

lation thoroughly in accordance with the Liquor License Act which it amends, namely, c. 194, R.S.O., only that it goes further and makes enactments which no doubt will be a fruitful source of litigation. S. 2 provides that members of municipal councils and constables shall be ineligible as bondsmen for license holders. S. 3 increases the fees for transfers and removals of licenses from \$10 to \$50, according to the locality of the licensed premises. The next section makes clear the original intention of the law that the highest fee a municipality may impose for a license is \$200, in addition to the fee fixed by the Government. S. 5 appears to conflict with the Inland Revenue Act of the Dominion, and fixes the amount which may be sold by brewers at any one time, and also provides that they may sell only to licensed dealers. By s. 7 druggists are required to register every sale of liquor, no matter how small the quantity sold, and a medical certificate is required when the amount sold is more than six ounces. S. 9 introduces a new feature in the way of appeal by allowing the Crown, when an order for dismissal is made, to have a new trial when the Attorney-General of the Province so directs. This is totally subversive of English criminal law, and if *Reg. v. Hart, ante*, is to stand as an authority, it will be a source of litigation to defendants who have once been dismissed on their trial by the magistrate. Ss. 10 and 11 increase the penalty for selling liquor to interdicted drunkards. S. 13 makes it clear that all the machinery of the License Act is behind a local option by-law, and the succeeding section, relating to local option by-laws, enacts that any by-law passed under the provisions of s. 13, 53 Vict., c 56, shall not be repealed until after three years from the day of its coming into force, nor until a by-law for repeal has been submitted in the same way as the original by-law has been submitted to the electors; and in case of the defeat of the by-law for the repeal, no other such by-law for repeal shall be submitted within a like period of three years. This Act is in accordance with the system that has been pursued by the Legislature for some time past, and will probably be successful in pleasing no one.

C. 52 bring us to the much-canvassed merits of the provision prohibiting the use of cigarettes, cigars, or tobacco by minors under eighteen, an offender being subject on a summary conviction to a penalty of \$50 or imprisonment, with or without hard labour, up to thirty days. This Act met with much opposition in the House, and a clause to punish children with tobacco found in their possession was finally dropped.

We had hoped, on perusing the "Act to prevent the wasting of natural gas," to find that it was intended to apply within the House as well as without. This idea might be put in the form of an amendment next session.

C. 58 makes a number of important changes in the game laws. S. 1 reduces the open season for deer shooting to fifteen days. By s. 2 the shooting of a variety of wading birds, commonly included in the term "plover," is practically excluded, since these birds are only to be found in Ontario during what is not the close season. No person may kill more than three hundred ducks in one season. While previous to this Act the exportation from Ontario of deer only was prohibited, all kinds of game birds are now excluded. S. 5 prohibits