

Hon. Mr. SHANNON referred to the attempted alteration of the city license law last year.

Mr. ARCHIBALD remarked that the town of Pictou was also excluded from the operation of the general law. Such legislation was not adapted to the wants of the country, and he did not see why these exceptions should be made.

Mr. MILLER said that as the organ of the Temperance body had been referred to, he would say a word on the subject, though he felt surprised that the hon. member for Inverness had thought it worth while to refer to it.—That paper would seem to insinuate that that gentleman and himself were occupying a position inconsistent with their legislative duties in being retained by any body of persons. The facts were, that after the passage of the law, a number of gentlemen called upon them for advice, and, in discharge of their professional duties, that advice was given. A journal which went out of its way to make an insinuation that the retainer had been accepted in a legislative capacity, was not likely to promote the objects it had in view. He did not think the proposed separation a wise policy, and had heard no argument advanced in its support that was entitled to a great deal of weight.—That had been his opinion of the matter long before the Grocers' and Liquor Dealers' Association had been in existence.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said he had been desirous that Mr. Blanchard should have an opportunity of explaining his position in reference to the matter, and was glad to find that that gentleman's views coincided with those of the promoters of the change, and with the views entertained by the great majority of the people. The hon. member for Richmond entertained different sentiments, and he was entitled to hold these, and to give an opinion upon the law without the imputation of improper motives. He trusted that the observations to which these gentlemen referred would not prevent them from carrying out their convictions as to the course which should be adopted; but so far from thinking that the latter gentleman was right in treating the organ of the Temperance body with contempt, he considered a paper fighting in the cause of Temperance and morality, against such opposition as it must have to encounter, should be referred to with respect. He had never seen anything in that paper to lead him to think it other than the organ of a very large influential, and respectable class of people.

Mr. TOBIN said he had never considered this a question with which the House should deal; it was a matter for the City Council and the Sessions, because the Province derived no revenue from the licenses. The Mayor and Corporation of the city were entrusted with matters far transcending this in importance, and they should be the judges of what was a good license law. He thought the conduct of the citizens of Halifax was as orderly as that of any other people in British America or the United States. The leader of the Opposition had once contended that the country should be governed by cold water principles, but that gentleman seemed to have changed his opinions, and to have come to the conclusion that hot piety and cold water were not best after all. Even the Chairman of Railways would admit that something besides cold water was necessary in his

department. The law which had existed up to last session imposing heavy fines upon persons selling liquor without license, was an instance of a law which was too stringent to be carried into effect.—and as to the expediency of the separation clause, very great doubts existed in the community.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said he did not see why authority should be given to the City Council to deal differently with the community of Halifax from any other portion of the Province.

The bill was read a first time.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. S. MACDONNELL presented a petition from Inverness against the Union of the Colonies.

Also, a petition from the same county, asking the establishment of a daily mail to Port Hood and Margaree. This petition he urged very strongly upon the notice of the Government, alluding particularly to the fact that a daily mail now crossed the Gut of Canso on its way to Sydney.

Mr. LONGLEY, in accordance with leave previously obtained, introduced a bill in reference to a public landing at Paradise.

#### RAILWAY DAMAGES.

Mr. D. FRASER presented a petition from certain inhabitants of Pictou, praying for an alteration in the 70th chapter of the Revised Statutes, respecting Railways.

Mr. ARCHIBALD called attention to the propriety of taking the petition into careful consideration, and expressed his opinion that the power given by the law to cut down timber, &c., for public purposes, should be carefully restrained. No individual should be more overridden than is absolutely necessary for the promotion of the public interests.

Mr. D. FRASER introduced an Act to amend chap. 70 R. S., in accordance with the prayer of the petition.

Hon. PROV. SECY. said that he hoped that the hon. member would be able to suggest a means by which the interests of the public, as well as those of private individuals, would be equally protected. He was not prepared to say that sub-contractors might not occasionally take a course under the present law, which would be exceedingly inconvenient to the owners of private property, but the proper time for parties to remonstrate was when the Railway Act was being passed. The House should not forget that an expenditure of \$2,000,000 was now going on for a great public work, which, whilst of undoubted advantage to the whole Province, would especially benefit Pictou, and largely increase the value of property within miles of the railway. Under such circumstances he thought it strange to see persons objecting to incur a small amount of inconvenience in connection with a work which was to be of such signal advantage to them. He had no objection to the introduction of the bill, though he would like to see how the public as well as private interests were to be at the same time protected. He had heard of parties who had combined to put a price of 60 cents upon railway sleepers, and yet had sold them subsequently for 10 cents to the parties who actually got the contracts. It was as well to understand whether those engaged in the construction of our Railways were to be called upon to pay inordinate prices through such combinations.