

RESENT ATTACK FROM DR. HINCKS

Legislature Feels That the Physician's Charges Are Ill-advised

With surprising unanimity Opposition and Government Leaders in the Legislature yesterday joined in public denunciation of Dr. C. M. Hincks for a published utterance in connection with the problem of the feeble-minded: that he "had enough facts to blow up the Parliament Buildings." Hon. Mr. Ferguson contented himself with such adjectives as "reckless, irresponsible and unwarranted," but Premier Drury, in concurring with Hon. Mr. Ferguson's protest, compared Dr. Hincks' sensationalism with that of a Bolshevist and Anarchist.

In introducing the matter Hon. Mr. Ferguson produced a newspaper report and read to the House the statement credited to the doctor: "Why, we have enough facts to blow up the Parliament Buildings." Mr. Ferguson commented: "There is a whole column of such stuff." His object in introducing the matter, he said, was that "such alarmist statements of a reckless character of this kind should not be allowed to go abroad. Public authorities who have charge of the educational affairs of the Province should see to it that the public are not misled by men who, from one motive or another, make most reckless assertions concerning the condition of affairs in the Province of Ontario regarding the growing youth and the unfortunate mental defective."

Has Bad Effect.

"Now, men of this character," Mr. Ferguson went on unrelentingly, "are in the habit of getting on the stump or soap-box, or any other rostrum they can take advantage of, for the purpose of securing public notoriety and making sensational statements entirely unwarranted in point of fact. I think the public should be informed by the authorities who have charge of these things. It is bound to have a bad effect on public sentiment in Ontario and Canada, and even with the neighboring Republic, if the public press is to be filled with statements of so startling and hysterical a type." (Applause from both sides of the House.)

Premier Drury replied for the Government. "I wish to concur with what my honorable friend has said," he stated. "It is a very easy matter for anyone desiring his name to be brought before the public, and without any very great sense of responsibility, to make startling charges. In some cases there may be some foundation; in others there may be no foundation. But, in any case, not until the Government has been approached, has been asked and has refused an investigation, is it justifiable to make a statement such as the one quoted."

"I think that while we are talking about Bolshevism and Anarchy, this sort of irresponsible statement is just about as bad a form of Anarchy as we could get. The effect of it is to undermine the confidence of the people in Government institutions."

FLAVELLE SAYS 'VISHNICK' WAS 60 OVER PROOF

But States He Learned Fact Only Through Dewart's Charges

OVERLOOKED ELECTION

And Did Not Know That Stone Was Tory Worker

The matter of "vishnick," which caused such a sensation during the last general election, following charges by the Liberal Leader, H. H. Dewart, K.C., came up for discussion by the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature yesterday morning. J. D. Flavelle, Chairman of the Board of Ontario License Commissioners, recounted to the committee the story of the vishnick sales. He admitted that no concessions had been granted this year.

On representations made by Rabbi Jacobs, the board had appointed three Rabbis to act as special vendors, and in notifying them of their appointments also sent a letter that they would be responsible for issuing but one bottle to each family for the Passover. An exception was made in the case of very large families, where two bottles might be allowed. Later, upon the suggestion of Rabbi Jacobs, the board had appointed B. Stone to make arrangements for securing the "sacramental wine" and to O.K. all orders to be presented to the dispensaries.

Given Free Hand.

Apparently Stone was given a free hand in purchasing supplies for the board. It was understood that he was to buy only "sacramental wines." Not until Mr. Dewart made his charges, said Mr. Flavelle, did the board think that anything else was being purchased. Following the charges, the board immediately cancelled all arrangements for distributing the wine, pending an investigation. An analysis was ordered, and the result had been that the liquor was found to be about 60 over proof. It was practically brandy, the evidence showed, though the labels had been altered to make it appear that it was simply cherry wine.

Mr. Dewart asked how many bottles were brought in altogether.

Mr. Flavelle replied, "speaking from memory," that about 2,500 bottles were brought into the city.

"Are you not very much under the mark?" asked Mr. Dewart.

Remarks Were "Crazy."

"No," came the reply. "Your remarks at that time were crazy." A dispute started immediately. Mr. Dewart did not like the Chairman's remark, and the latter retaliated by declaring that his truthfulness had been questioned. When the taking of evidence started again, Mr. Dewart asked if two carloads were not brought in. Mr. Flavelle said that the first shipment was a small one, much short of a carload. Another carload was brought in later, but never opened. It was sent back to Montreal.

The necessity of appointing special vendors had disappeared when importation was again allowed. The arrangements made whereby those living in boarding houses could get wine during the feast of the Passover had not been renewed because of the row.

Mr. Flavelle said he did not know