

people had of that gentleman. With regard to the general question, the Government had been urged on all hands to remove the appointment of Commissioners from municipal bodies. It was notorious that the Inspectors previously appointed were not useful officers, and the change was made both in the interest of temperance and of respectable innkeepers themselves. It was quite probable that some Commissioners had made mistakes, or were not as efficient as was desirable, but his wonder was, not that such cases should occur, but that they had been so extremely few. He was satisfied, however, that the general opinion of the public was that this law had been a success.

Mr. MORRIS said he had been unable to arrive at a definite conclusion as to whether in the opinion of the Government Commissioners and Inspectors should hold municipal offices or not. He remembered the time when such men as the late member of Parliament for South Bruce and the late leader of the Dominion Government held seats in this House, but the friends of gentlemen opposite endeavoured, successfully, to get a measure passed which compelled them to resign their seats in this House, and thus the Province lost the services of these men. Now, in the case of two positions far inferior, they were willing to let one man occupy both. What he desired, however, was simply to know the Government's policy in the matter, as there seemed to be a difference of opinion among themselves.

Mr. CALVIN claimed that the present system of issuing licences by Commissions did not meet the approval of the people. He held in his hand a letter from a magistrate saying he would resign if the law were not repealed. It was contrary to the very principle of liberal government to take the authority from the people and give it into the hands of two or three men who, perhaps, never visited the county in which the licence was granted more than twice a year. It was ridiculous to suppose that the County Councils did not best know what they wanted. The present system resulted in there being no house of accommodation along a stretch of 15 miles of well-travelled road in his county. He claimed that in many other instances the Government had taken privileges out of the hands of the people, and made them refer to this House for every change they desired to effect.

Mr. ROBINSON said if there ever was anything more than another which showed him what straits the Opposition were driven for charges to urge against the Government it was their conduct in the present discussion. (Hear, hear.) The license law was never administered in Kingston so well as at present. At one time the charge had been made against the Commissioners that they had used their position to win an election, but this charge had had to be withdrawn in the newspapers. He could certify that there were not three more respectable men in Kingston than the Commissioners, and one of them was a Conservative, as was also the License Inspector.

Mr. CURRIE said that he understood that the Bill in question had been for the purpose of reducing the number of taverns, and to take out of the hands of the municipal corporations the licensing powers. It was strange that the member for East Grey and others on the Opposition side of the House, now so strongly objecting to the principle of the Bill, had spoken in favour of and supported it.

Mr. LAUDER—We did not approve of the appointment of Commissioners.

Mr. CURRIE contended that the Bill when introduced had received the assent of both sides of the House, and no amendments had been suggested until the third reading. It had been stated that the Government had passed the law in order to unjustly widen their influence, but this would be seen to be false on looking at the fact that the amount of annual revenue from licenses had decreased by \$30,000 since the law came into force. He was pleased to hear the testimony of the hon. member from Kingston. He believed that if the testimony from all the cities were heard it would be found to be in favour of the present law.

Mr. CHISHOLM referred to a case in Brampton to which reference had previously been made by Mr. Lauder. A license had been refused by the Commissioners to

one McEwen. He explained that when the present law was introduced the Commissioners decided to reduce the number of licenses, and with that view had withdrawn licenses from two respectable houses. When it was subsequently decided to add another license to the list, the Commissioners had naturally given it to one of the two houses which had formerly been closed. Mr. McEwen had in the meantime built a very good house and had applied for a license. His application had been supported by petitions from the Town Council and from the citizens, but the license had not been granted for the reason given. The town, however, was growing, and no doubt Mr. McEwen would secure his license when it was found advisable to increase the number of hotels. He believed the Act was working well, and that Municipal Councils were glad to be relieved of the responsibility of granting and withholding licenses.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) was sure it was the feeling of the country that in justice to all concerned the License Inspector should not hold municipal offices—(Opposition cheers)—though there was nothing illegal about their holding those positions. He thought this principle had been pretty well acknowledged and carried out. If anything could surprise him in the inconsistency of the Opposition—(hear, hear)—it would be the speeches of the members on this occasion. Referring to his hon. friend's (Mr. Calvin) speech, he thought that gentleman was going back in his ideas of legislation. In proof of this he quoted a speech of his on the occasion of the discussion upon the passage of the Bill, in which he had approved of the appointment of Commissioners by the Government. He quoted other Opposition speeches to the same effect. With regard to the expenses, he quoted the returns to show that this law was self-supporting. He was sorry to see the organ of the Opposition attempting to have the Saturday night clause removed from the Act, for this was perhaps the most important clause in it, and had been of almost incalculable benefit to the working classes.

Mr. CALVIN explained that he had been in favour of total prohibition, but he did not think the Commissioners were likely to bring that about.

Mr. MEREDITH stated that he would not press the motion, but he announced that he would, at a later stage, ask the House to assent to a Bill disqualifying Commissioners and inspectors from holding municipal offices.

The motion was then withdrawn.

TAVERN AND SHOP LICENSES.

Mr. PARKHILL moved for an order of the House for a return showing the number of tavern and shop licenses issued in each of the several municipalities of the county of Simcoe, including the townships of Tecumseh, Adjala, Mono, and Mulmur, detached therefrom for electoral purposes; also the amounts received by the several Boards of License Commissioners of the counties of Simcoe, Dufferin, and Cardwell, and the amounts of money that have been paid over to the several municipalities in the said counties out of the license fund in each and every year since 1874.

Mr. HARDY said he had no objection to the motion, but he believed the information would be found in the reports, though probably not in detail.

The motion was carried.

THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. MOWAT presented a message from His Honour, transmitting the estimates for 1879.

On motion they were referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the House should have the abstract of the receipts and expenditures for 1878, as well as the estimates, before they discussed the latter.

Mr. WOOD said the estimates had just arrived. They could not be prepared earlier. He expected to present the abstract tomorrow. It was not customary to present it before the discussion on the estimates.

Mr. MOWAT said that if the hon. member for London desired the discussion postponed till the day following the statement there was no objection to that.

Mr. CURRIE was of opinion that the