

If a man invests a large amount of money in a city, he is to be allowed to go on for a longer time in business, than the man who has invested a smaller sum. It may be that one business is the larger, and the other the smaller; but because a man is poorer is he to be crushed earlier than the richer? This is a measure of compromise in very many respects; and the Committee desired to have a law uniform in its character. There are many provisions in the Nova Scotia law, that many members of the Committee, myself among the number, would have readily incorporated in the Bill, but they were opposed, and as every member of the Committee felt it incumbent to make the law workable for the whole Dominion, they conceded their individual opinions. It was better to concede and give a little. I have grave doubts as to the propriety of including this clause at all, in the law. There are many others holding different and very strong views. I do not see any justice in saying that a man who invests his all in a country grocery shop, in which he sells both articles, shall have only three years in which to wind up his business, while the man in the city shall have seven; let us have both alike. All the representations which I have had from the country, outside of cities, are the opposite to those received by the leader of the Opposition. I am told that it will shut up and ruin a large number of those engaged in this trade, if this is made applicable to the country, but by all means let it be enforced in the city, because a man can separate the businesses and succeed in the city, while greater difficulty in this respect is experienced in the country. I am under the impression that in cities and towns, at the end of the period, you will find people gradually adapting themselves to the circumstances, as provided for in this Bill, and there will be less difficulty and trouble, and less discontent and violation of the law, if all are placed on the same footing.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be sorry to be guilty of any unintentional injustice to the poor as compared with the rich. I heard a good deal of long leases, of extensive buildings erected for the purpose of carrying on the combined business, of vested interests of that description, which required time for turning round, and of great establishments, and in deference to those who have enquired into the matter and received representations concerning it, I was not indisposed to accept the view that a considerable number of years was needed in this relation, for the large transactions, large investments, long leases, &c.; but this is not the way in which things are done in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg pardon. In rural places there are stores in which \$7,000, \$9,000, \$10,000, &c., are invested with leases of five to ten years.

Mr. BLAKE. I know; but grocery stores are not there much larger on account of the liquor trade which is done. It is not the liquor trade which makes the difference; and these smaller transactions, these smaller establishments, and these smaller investments are easier wound up than the great ones. The latter might require seven years; but now the hon. gentleman proposes a longer period for the smaller than for the larger establishments, because if the greater ones are separated the businesses will still be profitable, while with the smaller ones the difficulties are greater. That is the reason for making the term longer than seven years, for they must then share. I understood that the time was extended in order that they might get out of the business without loss.

Mr. FARROW. I entirely agree with the members for West Durham and Oxford. I know there is a desire in my section of the country that the liquor establishments shall be separate from the grocery stores. I am glad to say that this is the case in the town of Wingham and in the village of Blyth. When liquor was there sold with other goods, customers were treated as an induce-

Mr. BOWELL.

ment to buy, and there was more drinking often done in these places than in hotels; and, therefore, I think it very proper that these businesses should be separated as soon as possible. As to the cities the year 1890 is quite right; but in incorporated towns and villages, three or four years would suit the majority of people in Canada.

Mr. ROSS. I would move in amendment that in cities the term be fixed at the 1st of May, 1890, and in towns and villages, at the 1st of May, 1886.

Mr. BOWELL. You take a city or town of 9,000 or 10,000 and another town made by Act of Parliament with 10,000; and you give to the city with the same population as the town an advantage.

Mr. ROSS. I will place cities and towns together.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us make a compromise. Instead of 1886 make the year 1887.

Mr. McCARTHY. It can be managed by adding to the clause "or elsewhere prior to the 1st of May, 1887."

On section 89,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that this clause, which provides a penalty for drinking liquor in a house to which a shop license applies, should also apply to drinking in contravention of the law, in a licensed tavern. The offence of the purchaser who obtains liquor at a hotel contrary to law, is just as great as the offence of the seller. I want the law to be made applicable to the informer. The misfortunes of these prosecutions is that vagabonds are engaged as informers, who try to induce tavern keepers to sell liquor frequently under false pretences. A case appeared in the press of an informer who sent a boy to get liquor, on the pretence that he wanted it for his mother, who was taken ill at a railway station; and it turned out this boy was in the employ of an informer, who went, on receiving the liquor, and informed against the tavern-keeper.

Mr. BLAKE. It is true a very untrustworthy class of men are those who give evidence in these cases, but I cannot see how you can alter that system.

On section 92,

Mr. HALL. Some discretion should be given to the Inspector. The complaint may be untrue, or upon trivial cause, and I would suggest that these words be added:

The said Inspector, if satisfied the statement made to him is correct and the requirement a reasonable one, shall thereupon serve a written notice on the person or persons holding license, forbidding such sale to the person in said notice designated.

Mr. BLAKE. From what was this clause taken?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was taken from the law of the Province of Quebec, the only change being that third parties are allowed to give notice.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no objection implied in the words, "may require."

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not deemed well to make it imperative upon him. The reason for the change was, that the woman, or wife, might, perhaps, have delicacy in going herself to the tavern-keeper and forbidding the sale of liquor, and might prefer to go to a third person. The notice, also, would come with more force from the Chief Inspector. I think we cannot accept the suggestion.

On section 96,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend that, by leaving out "License Commissioners" and adding "Chief Inspector or Inspectors." We can hardly subject a Judge who is one of the Commissioners, to a penalty of the kind, nor suppose him guilty of an offence.

On section 5, sub-section a,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend the clause by inserting in the eighth line, after the word Quebec, "the