

personal question again, which has already been ruled out.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will allow me to try whether I cannot put myself in order on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Speaking to the motion to adjourn will not enable you to refer to the previous debate.

Mr. PATERSON. I think it would be unwise to adjourn this debate until there has been a little understanding as to what has been said in the course of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I am under the control of the House in my judgment as to whether I am correct; but if the hon. gentleman is going again to refer to what has taken place, he is not in order on this motion to adjourn.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire entirely to be guided by you, Mr. Speaker, and do not desire to place you in any false position at all. I was saying that I thought it inexpedient that this motion to adjourn the debate should prevail until there was an opportunity of replying to a remark that has been made in the course of this debate. I think before the debate is adjourned that that remark should be attended to, and there should be some explanation in reference to it—a remark that was made during the present debate, which is now moved to be adjourned; and I think it is expedient that the debate should be adjourned until that is done. The remark to which I refer was a statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, who, in replying to a remark that I addressed to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) when I said the hon. member for Simcoe, last night, in reading an article from the *Globe*, had done precisely what the hon. member for West Durham had done, and which the hon. member for Cardwell characterized as being unworthy of him, that he was reading an article and that he did not read the whole article, but threw down the paper, and the hon. member for West Middlesex rose and finished it. That, Sir, was what I said, that is what I believe, that I reiterate, and leave that to the judgment of this House, whether it be true, or whether it be not true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is the judgment and regulation of the House that the hon. gentleman went further, and that he stated that the hon. member for North Simcoe had read in that paper what was not in the paper at all.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. VAIL. I do not rise to reply to any observations made by any hon. gentleman, but I desire merely to read one or two clauses from the License Law which was in force in Nova Scotia previous to Confederation. The third clause runs as follows:—

“Licenses may be granted by the Sessions upon the recommendation of the Grand Jury, except in the city of Halifax, where they may be granted agreeably to the Acts incorporating the same; but such recommendations shall be rejected in whole or in part by the Sessions, who shall have power from time to time to determine the periods at which licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors shall commence and expire; but no license to sell liquors shall be issued or granted to any person who now does or hereafter shall keep a brothel or house of ill-fame; but in any county in which the majority of the Sessions may be disposed to grant licenses to sell intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, they shall nevertheless withhold such license in any polling district when a majority of the ratepayers petition the Sessions against the granting of such licenses, and such decision shall remain in full force and effect until reversed by a majority of the ratepayers upon real or personal estate in any polling district where such action shall have been taken.”

Here is another very important clause in the Nova Scotia law, which is not contained in the Bill. It is as follows:—

“No license shall be granted to any person who shall reside or have his place of business within the limits of the railway, nor to any person who shall reside or have his occupation within any proclaimed gold

Mr. SPEAKER.

district, and all sales of intoxicating liquors within such limits, or within such proclaimed gold districts, shall be deemed as made without license, notwithstanding the seller may hold a license, and he shall be liable to all penalties and forfeitures incurred by those who shall sell without license.”

That I consider is a very important clause, and I should like to see it inserted in this Bill before it is finally passed. We find it is absolutely necessary in Nova Scotia for the proper working of the mines.

Mr. RICHEY. If the amendment which we are now called upon to consider is intended to embarrass the legislation which we are endeavoring to pass through this House, or if it were conceived with the intention of embarrassing the hon. members of this House who have been engaged in the draughting of this Bill, and those who have voted in all good faith for it in the promotion of the interests of temperance, then I am willing to concede that, to a very large extent, perhaps, it may be calculated to effect that object. I will not attribute such intentions to the hon. gentleman who has presented them—I will give him credit for all of that conscientiousness which I claim for myself in dealing with this question; but I would desire to draw his attention, and the attention of this House, to the fact that whilst with those two amendments before us; that which we have already passed touching the Province of Quebec, and that which we are asked now to enact with respect to other Provinces, it is just one of those cases where a very great distinction may exist, while the words embodied in the amendment may be very similar. There may be, with regard to sentences as well as to words, an appearance of similarity in sense, while the significance of the sentences as of words is altogether different. If I cannot demonstrate this in the course of a two minutes' speech, I shall have to be content to labor under whatever implication of unfairness any hon. gentleman may be willing to charge us with. Let us look at the position as it presents itself before us at the present moment. Constrained by the interpretation of the law, by the highest tribunal to which an appeal could be made, the Government of the Dominion have been called to the task of providing an enactment to regulate the traffic in intoxicating liquors, with a view to restrain that traffic and to prevent it from being carried to an undue extent; and this guiding principle has been before us in our effort at legislation in this particular: It is to embody in the Act which is to be passed by this House, as far as possible, whatever restrictions already are found to exist in the different Provinces of the Dominion, yielding only so far as may be necessary to effect the great object which we have in view by some degree of mutual concession in order to the attainment of the necessary uniformity. Animated by that principle when the hon. member for Laval presented his amendment and fortified it by the argument that we were withdrawing from the Province of Quebec restrictions existing at the present day, and which existed prior to Confederation, and still continued in existence; to maintain as far as possible the restrictions in the various Provinces, this House yielded. When the amendment which the hon. member for West Durham proposed is submitted to the House, it is, it is true, couched in the same phraseology; the text is the same, while the commentary is altogether different. Whilst we were told by the hon. member for Laval that these restrictions and these powers conferred on the municipalities to further restrain the traffic in intoxicating liquors, had been continued up to the present moment and existed at this day, there has not been, so far, an attempt to show that the powers conferred on municipalities before Confederation, were in the other Provinces continued and were existing to this day. The hon. member for Digby has come before us as the champion of Nova Scotia in this particular, and has cited an Act by which the traffic in intoxicating liquors was regulated prior to Confederation; but does