

# ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

THIRD PARLIAMENT---SECOND SESSION.

FRIDAY, Feb. 16.

The Speaker took the chair at 3:15 p.m.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES.

Mr. Clarke (Wellington) presented the third report of the Public Accounts Committee.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. Paxton introduced a Bill to amend the Act respecting Municipal Institutions, which was read the first time.

## CORRECTION.

Mr. RICHARDSON drew attention to his being misrepresented in all the morning papers as speaking in favour of the extension of the franchise to farmers' sons. He was opposed to the measure and did not speak. The remarks attributed to him were made by Mr. Macdougall (Middlesex).

## EXPLANATION.

Mr. ROSS desired to explain why the amendment to the Agricultural Bill of which he had given notice was not moved at the third reading. He said that at the time the third reading was called a hon. member was speaking to him in his place, and he did not notice the Bill called, and it was declared passed before his attention was directed to it. The amendment was the same as he had moved in Committee of the Whole, and which was lost on a division, but the motions in Committee not appearing in the journals of the House, he desired to move it again to get it thus on record. The amendment referred to is as follows:—"That the said Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend section forty one of the said Bill by striking out the first part of said section down to the word 'Directors' in second line, and substituting in its stead the following:— 'The society shall at such meeting, elect a President, two Vice-Presidents, and nine other Directors from the members of such society, and in appointing such Directors, the society shall elect as least one of such Directors from among the residents of each township in the electoral division in which there is a branch society or union society, and from among the residents of each town or village in which there is a horticultural society, provided that there are in such township, town, or village, at least ten members of the electoral district accordingly, and should the electors be a larger number of townships, towns, or villages having such branch or horticultural societies than nine, then the number of directors may be so increased as to provide that one director may be appointed from each of such townships, towns, or villages.'"

## THE CITY OF TORONTO BILL.

On the order for the third reading of the Bill respecting the City of Toronto, the Toronto Water-works, and other matters,

Mr. BELL moved that it be recommitted for the purpose of inserting the clause of which he had given notice.

Mr. MOWAT suggested that the matter should be allowed to stand till Monday, as it was understood that the parties concerned might come to an understanding.

Mr. BELL consented to let the order stand.

## THE LIQUOR-LICENSE BILL.

The Bill to amend the Act respecting the sale of spirituous liquors was referred back to Committee of the Whole, received certain amendments, and was reported.

On the motion for the third reading,

Mr. HARKIN moved to have the Bill recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House, so that such changes made as will enable the Councils of municipalities to appoint their own inspectors, and to dispense with the services of the commissioners and inspectors now appointed by his Honour in Council under the authority of 30 V.C. cap. 26. In making the amendment, he deprecated the entrusting to the Government the power of appointing so large a body of salaried officials as the inspectors and commissioners.

Mr. PRESTON said that the Act was a very expensive one to carry into operation. The municipalities felt it an insult that they were not considered fit to be trusted with the privilege of appointing their own inspec-

tors. The Government in a hasty appointed a set of officials of one political complexion, who thought of nothing but of drawing their own salaries. Were the officers to be appointed by the municipalities, they would be under a local supervision which it would be difficult to evade.

Mr. LONG said that great injustice had been done in his riding by the refusal to grant licences to those that had the legal accommodation, apparently because the occupants were not in sympathy with the Government. He had apprehended last session that the Bill would be used politically, and certainly in his riding it had been employed in that manner. He thought that the inspectors should be appointed by the municipalities.

Mr. HARDY said that he apprehended that if the power of appointing these inspectors was vested in the Opposition no doubt the law would be considered a great success. He lived in a strong Conservative town, and he had yet to hear an expression of disapproval as to the manner in which licences are now issued and inspectors appointed. If municipal councils thought that there had been an infringement of their rights where was the expression of this feeling, by petition or in any other form? He contended that the country was receiving advantages from the working of the Act.

Mr. SCOTT thought still, as he had said last session, that it was a mistake to transfer the authority from the Municipal Councils, which are more directly responsible to the people of their localities, to the Government. He had no hesitation in saying that in his own constituency, in many instances, the grant of licences had gone by favouritism. He supposed it was a strange coincidence that supporters of the Government with poor accommodation, had got licences, while men not in political sympathy with them but possessing good premises were refused. If the hon. gentlemen opposite were living in these localities they would hear of severe complaints. He complained also of the great waste of funds involved in his administration of the law.

Mr. FRASER thought it strange that the hon. gentleman should delay till such a late day in the session before proposing such a radical change in the measure. This waiting for the papers was a very large excuse, and was on a par with the others urged. He considered this as a motion of want of confidence and was such as he might expect from the back seat of the Opposition.

Mr. HARKIN—I alone am responsible for the motion.

Mr. FRASER was glad that the burden of this was in a measure removed from the franchisees. One great objection to this law was the expense of enforcing it. He would be ashamed to think that the people of Ontario wished to make a revenue out of the licenses. He preferred to think that they would much rather see them expending every cent of the money derived from this source in surrounding the sale of liquor with such restrictions as would tend to remove the mass of misery connected with it. Perhaps much of the cry of expensiveness arose from the fact of the administration of the late law having been shameful. When the appointment of inspectors was in the hands of the Municipal Councils, the supervision was a free, and what else could be expected when salaries were in many instances nominal. The real objection of the Opposition, he imagined, was to be found in their chagrin at seeing so much patronage in the hands of the Government, and its imputed exercise towards the friends of the Ministry. This was a poor objection, for whenever they had entrusted a commissionership to a member of the Opposition, they had found its duties so meagrely discharged that they had no recourse but to appoint their own friends. The instance adduced of its defective working in cities was the most unhappy that could have been selected, as any one perusing the newspapers could see the determined efforts being made to curb the excesses of the trade, and restrict the illicit traffic. If the inspectors failed in their duty occasionally it was only what might be anticipated, when it was remembered how many of these officials had been appointed. It could not be expected that all over the Province the inspectors would be equally efficient. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, had expected what no reasonable man would have expected. Another grievance of the Opposition was that where licences had been denied in certain cases they had turned out to have been denied to friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. If it had turned out that no one had any but friends of the Gov-