

SECOND READING FOR SANDY BILL GIVEN IN HOUSE

Measure Provides for the
Stoppage of All "Short-
circuiting"

CLASHES IN THE DEBATE

Raney and Dewart Exchange
Words—Premier States
His Position

Another step toward "bone-dry" legislation for Ontario was taken in the Legislature yesterday, when the "Sandy Bill," which would stop "short-circuiting" within the Province, was given second reading. The bill would prohibit the delivery of liquor in Ontario from distilleries or breweries in Ontario upon orders mailed to Montreal and returned to the Ontario producers.

Hon. W. E. Raney gave an explanation of the bill and defended it against criticism from Charles McCrae, Conservative member for Sudbury, and H. H. Dewart, Liberal Leader. With the latter he got into a few arguments. Premier Drury himself gave a clear view of the purposes of the bill and added to the defense by Mr. Raney.

Urges Immediate Enactment.

Mr. McCrae thought the bill should come into effect immediately, and argued that, as worded at present, it would prevent anyone from having liquor in his cellar. If it was put into force immediately, he said, it would bring about a practically "bone-dry" condition. Then the people having had that experience would know what they were voting for on the referendum.

Premier Drury replied that before the lifting of the ban on importation the people knew what "bone-dry" meant, and could therefore now vote with a knowledge of it. Another reason he advanced for not putting it into force before the referendum was that the referendum vote might indicate that the people wanted importation allowed. If such became the case, then the Sandy Bill, which would compel all liquor in Ontario to be shipped to Montreal before it could be brought in again, would be ludicrous.

Mr. Dewart had much to say about export, and thought that it should be dealt with by the Government. He was informed by Mr. Raney and the Premier that the Ontario Government had no jurisdiction. It was a matter for the Dominion.

Hopes for Co-operation.

In introducing his measure Mr. Sandy opened with a tribute to the efforts of the late Premier, Sir William Hearst, on behalf of temperance. He hoped, and he said, had reason to believe, that the same assistance would be extended by the Opposition in the case of the Sandy Bill as had been extended by Mr. Rowell in the days of the Hearst Government.

The principle of his bill, he said, was incorporated in the O.T.A. It was only to be expected, he argued, that if the people did not want liquor sold in Ontario they would not want it procurable by circuitous methods. He said he admitted that bone-dry prohibition was going

to work hardship on many citizens who had used without abuse the right of drinking liquor as a beverage. He thought, perhaps, it was not going too far to say it was going to work a hardship on certain classes. But all advanced legislation had been brought about through some persons making sacrifices.

Concerning the desires of the numbers of foreigners who might be contemplating coming into Canada, he said it would be wiser to legislate for bone-dry prohibition now, and then require them to live up to the ideals of Canadian citizenship rather than lower Canada's standards to meet theirs. Because public sentiment supported the intent of his bill, and because expenditure on liquor was money wasted, he urged it upon the House that his bill should receive hearty endorsement.

Contingent on Referendum.

Carl Homuth, Labor member for South Waterloo, agreed that if the people said they did not want liquor shipped into the Province, the only thing to do was to pass the Sandy Bill and give them what they wanted. But certainly no man would want the Sandy Bill to pass if the referendum were defeated. It would simply mean legislating additional costs on liquor shipments into the pockets of the railway companies. Mr. Homuth insisted that there must be careful scrutiny of the provisions of the temperance legislation being enacted, so that the citizens of the Province might know just what they were permitted to do and what they were not permitted to do.

Mr. McCrae, Conservative member for Sudbury, said he was apprehensive that the legislative seed planted in "Sandy" ground might require a great deal of wet to bring forth fruit. Although the Province admittedly had no jurisdiction in interprovincial trade, the very introduction of this bill, and the support it would be given by the Government, was a declaration, having the approval of the Attorney-General of the Province, that this House had power to pass legislation set forth in the bill.

In Advance of Public Opinion?

Mr. McCrae said he would support the bill if clause nine were omitted. Clause nine provides that the legislation contained in the bill shall not come into effect until after the referendum is taken and the law resulting from it is effective. He argued that if the bill went into effect now it would stop the storing of liquor in cellars, and then, having a period of "bone-dryness," the people could vote intelligently on the referendum. He maintained that, even if a person wished to import, the provisions of the law stopped it by making it unlawful to transport or carry liquor within the Province. He was of the opinion, however, that "bone-dry" legislation was in advance of what the public opinion of the Province could stand.

He made a reference to the U. F. O. platform as containing a plank that its policy was to give the utmost temperance legislation the Province could.

Acting on People's Authority.

Premier Drury, interrupting, said that the U. F. O. pledged itself to carry out the will of the people to the utmost, but not to act without their authority.

Mr. McCrae said thousands who desired importation of liquor voted on the last referendum to get rid of the bar. He wanted the bill put into effect at once to give the people an opportunity to see what "bone-dry" legislation was, and then they could vote on the referendum if they wanted it continued.

Premier Drury pointed out that they had had that condition before the ban on prohibition was lifted.

Hon. Mr. Raney, who then took up the origin of the bill, said that evidently the judgment of the late Hon. W. J. Hanna that the Province had no power to stop importation had been waived by the previous speaker when he said that this bill alone would stop importation.