license from whom would be a proceeding unjust and illiberal. Let not the City Council listen to such false reasoning. No really respectable Grocer would condescend to sell spirits by the glass, any more than a really respectable publican would condescend to sell an ounce of tea or sugar. If Grocers and other dealers think fit to supply their customers with wine or spirits, they can readily obtain a shop license, which allows them to sell "intoxicating liquors in quantities not less than one bottle, con- "taining not less than three half pints; *but no part whereof* "*shall be consumed on the premises.*" That an outcry will take place on behalf of those highly respectable Grocers who have long been accustomed to retail "white-eye" at five cents per glass, we have not the smallest doubt; but let the members of the City Council stand their ground, and they will, in the end, receive the thanks of their fellow citizens for the most salutary city reform ever effected. We cannot altogether approve of the policy of the Council in allowing *Confectioners* to obtain a spirit license under the third class. It is highly important that the distinction between "Eating Houses" and "Confectioner's Shops" should be clearly marked. What constitutes a Confectioner's Shop? The articles included in the term "Confectionary," vary so considerably that this portion of the Act seems open to the gravest abuse. If every man who chooses to exhibit in his window two or three bottles of barley sugar and a corresponding amount of lemon drops, be entitled to take out a Confectioner's spirit license, the sale of bad rum will continue on much the same scale as at present. The Council would do well to reconsider the third portion of Schedule A, and omit the words:—"*or a Confectioner's shop.*" We presume it was the intention of the Council to accomodate those who endeavour to combine the business of a Confectioner with that of an Eating house keeper,—a convenient arrangement very common in the West End of London. We know of dozens of such establishments in London, and other large cities, but at none of them are intoxicating liquors retailed, the custom invariably being to send to the nearest tavern for such liquors as may be ordered—a system which works well, alike for the Confectioner, the tavern proprietor, and the public. We fear that some difficulty will attend the successful working of the law as laid down with regard to minors: "Any person holding a "license who shall knowingly sell intoxicating liquors to a "minor, any part of which shall be consumed on the premises, "upon proof thereof before the Mayor, or presiding Alderman, "shall forfeit his license, and shall not again be capable of "holding a license." It seems somewhat hard that a lad of 19 or 20, should not be allowed a glass of ale on his way home from the cricket field, or the Dartmouth lakes, and the penalty attaching to a publican who would under such circumstances serve a glass of ale, seems harder still. Can it be that our youths are so precociously addicted to the abuse of intoxicating liquors as to render such a clause absolutely necessary? We now come upon a clause which, however, judicious in principle, seems to go somewhat beyond the limits of orthodox legislation. "If the husband, wife, parent, child, brother, or sister, master, "guardian, *or creditor*, of any person addicted to the intem- "perate use of intoxicating liquors, or (? if) any Alderman or "Justice of the Peace, or Commissioner of the Poor shall give "notice in writing to any person engaged in the sale of intoxi- "cating liquors, that such person (? the person engaged in the "sale, &c.,) is addicted to the intemperate use of intoxicating "liquors, it shall not thereafter be lawful, &c., for the person "receiving such notice, &c., &c., to sell or give any intoxica- "ting liquors to such intemperate person, &c." Any attempt to carry out this law would give rise to an amount of scandal grave in proportion to the social position of the parties implicated. It is not easy to say what constitutes an "intemperate use of intoxicating liquors," on the part of a man of whose antecedents we know nothing whatever. Let us suppose, for sake of illustration, that a teetotal tailor has given credit to a man of prepossessing exterior and doubtful means, and that, having in vain furnished his "little account," the temperate tailor hears that his dubious patron is in the habit of drinking a bottle of brandy per diem. The teetotal tailor might, in his capacity as *creditor*, and in hopes of getting his bill paid, prohibit the sale of liquor to his prepossessing debtor, and by so doing consign his patron to *delirium tremens* and probable death. Again,—a desperate *creditor* might, were he so minded, stop the liquor of a debtor kept alive solely by liquor, merely because the said debtor was known to have ensured his life for the sake of his creditors. There is, in point of fact, scarce any limit to the difficulties consequent upon an endeavour to enforce sobriety by means of legislation, and the City Council would do well to erase from its Statutes the clause in question. The clause relating to "Habitual drunkards" should likewise be expunged. In the first place, it could never be fairly carried out; and in the second place, it is entirely opposed to individual freedom. However sad may be the contemplation of an habitual drunkard, undermining his health and neglecting his family in order to gratify his cravings for strong drink, the spectacle by no means justifies "any two Aldermen" causing a notice of such an one's unhappy peculiarities to be made public in the columns of the press. When a man ill uses, or neglects his family, the latter can appeal to the law for protection, but any attempt to enforce morality by law is as inexpedient as it must necessarily be impracticable.

THE LEGISLATURE—MINOR DEBATES.

The arguments employed against the Hon. Mr. SHANNON's bill, "to allow foreigners to obtain patents in Nova Scotia on "the same terms as those imposed on our citizens in their "(foreigners) countries," seem expressly designed to prove the truth of Mr. MCCULLY's assertion—small countries produce small men. Listen to Mr. BLANCHARD's words:—"He thought it would be "unsafe to extend large privileges to foreigners in the way "proposed." If it were not that in this Province a so called conservative party introduced universal suffrage, we should say that Mr. BLANCHARD had made a mistake in taking up his position on the Speaker's left. Fancy, a so-called liberal arguing in favor of protection as regards patents! Mr. BLANCHARD's liberality on this subject, reminds us of the liberality which, some ten years back, was accorded to an English army doctor by one or more Haligonian physicians. The Englishman had the effrontery to cure patients whom the Halifax doctors did not cure, and the latter, with that liberality for which we are so justly celebrated, asserted that an English officer, because he *was* an English officer, had no right to interfere in matters so purely local as health and sickness—indeed the local practitioners were silly enough to refer the matter to the English authorities, and thus merit the snubbing they (as a matter of course) finally received. Mr. LEVISCONTE went a little further than Mr. BLANCHARD, and referred to the loss "which would be caused *by opening a door to competition in our present* "*inventions.*" We wonder to which of those two mighty parties, for whose squabbles our gigantic population pays $30,000 per annum, Mr. LEVISCONTE belongs. How glad we are that we neither know nor care? To write for a party paper in a Province like Nova Scotia must be a painful task indeed, and we sincerely sympathize with those who are bound to support a man who dreads "competition in invention," merely because he is one of a political party, in a country which needs neither politics nor politicians. The only sensible remark made concerning patents, was that of Mr. SHANNON, who said, "our "attempts at invention, as seen in the PROVINCIAL SECRETARY's "office, are positively ludicrous, and I do not see any reason