Mr. Gow—If the present law were enforced to the letter, would you still be favourable to an unlimited number of licenses?

The POLICE MAGISTRATE replied that he would. Last year they had applications for about 80 more than could receive licenses, and a large number of these had ample accommodation on their premises for boarders and travellers. Sec. 5, exempting ten persons in cities and four in towns, qualified to have a tavern license, from having all the accommodation required by the preceding sub-section, he considered to be one of the worst provisions in the statute as far as cities were concerned. Saloons (which came under this head) were, as a class, nothing but drinking booths and gambling hells. He thought this proviso ought to be abolished and that one substitute eating-houses should be enacted in their stead, and that these houses should be allowed to sell beer by the glass and wine by the quart, but no other spirituous liquor. The number of such houses might be limited to about one to every 500 inhabitants in cities. With respect to licenses, he thought the amount paid for them ought to be fixed. In Toronto, for instance, they had them at $45, $50 and $75. In sub-section 7, he proposed to add after the word "certificate" in the second line, the words "or who receives money or other thing for granting permission to sell." By this alteration he desired to include a class of cases which had recently arisen, when parties who could not get licenses from the corporation, got them from a person who gave them for a small sum permission to sell and actually nailed over their doors a tin plate showing that he gave them permission to sell. He (the Police Magistrate) would suggest that it be made a misdemeanor to compound any breach of this law. He had actually seen such cases compounded in court before his eyes and had been powerless to prevent it. One morning no less than 60 cases were disposed of in this way. Sub-section 9, providing that the sale of liquors in shops or taverns may be prohibited, he regarded as a useless substitute for a prohibitory law. Section 250—providing that the sums to be paid for licenses should include the Imperial and Provincial duty—he would suggest to amend by fixing the maximum amount of tavern license at $250 and minimum $100. His object was to raise the qualification of the men who keep these places, and, if possible, put the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the hands of the best men that could be got. He would suggest that section 252 be amended so as to provide that wholesale dealers—the men who sold by the puncheon—should be made to contribute to the revenue as well as the retail dealers. He objected to section 253 and said the selling of liquor to be consumed outside these taverns, in quantities less than one quart, should not be permitted. He knew of cases in which respectable people—who would not be seen going to taverns—got liquor from thence by their children, and drank it at home, to the ruin of themselves and their families. The penalties for selling liquor without license, as fixed by the 254th section, he would alter to $50 and costs or 3 months imprisonment for a first offence; $100 and costs or 6 months imprisonment at hard labour for the second offence; and for every subsequent offence not less than 2 years', or more than 5 years' imprisonment in the Penitentiary. If they desired to put down this unlicensed liquor traffic, the punishment on offenders must be severe. On section 255, he would observe that the penalties attaching to shop-keepers for allowing liquor to be drunk on their premises should be the same as applied to tavern-keepers. His opinion on section 256, which provided that the informer should get half the penalty recovered, would lead him to leave that section as it stood. The office of informer was one few were found willing to undertake—any man who accepted the position, did so at great personal risk—as he heard even a decent temperance man say yesterday, they were hated worse than the devil—and hence strong inducements were necessary to get such men. On section 257, the Saturday night provision had worked well in Toronto. During the first six weeks of that law, while alone he was able to enforce it, the highest number of drunkards on the calendar on Monday morning was 4, and on two or three occasions only one case appeared. But, by-and-by, the magistrates interfered—the parties engaged in this traffic were told that the law could not be enforced—an organization was formed in the city to set the law at defiance, and it was successfully defied. Not having given bonds, there was no way of enforcing the Police regulations against these parties, and free trade in liquor prevailed. One result of this was that nearly 3,000 drunkards appeared before him that year; and yesterday (Monday) there were no fewer than 24 drunken cases on the calendar. In section 258, he would suggest that for the 4th offence, power be given to cancel the license. He would do away with the imprisonment, cancel the license, and disqualify the offender for three years in the municipality. Under section 259, he had occasion to rule that the informant was not a competent witness. He saw also that many municipalities allowed it, and thought it would be a wise provision. The first sub section of Sec. 262, providing for the appointment of Inspectors of shop and tavern licenses, ought to be amended by making the Chief of Police *ex-officio* Inspector of Licenses. It was impossible for one Inspector in Toronto—where there were some 300 places for the sale of liquor—to see that the regulations were properly complied with, and policemen being always on the beat, would make very good inspectors. Such a system prevailed in Great Britain, New York, and elsewhere; and had worked well, and had not tended to demoralize the police force. With regard to the sections touching licenses, he would propose to deduct from every tavern license in cities $10, and from every shop license, $8; in counties, he would deduct $10 from every tavern license, and $5 from every shop license, and apply these sums towards creating a fund for the establishment of an Inebriate Asylum. In this way, a sum of $75,000 or $100,000 could be readily raised. Appeals in liquor cases, he would suggest, should be done away with—except to the County Judge—and he would further suggest that the police be empowered to arrest persons without warrant for breaches of the license law. There was another point—a purely personal matter—to which he would desire to draw the attention of the committee. He thought that the Government ought to pay the salary attached to his office. At present he was appointed by the Government and paid by the Corporation. To show the working of the present system, he would merely mention that time and again he had been taunted in this way:—You do so and so, now—contrary to the obligations of his office; or else we'll attend to your salary—and there was no doubt they did attend to it.

Mr. COYNE—But you have your private practice?

The POLICE MAGISTRATE said he had not made $5 at the profession since he had been magistrate. The principle was, to his mind, a bad one, that those against whom he had to administer the law should be the persons to pay him for administering it. All parties administering the law ought to be paid by the Government.

Mr. MCKELLAR said he would like to hear the news of the Police Magistrate in reference to the secret societies' oath administered to the Police.

The POLICE MAGISTRATE said that no objection had ever been raised to the oath by any of the men in the force. Some of the most efficient men in the force were the very men on whose behalf this was being asked—he referred to the Orangemen; but they had not objected to the oath. The Police Commissioners, as a rule, never refused to appoint a man on the force because he was an Orangeman or belonged to a secret society. All that was asked of any member of that force was that he should discharge his duty faithfully, and not attend any meetings of a secret society while he belonged to the force; and that rule was brought about in this way:—In 1859, before the reorganization of the force, there were most scandalous proceedings connected with it. The late Police Magistrate, Mr. Gurnett, represented to the Government that during those proceedings, 24 men went into the witness box, and clearly perjured themselves, on the ground that they considered the obligations of the Secret Society to which they belonged, superior to their oath of office; and in consequence of this, a riot, which had happened in Toronto, went unpunished. When the Force was reorganised by the Commissioners the present oath was put in. On his accession to office he had found in administering that oath that it was so strong that the constable was required to swear that he was not then a member of any Secret Society; and in the very first instance he observed a man going to take the oath who would certainly have perjured himself in so doing. Subsequently he had that portion of the oath struck out. It was now an oath similar to that taken by the Force in Australia, Great Britain and Ireland; and had, so far as his observation extended, given satisfaction to all classes of the community. It was a remarkable thing that nothing was