WHAT BECOMES OF GRAND JURY'S WORK?

Pertinent Inquiry Made in the Legislature

AROUSES HON. MR. HANNA

Bill to Provide for Reciprocity in Automobile Licenses Receives Second Reading—Return Asked Regarding Advisory Council Meetings.

Mr. W. E. N. Sinclair (South Ontario), in the Legislature yesterday drew the ire of the Provincial Secretary on a motion for a return showing all presentments made by grand juries within the Province for 1912. The object in asking for the information, he said, was to know what became of the presentments. These jurors were drawn from the best citizens of the community, and the maintenance of the system was costly to the Province. He would like to know whether the Province got value for its expenditure.

Information Is Wrong.

Mr. Hanna, who replied for the Government, said the reports of grand juries were often outside of the facts, and information was laid before them that was far from correct. In a recent case at Whitby where two men were incarcerated in the jail when they should have been wards of the Province in an insane hospital, Mr. Justice Latchford grew indignant when the grand jury reported that such a condition of affairs existed. It was not the first time that a court showed indignation on the report of a grand jury that was founded on incorrect information. At the time no petition whatever had reached his department and the officers had no knowledge that the two persons in question were detained in Whitby jail. Apart from that he was satisfied that the reports should be brought down.

Evidently the member for South Ontario had disturbed the Provincial Secretary, remarked Mr. Rowell. "I am surprised that my hon. friend should bring in the judges of the land in a matter like this—."

Ironical cries of, "hear, hear," from

the Conservative members.

"It might be true that the grand jury reported on incorrect facts," he went on, "but it was no occasion for an attack on a judge on the bench." "Surely," he said, "one would recognize a decision rendered under such circumstances, and to bring in the name of a judge in that way and base an attack on the finding of a grand jury is entirely unwarranted in this House."

Repeated Occasions.

Mr. Hanna: "It is not one occasion, but two and three and more occasions. I do not apologize in the House or out of the House for answering the remarks of a judge from the bench affecting my department. I do not hesitate or apologize for answering these remarks on the floor of the House, because these remarks were made by him in a capacity where I have no opportunity of answering him, and if he has no opportunity here to-day, the account is square."

"The amazing part of it is he is not a little timid about making attacks upon the Judges," said Sir James, adding a word or two to the fray. "The leader of the Opposition had instructed his follower to bring up a matter which was intended to bring about an attack on the Provin-

cial Secretary. The trouble which the leader of the Opposition anticipated had turned back on him and he didn't like it."

"I had no knowledge whatever of the matter in question," replied Mr. Rowell.

"The whole situation was made the subject of comment from one end of the Province to the other. I went into the press and gave a statement, and from that time there has not been one word of retraction from the Judge," explained Mr. Hanna, with some show of feeling.

Mr. Sinclair stated that the Whitby incident was never in his mind when

asking for the return.

"I wanted to see the presentments," said Mr. Rowell, "and find out if the Government was as slow in acting upon them as they are in other things."

Automobile Reciprocity.

Mr. Ellis' bill to provide for reciprocity in automobile licenses between the Provinces of Canada extending a similar privilege to Ontario was given a second reading.

Mr. J. S. Elliott (West Middlesex) suggested that there be some provision for the registration of licenses granted by other Provinces, so that in case of accident the offending machine could be identified.

To Mr. Rowell the Provincial Secretary said many requests had been received for this legislation. The difference in money so far as Quebec was concerned was not great, but if the privilege was extended to the State of New York it would amount to about \$8,000 in revenue and \$7,000 in the case of Michigan. He would not favor recipacity with the States. It would mean that large touring cars would go through the Province from Buffalo to Detroit, and the wear on the roads would be disastrous.

An Anomalous Body.

In asking for a return giving the meetings of the Advisory Council of Education, Mr. T. Marshall (Monck) said this body was organized four or five years ago, but that it had not fulfilled the expectation of those who promoted it. It was anomalous in every respect. A portion of the members were elective, but as the deliberations of the council were confidential a member could not go back to his constituents and report that the program on which he had been elected had been carried out or even discussed. The members were allowed no initiative, and could only deal with matters brought forward by the department. It was an awkward position for such men as Dr. Falconer, Prof. Hutton and Dr. McKay to be put in. The Superintendent of Education was the Chairman of the Council. "The business of the Chairman is not to ask advice, but to give it," he concluded.

Dr. Pyne thought there was personal animus between Mr. Marshall and Dr. Seath. Perhaps the Superintendent of Education had properly sat upon the member for Monck on some occasion. The object of the appointment of the Council was to bring matters of education before the public of the Province.

A number of motions for returns were allowed to stand over on the request of the Government. Mr. Elliott was prepared to discuss the pro-