

house or place without license, the Magistrate making such conviction, may in and by the said conviction, or by a separate or subsequent order, declare the said liquor and vessels, or any part thereof, to be forfeited to Her Majesty, and may order and direct that the said Inspector, policeman, constable or officer shall destroy the same or any part thereof, and the Inspector or other person as aforesaid shall thereupon forthwith destroy the same or part thereof as directed by such conviction or order;—which was agreed to.

The Bill was accordingly recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, further amended, reported, considered as amended, and agreed to.

And the question being again put,—that the Bill be now read a third time;

Mr. *Gigault* moved in amendment thereto, that the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same by adding to section 7, as sub-section (e) the following:—"The Board may in granting a *License* to an *Hotelkeeper*, authorize him to sell *Liquors* in quantities exceeding one Imperial quart, and not exceeding one Imperial gallon, at any one time to any one person, said quantities not to be consumed on the premises;—which was negated.

Mr. *Fleming* then moved in amendment, to leave out all the words after the word "that" in the said motion, and to insert the following instead thereof:—"The Provincial Legislatures have since *Confederation* exercised Legislative powers in the regulation of the issue of *Licenses* for the sale of *Intoxicating Liquors*, and the hours and certain other incidents of the sale.

That the Appeal Courts of Ontario and Quebec have each decided in favor of the exercise by the Provinces of the Dominion of the Jurisdiction, and this Appeal Court of Quebec has further determined that the Judgment of the Privy Council in *Russell* and *The Queen* does not decide that the Provincial Legislatures have not this Jurisdiction.

That the questions involved are now under the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada, and will shortly be brought under the consideration of the Privy Council.

That the Parliament of Canada should not assume Jurisdiction as proposed by the said Bill until the question has been settled by the Court of last resort;—which was negated on the following division:—

YEAYS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Auger,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Bain,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Béchar,	Gillmor,	Paterson (<i>Brant</i>),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (<i>Shelburne</i>),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ross (<i>Middlesex</i>),
Burpee (<i>Sunbury</i>),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (<i>Renfrew</i>),	Keefler,	Somerville (<i>Brant</i>),
Casey,	Kirk,	Somerville (<i>Bruce</i>),
Casgrain	Landerkin,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland (<i>Oxford</i>),
Davies,	Livingstone,	Trow, and
De St. Georges,	McMillan (<i>Huron</i>),	Vail.—43.
Fisher,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison,	Dundas,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Dupont,	Massue,
Baker (<i>Victoria</i>),	Foster,	Méthot,