

pointing one or more License Inspectors in each license district should be vested in the Board, and this House regrets that legislation providing for this change in the law, and for handing over to the municipalities the whole of the license fees, except a sum sufficient to pay the expenses of the License Branch of the Department of the Provincial Secretary, has not been proposed for its consideration by the advisers of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor."—Lost—Yeas 26, nays 49.

Policy in 1890.

The policy of the Opposition was again reconstructed by the submission of the following resolution during the session of 1890 as an amendment to the Hon. Mr. Gibson's measure:—

"That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the whole House, and so amended as to provide that the License Commissioners hereafter be appointed in counties by County Councils and in cities and towns elected by the municipal electors of such cities and towns."

Policy in 1896.

In 1896 after allowing the question to lie dormant for several years, Mr. Marter, then Leader of the Opposition, seconded by Mr. Whitney, the present leader, moved a resolution which concluded as follows:—

"That this House is of opinion that it is essential to the honest, non-partizan and faithful execution of the liquor license laws, that the present mode of appointing Boards of Commissioners should be abrogated, and that in future the Boards of Commissioners in counties should consist of the County Judge, the Warden of the County, and one appointed by the Government and in cities and towns not connected with the county municipally the County Judge, Mayor, and one appointed by the Government."

It will be noticed that the policy of the Opposition on this subject has varied on each occasion when they brought the matter forward. In 1890 they proposed that the appointments should be made by County Councils in the counties, and that in cities and towns Commissioners should be elected by the direct vote of the electors. In 1883 they asked that Municipal Councils alone should elect Commissioners. In every instance they have demanded that not only the appointment of Commissioners but also that of Inspectors, and the issuing of licenses, should be placed again under municipal control, a system previously discarded as wholly pernicious.

Respecting the proposal submitted in 1896, it may be said that heretofore the appointment of County Judges as Commissioners has been found impracticable and inexpedient. Under the provisions of the License Act they are constantly called upon to hear appeals and determine cases. It is also their duty under the law to

BUILD UP ONTARIO