

lay with the Government. No doubt some inspectors were exceeding their duties, but as a general rule they were discharging them faithfully and well.

Mr. HARDY stated that the money in the hands of inspectors was ordered by the Department to be distributed on the 5th of July last, about a month before the letter was written, and he had no doubt that the answer of the inspector was that the money would not be paid until the spring because that was the time when the licenses were issued. He thought the money must have been paid over.

Mr. MERRICK said this letter was written by the treasurer of the village of Kemptonville, and he could assure the hon. gentleman that its statements were perfectly correct.

Mr. MORRIS thought the returns promised were not such as this Bill provided for.

Mr. HARDY said that the returns would be made to each municipality, covering all that the Bill called for, and perhaps more.

Mr. MORRIS preferred that statutory obligations should rest upon the Commissioners to make those returns before the rules of the Department. The Government would have power to compel officials to make the statutory returns, and to impose a penalty for not so doing. A statement of their receipts should be insisted upon for each municipality.

Mr. AWREY thought it would be a graceful act on the part of the hon. member for North Grey to withdraw his Bill when the Provincial Secretary had guaranteed to meet his wishes in another way. In proportion to the number of licenses issued the municipalities now received larger revenues than they formerly did. He believed the License Act in the last election was used as a means of political capital by the Conservatives, but the result showed that the people were with the Mowat Administration in this matter. The leader of the Government had anticipated this Bill in promising ample returns, and he had no doubt this little Bill would receive its quietus.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN referred to statistics whereby it was shown that the saving by the Crooks Act to the county of Leeds and Grenville was \$375 26 annually.

Mr. METCALFE supported the Bill.

Mr. LEES thought the Crooks Act had been serviceable, although it was not perfect. If the Government could show any reason why a private member should not bring in a Bill of this kind he would support them. On a subject like the present he knew that the question of politics would not obtain in his municipality, and he did not think his constituents would sustain him in voting against this Bill.

Mr. HARKIN found fault with those provisions of the Crooks Act for the appointment of license inspectors and license commissioners. He claimed that inspectors appointed by County Councils were more efficient than those appointed by the Government. The number of unlicensed shops had increased, and the statistics for Ontario would show that drunkenness had increased, especially in those municipalities where the Dunkin Act was in force. The system of maintaining inspectors had the effect of taking large sums out of the Treasury and putting it into the pockets of these individuals.

Mr. BAXTER read from the budget speech of Hon. E. B. Wood for 1869, in favour of the Government taking entire control of the licensing system of the Province. In that speech the present License Law was foreshadowed. It was there suggested that the entire amount of revenue derived from licenses should be appropriated by the Government; whereas in the present Act only one-third was taken from the municipalities. Although there were objections to the Crooks Act, they were not so great as hon. gentlemen would have them believe. After hearing the explanations of the hon. Secretary he did not see any necessity for the Bill, and he would therefore vote against it.

Mr. NEELON thought the Government had made no friends by the License Act. In his county considerable pains were taken in appointing inspectors, and one of them was a Conservative. He would vote against the Bill because the Government had promised to provide for statements on the subject.

Mr. PAXTON claimed that no measure put on the statute book had given more general satisfaction than the Crooks Act. At the time that Act was passed all kinds of objections were brought against it by gentlemen in Opposition, but now they did not dare to say it was bad, but simply that it put in the hands of the Reform Government the appointment of officers to carry out their pleasure, and that therefore it was not in the interest of good government. The officials appointed to carry out the Act had given general satisfaction, and while there were some exceptions, not one in fifty had been found to have acted in an improvident or improper manner.

Mr. WIGLE observed that many supporters of the Government had previous to the election promised their constituents that they would vote for a good measure no matter from whom they emanated. Here was an opportunity for them to do so, and they were rejecting it. He had no fault to find with the commissioners or the inspectors in his county. The Opposition did not oppose the Crooks Act, but they claimed to be able to pass equally as good a law at one-third of the cost.

Mr. MACK thought it was conceded on all hands that the principle of this Bill was a good one. He meant to vote for the Bill on its own merits. He was not finding fault with the Crooks Act, which he supported thoroughly. But he thought it would be more convenient that the provisions of this Bill should form part of the statutes than to be simply regulations of the Department. He would vote for the Bill.

Mr. ROSEVEAR said he was perfectly satisfied with the inspectors in his riding, because the more they canvassed against him the more votes he had got. (Laughter.) It seemed as though the Government were afraid that the Conservatives should introduce anything into this House for the benefit of the people. If this Bill were passed it would hurt nobody, but would do a great deal of good.

Mr. HAY said he would have voted for this Bill but for the promise of the Provincial Secretary, because he thought it was in the interest of the people that they should have this information. He referred to the evils and inconveniences arising from the old mu-

nicipal license system. Most of the municipalities were glad to have the Government assume the control of this troublesome question, and their hands should not now be hampered. Of course the Government would appoint their friends to the inspectorships, but if the inspectors or any other public officials interfered in political elections they should be condemned. He hoped the Government would see their way towards making, this session, some changes in the license law which were found necessary. On this question, which was so intimately connected with the repression of crime, insanity, and other social evils, they should rise above party. (Cheers.)

Mr. CREIGHTON wished to refer to a question of fact between himself and the Provincial Secretary with regard to the Dunkin Act in North Grey.

Mr. HARDY said there was no question of fact.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Then you admit I was right?

Mr. HARDY—Certainly.

The members were then called in, when the second reading was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Baskerville, Bell, Boulter, Broder, Calvin, Creighton, French, Harkin, Jelly, Lauder, Lees, Mack, Meredith, Merrick, Metcalfe, Monk, Morgan, Morris, Near, Parkhill, Richardson, Rosevear, Tooley, White, Wigle—26.

NAYS.—Messrs. Appleby, Awrey, Badgerow, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Bonfield, Cascaden, Cook, Dryden, Ferris, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Huron), Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Hawley, Hay, Hunter, Laidlaw, Livingston, Lyon, McCraney, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Miller, Mowat, Murray, Nairn, Neelon, Pardee, Patterson, Paxton, Peck, Robinson (Cardwell), Robinson (Kent), Robertson, Ross, Sinclair, Springer, Waters, Waterworth, Wells, Widdifield, Wood, Young—50.

Mr. Scott, for the Bill, paired with Mr. Striker, and besides these the following gentlemen were absent:—For the Bill (presumably)—Messrs. McMaster and Long; against it (presumably)—Messrs. Crooks, Caldwell, Gibson (Hamilton), Deroche, and Chisholm. Leaving out of consideration Mr. Speaker, together with Stormont and West Hastings, which are unrepresented, this vote would seem to indicate the strength of parties in the House to be—Ministerial, 56; Opposition, 29.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. MEREDITH asked why the Public Accounts Committee had not yet been called together.

Mr. MOWAT—I understand it has been called for Friday.

Mr. HAROY presented returns showing the amount received by the Crown Lands Department on account of land improvement fund since 1861; and the total amount of money received for shop licenses in 1878.

The House adjourned at 10:30.

#### COMMITTEE ON RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

At the first meeting of this Committee this morning, Mr. Young was elected chairman. Letters were read from the makers of several patent railway brakes, recommending the same.