

the Administration of Mr. Mowat have used the licensing machinery to coerce the tavern-keepers. The hon. gentleman is aware that in his own county, and in every county where they could, they have utilized their corrupt power, which they took purely for party purposes. That, in itself, is a justifiable reason why this House should take away from men, who are merely the tools of a corrupt so-called Reform Administration, this power, and place it in the hands of independent men who will exercise it for the good of morality instead of making it an instrument to serve party purposes.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think it necessary, in discussing this question, that we should show any party feeling in the matter at all. All I ask on the part of Nova Scotia is that the members from Quebec should treat us in the same way that we treated them. We have voted with them on this question, and all we ask now is that they shall return the compliment, and allow us the same provision they have asked for themselves.

Mr. AMYOT. I have heard with a great deal of attention the call that has just been made upon the loyalty of the members from Quebec in relation to this question. I am thankful to the members of this House who so unanimously acceded to the desire of the members from Quebec. We must remember that there is a clause in the British North America Act that provides for special laws for the Province of Quebec, and for uniformity of some laws in the other Provinces. To-day we came unanimously before the House, and asked for a special provision for the Province of Quebec; it was granted us, and we are thankful for it. Now, in reference to the other Provinces, we find there are two parties: We find a majority on one side, and a minority on the other side; and we, from the Province of Quebec, considering the principle that the majority should rule, think we will have to vote with the majority from the other Provinces.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to endorse the utterances of an hon. gentleman on this side with regard to the manner in which the Crooks Act has been administered. Two important cases recently occurred in my county which show how necessary it is that this Parliament should take action in this matter. In the village of Arthur, the chief hotel in the place, which had been in existence for a great many years, and was situated in the centre of the business part of the town, was refused a license, and the license was given to another house in a side street, with only two or three bedrooms in it, and without suitable accommodation such as should be possessed by a hotel. Another similar case occurred in the same village. Now, Sir, I am of opinion that a good License Act is the best Temperance Act that can be adopted in any country. Only the other day we had evidence given to this House that the sale of spirituous liquors had decreased in the Province of Ontario since the Crooks Act came into force; but that Act has fallen into disrepute by the partisan manner in which it has been administered by the Mowat Government. Another instance was given by the hon. member for West Durham, to show that a partial prohibition, such as the Dunkin Act, is a failure, and was proved to be a failure in many instances in Ontario. That Act was in force in the county of York, and the hon. member stated that in that county it was an entire failure.

Mr. McCARTHY. I only rise for the purpose of giving a denial, in as emphatic language as I can give it, to the statement made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Pater-son). I do not know whether it is Parliamentary to say it is untrue, but in as strong language as I can put it, I desire to express my sentiment in that direction.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It was not my intention to speak upon this question; but the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) made some remarks, the drift of which I cannot understand. He says we should look at this matter in no

party sense, but should give to Nova Scotia the same rights as we have given to Quebec. Most decidedly, there is not an hon. member in this House who would not say Amen to that. But if he wishes to be understood, that in Nova Scotia we should go back to the laws prevailing before Confederation, which means almost no License Law at all, it would excite the temperance people of that Province almost to rebellion. If that is the meaning of the hon. gentleman I can understand it, but on no other grounds is it comprehensible. I understand that in the Province of Quebec, the laws have been altered very little since Confederation, whereas in Nova Scotia, at almost every Session of the Legislature, the License Law is amended in some particular; and yet the suggestion is made that we are to sweep them all away and go back to the Acts before Confederation.

Mr. PATERSON. I just wish to say, in reference to the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), any remarks I made I believed them to be perfectly true; but if I have done an injury to the hon. gentleman in saying what was not true, I should very much regret it. But I must still say that was the impression on my mind, that it is still my impression, and though I am anxious not to misrepresent the hon. gentleman—

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman made a charge against me, and I simply give it a denial. I did not enter into any detail, but simply gave it a denial. The hon. gentleman may accept it or not as he pleases—I do not care; but he has no right to go into it again and make a speech upon it without my having an opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has any personal explanation to make he can do so. He made a statement which the hon. member for Simcoe said is not correct, and there is an end of it. He cannot go on and argue the question again, and say that it was correct.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman need not have gone further, and made the statement that he did, and then prevent any reply being made.

Mr. BOWELL. Why?

Mr. PATERSON. He went the length of saying that he did not know whether it was Parliamentary to say that it was untrue.

Mr. McCARTHY. Precisely.

Mr. PATERSON. And the statement I made, if I remember what I said, was, that he, last night, in reading an article from the *Globe*—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion for adjournment. It has not been put; I have not heard it.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no motion before the Chair. All motions must be in writing.

Mr. BLAKE. That has not been the practice in motions for adjourning a debate.

Mr. BOWELL. It may have been the practice through courtesy to allow verbal motions; but in every instance where the attention of the Speaker has been called to the fact that a motion was not in writing, it has been ruled out.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is true, the practice has been to make verbal motions for adjournment; but there is no necessity for making this motion, as the hon. member for Brant cannot put himself in order on this motion by referring to the