

able institutions were only made on the order of the Minister, at the request of the board. In such instances it was specified that the liquor was only to be used for medicinal purposes.

The witness was closely questioned by Mr. Z. Mageau, Col. Machin, Dr. Forbes Godfrey and others, with reference to instructions given to inspectors anent searching baggage for liquor. While it had been stated that there had been little trouble with such matters up until a couple of months ago, Mr. Mageau asked the witness if he knew that such a practice had been going on west of North Bay last year. Mr. Smith explained again the instructions given and said he himself had notified the Inspectors in the North what their duties were in that regard.

Mr. Mageau had in mind the searches made by one officer in particular, but refused to publicly divulge his name. Chairman Charles McCrea asked if the official was not engaged by the municipality. Mr. Mageau replied that he had been informed the man acted under instructions of the License Inspector. Mr. Smith stated that the Inspector had denied that such a state of affairs existed. Dr. Godfrey explained that he understood the man was a Provincial policeman, and that the Chief of the Provincial force had sent a letter to that officer advising him to discontinue such practices. He moved that the letter sent to that office be produced, so as to clear the License Board. Mr. R. H. McElroy said that there had been almost a scandal in Ottawa because of a search being made of baggage, but the officer in question was one engaged by the municipality and not by the board.

#### **No Increase in Cost.**

Mr. Mowat, Chief Clerk and Accountant of the board, said he had been in the department since 1886. He explained the routine of checking up accounts, and how, if he thought they were unreasonable, he demanded an explanation from the Inspector. If he were then not satisfied he made the deductions. The Inspectors had instructions to check carefully the maintenance and incidental expenses of the officers under them. Mr. Mowat told Col. Machin that considering the increase consequent upon the higher cost of living, he did not think the enforcement of the liquor laws cost much more now than under the old system. However, the enforcement of the O. T. A. had not cost the Government a cent; in fact, there was a little surplus.

The system of employing private detectives had been in force prior to the present board taking office. Former Inspector Morrison claimed that it cost no more to employ the private detectives, because they only had to be paid for the time they were working, whereas the men in the department had to be paid by the month. Then, too, the former Inspector claimed he could get better work from the private detectives. He knew nothing of the Pinkerton service, whether they charged more for their operatives than the Employers' Agency, or not.

At the conclusion of the evidence several motions were presented by Opposition members asking for the bringing down of accounts of other contractors for work done during the past year.

# GOVT. MUM ON LIQUOR VOTE

## Will Not Announce Referendum Decision Until Next Week

### BILL BEING DRAFTED

After several weeks of hesitancy during which time it knew not what policy to adopt, the Ontario Government has at last made up its mind as to the line of action it will follow in reference to its temperance legislation. But while Sir William Hearst and his colleagues have made up their minds, they are guarding their secret closely. The public is not going to be let in on the matter until next week, most likely on Tuesday, when the Prime Minister will introduce the necessary bill.

Several caucuses have been held by the Government to discuss the matter with its followers. Wednesday night members of the Cabinet canvassed the situation for more than three hours. Thursday night they spent two hours more finding out the attitude of those who sit in the back benches, and rarely ever speak in the House. The word was passed around that the privileged ones, who were permitted to attend the caucus, were to keep absolutely mum on the subject. Yesterday the members adhered to their instructions to the letter.

However, notwithstanding the secrecy attaching to the question, there was considerable gossip around the Parliament Buildings. Boiled down, it can be stated with considerable definiteness that there will be four questions submitted to the electors when the referendum is taken in the fall. The bill is now being drafted and the wording of these questions has not been finally settled. It is known, however, that one of them will be as to whether or not the elector is in favor of the repeal of the Ontario Temperance Act.

#### **The Question of Beer.**

It is anticipated, too, that full opportunity will be given to the electors to say in just what manner they want beer sold, should they favor that beverage being made available. There will probably be a question as to whether beer should be sold in sealed packages for home consumption under Government control, and also a question as to whether or not it should be sold in standard hotels. Doubts are expressed in the corridors about the proposal to allow wine to be sold being put on the referendum. It is expected that the wording of the questions will be so phrased as to give the people every opportunity to say to what extent they favor Government control of the sale.

Another question which it is hinted will be put before the people is whether or not they want to have all kinds of liquors sold, but perhaps under Government control.

These, with slight variations, are the questions that will likely be submitted. But meanwhile the law clerks are busy, the Prime Minister is keeping his secret, and the public goes on wondering just what will be the result. It is considered likely that the changes will be brought into force by a proclamation by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.