

Then there was under the old Government the farce as to second prosecutions. A man might have twenty convictions standing against him and yet be prosecuted in each case as for a first offence. Now it is the duty of the Inspector to prosecute a second offence as such and if he fails to do so, the Inspector may be prosecuted; then in the case of a third conviction, the license is cancelled and the licensee disqualified. These are all more stringent provisions than anything in force under the old Government and were all adopted to help the Government to carry out its pledge to use every effort to enforce the law. The old Government while professing to do something for temperance quietly dropped a section of the Act, which made for its enforcement a section which had been in force for twenty-five years. This clause provided that defects in proceedings and convictions before the magistrate might be remedied and so convictions could not be quashed on technical grounds. This section was quietly dropped by the old Government in 1902. This Government just as quietly brought the section in again and it is now in force. Then this Government compelled the submission of Local Option By-laws upon the presentation of a petition signed by 25% of the ratepayers. This Government compelled the Council to pass the By-law if it received the required majority. Under the old Law the Council could refuse to pass the Local Option By-law no matter how large the majority at the poll for it. This Government gave the Councils of Municipalities the power to appoint and to pay special officers for the enforcement of Local Option—these are some and only a few of the provisions in the Government Liquor License Act which go to justify my statement—that the Act that contains all these provisions, viewed as a whole, is the most marked advance in real Temperance Legislation this Province has had for many years, and I accepted it as such and voted for it.

### **Improvement Suggested**

Now, I do not know that I should say anything more. I think I have made my own position clear, and that is what I mainly desire to do. There are other amendments still required—some are urgent—I would like to see them brought down this Session. There is the question of leased bars. Legislation is necessary to stop this practice. John Jones has leased a bar and is fined for a violation of the License Act. Then Sam Jones takes the bar over under a new lease and he is fined. Then Bill Jones leases it and runs it until he is fined, and the law which says that the owner in possession is liable where he sub-lets is evaded