howat's resolution afterwards carried without a division. Committee appointed, Mr Howat, Hon J. Hensley, and Hon D. Davies.

Adjourned.

FRIDAY, April 29.

Hon. J. C. POPE moved that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House to consider further of a Supply—agreed to.

Hon. J. C. POPE then moved that the Supplementary Estimate laid on the table on Tuesday last, viz, "Pew in St. James' Church, for use of His Excellency the Lieut. Governor, £7," be referred to the said Committee.

The House divided on the question.

*Yeas*—Hons. J. C. Pope, Davies, Kaye, Laird, Longworth, Gray; Messrs. Green, Howat, Montgomery, Yeo, Haslam, McLennan—12.

*Nays*—Hons. G. Coles, Warburton, Hensley, Kelly, Haviland, Thornton, Beaton; Messrs. Walker and Conroy—9.

Then the House resolved itself into said Committee.

Hon. J. C. POPE moved a resolution granting £7 to defray the expenses of a Pew in St. James' Church for the use of His Excellency the Lieut. Governor.

Hon. Mr. COLES said he must vote against that resolution again, particularly when he considered that it had unfortunately cost the House the loss of its former worthy Speaker. Though the Leader of the Government was under the impression that this vote was not excluded by the resolution of last Session, yet as it was not in the Estimates at first, it would have been better to have let the matter pass. He did not say that there was no position in which a Government could be placed that they should not force the Speaker to give way; but in this case though the Leader of the Government had dropped the supplementary estimate it would not have necessitated his resignation. He (Mr. C.) would oppose the resolution in every stage, and he would warn the Government to be prepared. Had the Opposition forces been in their places this morning the estimate would not have gone into Supply.

Hon. Col. GRAY understood the hon leader of the Opposition to say that the late Speaker's refusal to put the motion on this estimate would, though allowed to pass, not have necessitated a resignation of the Government. True, the estimate was overlooked in those first brought down, but the Government did not know how many such estimates might be required before the Session was over. A bridge might be carried away, or something else turn up, which might require action on the part of the Government. With respect to the resolution before the Committee, the matter had already been discussed. The resolution of last Session applied to members of the Legislature; and he (Col. G.) still entertained the opinion which he had before expressed that His Excellency was not a member of the Legislature. When the question of pews was before the