by-law for the next ensuing license year "and" for future years, etc. It is thus clear that the word "or," in the fifth line of the section, was intended to be read as "and;" and, so construing it, the by-law was within the provisions of the section, and the first ground of appeal fails.

The next objection is that the town of East Toronto, which now forms part of the city of Toronto, passed a by-law on 9th February, 1908, limiting to 5 the number of licenses that might be issued in that town; that on 15th December, 1908, the town of East Toronto became annexed to and formed part of the municipality of the city of Toronto, their by-law being then in force, and that thereafter, namely, on 18th February, 1909, the municipal corporation of the city of Toronto passed the by-law in question limiting the number of tavern licenses that might be issued in the city of Toronto to 110, whereby it is argued there are now two by-laws in force dealing with the same matter, but unequal in their effect.

The answer to this objection seems very obvious. When the town of East Toronto became a portion of the municipality of Toronto, it became subject to the powers of the municipal corporation of the city of Toronto in respect of limiting the number of tavern licenses, and when the corporation of the city, in the exercise of its corporate powers, passed the by-law in question, limiting the number of tavern licenses to be issued, within what then constituted the limits of Toronto, to 110, that by-law applied to the whole territory embraced within the city's limits, in effect, and repealed any by-laws inconsistent with it. Thereupon the by-law of what was formerly the town of East Toronto ceased to exist; and this objection fails.

The last objection is that, after the first reading of the by-law now attacked, some other outlying territory became annexed to the city, and that the by-law should have been reintroduced before its final passage. Assuming that such would have been the more regular course, no one appears to have objected to the method which was pursued, and, doubtless, and by apparent inadvertence and not by design, it passed through its final reading without such reintroduction. It is reasonable to assume that if any person had suggested the reintroduction of the by-law, that course would have been adopted. Nevertheless, we are urged to quash the by-law on the mere technical ground that its first reading preceded the actual annexation of the added territory, al-