

is any profit to be derived from the sale of liquor, it should go into the pockets of those who are accommodating the travelling public, and not for the benefit of those who carry on a business simply to make money out of it. I think that section is very objectionable, and that the sense of the Committee will be taken upon it, and the time greatly reduced.

Mr. BENSON. I have numerous letters from all parts of my constituency asking that shop licenses be done away with. I am sure this sub-section 2 will give them great dissatisfaction. I can easily conceive that in large cities, where they have made great preparations in the way of vaults, and have laid in large stocks of wines and spirits, it may be necessary to give them some time to get rid of their stock without loss. But I am satisfied that in small towns and villages they might as well give up at once as at any future time.

Mr. PAINT. I approve of this clause, and, as there are considerable financial interests involved, I think it only proper that parties should have until 1890 to make their preparations. It is a very difficult matter to deal with, and there ought to be ample time afforded.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason of the Committee in adopting this, was, that in their opinion it was unfair to the men who were in the trade, a deputation of whom appeared before the Committee, representing they had leased in some places establishments which would not be required if they had to separate their business, and asking, at all events, that some time should be given them in order to make their arrangements and that leases might terminate. What have we done? We have gone much further than any law in any Province but one, and we have enacted that it is improper for the sale of liquor to be carried on with the sale of any other goods, and we give people a delay within which they can arrange their business so as to go out of it without loss.

Mr. KIRK. There is no necessity of giving them so much time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Some have been in the business twenty years, some have leases for seven or eight years, and some have built houses for the purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to this clause being adopted, but I think the next sub-section should be made more stringent where it provides a penalty for persons having a shop license who gives or treats. Then it should be provided that if any person sells or allows to be sold in quantities of less than one quart, he should, on conviction, forfeit his license. The great objection to shop license is that they allow liquors to be sold by the glass.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that there is no need, with the utmost liberality of treatment towards those persons, that this clause should pass in its present shape. In the first place as to large investments is to be taken with a great deal of allowance, because, now under the present law, these persons that did so did it at the risk of being refused their license in any one year. In the second place, the suggestion that there has been large sums invested in stocks is not applicable to the bulk of the holders of shop licenses; it is applicable, I presume, only to holders of shop licenses in cities and towns. Those who hold shop licenses in the country could very easily run off their stocks within a much shorter period than within now and 1890. In their case, therefore, a line of distinction could be naturally drawn between licenses in cities and towns and those in other parts of the country. Once again, in cities and towns there are probably numerous holders of shop licenses, and there will, therefore, be a certain amount of competition even if the licenses continue to exist up to 1890; but in the country shop licenses are issued to fewer persons in each locality, and it is extremely likely that some will go out of the business, and others may die long before the expiration of the period, and you have left few or no holders. You will practically be giving a

great advantage to holders of shop licenses in the country up to 1890 over all fresh comers into the trade. At all events we might shorten the time allowed as regards the country. There is a very strong feeling in the country against shop licenses; and under these circumstances there is no reason to extend the limit to 1890.

Mr. KIRK. In Nova Scotia where holders of shop licenses are not allowed to sell other goods, will be permitted under this law for seven years to engage in the two businesses.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In Ontario municipalities may by-law, separate the liquor from the grocery business at any moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a matter of doubt.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In Woodstock such a by-law has been in force for some years, and in my own town a similar by-law has worked very well, and no complaint has been made. I am quite willing to allow a little time to those in the business to adjust themselves to changed circumstances. The time might be extended to 1886.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are many persons doing business in groceries and liquors in Ontario and Quebec, at all events. If we were commencing *ab initio*, it might be better to separate the two businesses, but I have my doubts on it. My opinion is, that in towns persons having shop licenses to sell liquors are almost compelled to keep their stores respectable; whereas when dealers are selling spirits only, there is not sufficient check on them, and less chance of the houses being kept respectable—in towns at least; I do not speak of the country. However that may be, firms have established businesses, and have erected large buildings for the purposes of the double business. They have been encouraged to enter into the business, and there is no reason why, because in some cases it might be considered advisable to sever the businesses, a sense of injustice should be extended to those engaged in the grocery or liquor trade throughout western Canada. In order to prevent such a sense of injustice being felt, it is proposed to extend the time to seven years, and I do not think it is too long a period. No doubt the moment this Bill passes into law, grocers will look ahead and see how to make arrangements to alter their business.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman looks at the question from a different stand-point from many hon. members, for he holds that no particular injury accrues from the two businesses being united. As regards the country at least, a shorter time might be inserted than is provided in the Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). A by-law prohibiting the sale of liquors with groceries has been in successful operation in Woodstock. Instead of difficulty being caused in enforcing the law, the law has worked much better. The establishments are much more respectable and the duties of the Inspector are made easier. I would suggest that a clause be inserted by which the provision under discussion might be extended to large cities, but not to towns and smaller places.

Mr. McCARTHY. I feel there is a good deal in what the hon. member for West Durham has said, but it is difficult to understand why a man in the village should not be protected as well as a dealer in the city.

Mr. BLAKE. It must be remembered that the country merchant can close up his business much more rapidly than the city merchant.

Mr. BOWELL. Why should you have one measure of justice for one, and another for another. It may be true that a man carrying on a combined liquor and general business in a country village, may have greater difficulty in succeeding if the business be separated, than in a town; but the argument of the leader of the Opposition is this: