

Attorney-General if it was his intention to bring to the consideration of the Appellate Division the question of whether the Province was entitled to the moneys paid into court by the Ontario Jockey Club. Mr. Raney replied that the Government did not at the present time contemplate any action in the way of court proceedings.

Mr. Dewart then asked if Mr. Raney had obtained an opinion on the legal questions involved from any counsel, in addition to the opinions obtained from departmental officials, as to the effect either of the tax or of the Declaratory Act of 1922. Mr. Raney said that the Province had been in consultation with Mr. Rowell.

Will Consider Request.

The Southwest Toronto member inquired whether he would place these opinions on the table in the House. "I will consider the request," said the Attorney-General.

Mr. Dewart retorted that, if the Attorney-General did not lay them on the table, he would move for a return. Once again he asked if they would be tabled.

"I will consider the request and answer it tomorrow," replied the Attorney-General.

Mr. Dewart asked if Mr. Raney had received any communications from any legal or judicial source on these matters, and when the Attorney-General said he was not prepared to reply to that question, Mr. Dewart asked again: "Will my honorable friend say he did not receive any communication from the Judiciary of the Supreme Court of Ontario?"

"I already have answered that," said the Attorney-General.

"Will my honorable friend say that a letter was received from the Chief Justice of the Province of Ontario which the Chief Justice suggested should be made public?" inquired Mr. Dewart. "I decline to be interrogated any further," said Mr. Raney.

Dewart Is Persistent.

Again Mr. Dewart put a question. Would the Attorney-General undertake to bring down the letter from the Chief Justice of Ontario and make it public along with the opinions?

"I have answered all the questions I am going to answer," said Mr. Raney. "If the honorable member will put his question on the order paper, I will consider the answer."

Mr. Dewart moved the adjournment of the House, and in his speech which followed maintained he was within his rights in bringing the subject before the Legislature in the way he did. He had been informed, he said, so far as the Attorney-General was concerned, that he had received a communication from a Judge which influenced his conduct and action so far as this case was concerned. While he had no knowledge whether such was the case or not, he was advised that in a communication received by the Attorney-General from the head of the Judiciary in Ontario there was a suggestion that what was contained in that letter should be made public. If that letter was not a confidential letter, "I say the House is entitled to have what is the property of the House."

Ferguson Continues Probe.

Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, Conservative Leader, then joined with Mr. Dewart in the request, but the Attorney-General replied that he did not intend "to answer any question in this verbal way." Mr. Ferguson observed that the letter itself suggested publication. Mr. Raney retorted that Mr. Ferguson was building up a supposititious case.

Mr. Ferguson said he was building his case on the foundation that the Attorney-General was refusing to answer a question the answer to which he had in his own knowledge.

Mr. Ferguson, proceeding, said that they would see that the return was given to the House. He could not imagine the Attorney-General sitting mute under such circumstances unless he was acknowledging the truth of what had been said. He asked if the Attorney-General would say he did not receive such a letter. Mr. Raney said he had answered that already two or three times.

"Was it this letter that made you drop section three of the act?" asked Mr. Ferguson.

Mr. Raney said that he had explained already to the House that that section had been dropped on his own initiative. "Put the questions on the order paper and I will answer them tomorrow," said the Attorney-General. "I'll give an answer tomorrow."

Raney Promises to Answer.

To end the matter Mr. Raney appealed to the Speaker, and Hon. Nelson Parliament ruled that Mr. Raney's promise to answer the questions today should end the discussion, and end the discussion it did.

Mr. Dewart subsequently placed his questions on the order paper. These questions are as follows:

(1) "In view of the report in the Press that the Attorney-General does not intend to appeal from Mr. Justice Riddell's decision upon his application to the court under the Corporations Tax Act, 1922, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to have a stated case submitted to the court in which legal questions and questions of jurisdiction will be considered?"

(2) "If not, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to take proceedings in any other way, either for the payment out of court of the monies deposited under Mr. Justice Middleton's order or for the testing of legal questions and questions of jurisdiction which have been already raised?"

(3) "Has the Attorney-General received any opinions upon the legal question involved as to the validity of the Corporations Tax Act of 1922, or the Declaratory Act, 1922, as first introduced or subsequently amended, in addition to the opinions from the Departmental officers, Edward Bayly, K.C., Deputy Attorney-General, A. M. Dymond, K.C., Law Clerk, and J. T. White, Solicitor to the Treasury, from N. W. Rowell, K.C., or any other counsel?"

(4) "Will the Attorney-General bring down the opinions of the said Departmental officials and of any other counsel upon these matters, and lay them upon

the table of the House without waiting for a motion for a special return?"

(5) "Has the Attorney-General any communication or communications from any legal or judicial source in regard to either of the said bills, the Corporations Tax Act, 1922, or the Declaratory Act, 1922, either as originally introduced or as amended, and has he replied to such communication or communications. If so, from whom was such communication, or were such communications received, and were they privileged. If not privileged, will this correspondence be brought down and laid at once on the table of the House with the opinions above referred to?"

(6) "In view of the failure of the Attorney-General to appeal from the pro forma order of Mr. Justice Riddell, is it the Attorney-General's intention to introduce any further remedial order for legislation dealing with the matter of the two bills in question at the present session?"

Mr. Dewart also gave notice of motion for a return of all letters, correspondence and opinions between the Attorney-General and any other person or persons upon the legal question or questions of jurisdiction relating to the Corporations Tax Act, 1922, and the Declaratory Act, 1922, as originally introduced or as amended or passed, and particularly the opinions of the departmental officers and counsel, and all correspondence and communications with any lawyer or Judge or other person or persons, association or associations relating thereto.

Change Organization Of Road Commissions

D. J. Taylor, U.F.O. member for North Grey, yesterday succeeded in the Legislature in obtaining second reading for his bill, which provides that one of the three members of Suburban Road Area Commissions shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. One of the other members is to be appointed by the county and the third by the city. The act applies to the suburban areas of cities under 50,000 population. In areas around larger cities the commission consists of five members, one of whom is to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Hon. F. C. Biggs, Minister of Highways, did not endorse the bill, but was willing to let it go through to committee.

Another bill of Mr. Taylor's, compelling municipalities and the Province to provide entrances to private property where such entrances were cut off as the result of road building, was defeated, though Mr. Taylor agreed to introduce an amendment to have the private owner bear half the cost.