

## OF O.T.A. OFFICIALS AND THEIR METHODS

**Declares Attorney-General Is  
Excitable as Ad-  
ministrator**

### TALKS OF AMALGAMATION

With a contribution from H. P. Hill, Conservative member for West Ottawa, the debate on the Address was advanced one more step toward a wind-up in the Legislature yesterday. The day's proceedings were terminated rather abruptly at 5.30 p.m., when M. M. MacBride, Labor member for South Brant, who was troubled with an attack of grippe, moved the adjournment.

The member for West Ottawa made a characteristically critical address, at times humorous and sarcastic in its reference to the Government, and at other times vigorously serious. Mr. Hill ventured a little into the field of O.T.A. discussion, resenting the implication that his party was the friend of the bootleggers and rum-runners. The Conservative party, he said, had never taken a stand of criticism of the O.T.A. on its general principle, but had found fault with its administration.

#### Government Criticized.

Mr. Hill criticized the Government's boasted attitude toward agriculture. Out of 461 bills passed since Mr. Drury became Premier only seven or eight applied to agriculture. He scouted the idea that Hon. Manning Doherty was responsible for the lifting of the British cattle embargo. Mr. Hill claimed, too, that since this Government had come into power fifteen new forms of taxation had been introduced. Coming to the temperance issue, Mr. Hill resented the attitude of the Attorney-General in rushing out and declaring that a war was on. Because some members of the Legislature criticized his administration of the O.T.A. it did not follow that they were the friends of the bootleggers and rum-runners.

#### Is Dissatisfied.

"We can assure him that the O.T.A. is not him," added Mr. Hill. "We are dissatisfied with the administration of the O.T.A. under him, but we have never taken the stand that the O.T.A. was wrong and bad, and that we are making an attack upon it."

The O.T.A., he continued, had supporters willing to give up personal liberties, and this element of the community held the balance of power. If there was anything to turn that element against the O.T.A., it was inefficient and self-advertising methods of administration. The people did not expect hysterical, high-strung and excitable methods of administration. Lawyers were running all over the country on petty liquor cases. The public did not care to have the judgment of Magistrates interfered with by an excitable Attorney-General. He claimed that at present Magistrates dared not exercise their judgment as to the seriousness or levity of the charges made.

#### Attitude of Industries.

Mr. Hill alleged that attacks had been made on the lumber and other industries, so much so that business men looked forward with glee to voting against the U.F.O. Government, while industries were looking more and more toward locations in Quebec. He criticized the Backus deal by asking why Backus was allowed to tie up the only source of power at Dog Rapids, before bidding was asked for on the English River limits.

Concluding, Mr. Hill dealt with the rumors of an amalgamation between the Liberals and the U.F.O. He prophesied that if the Liberals permitted themselves to be swallowed up by the U.F.O., then the Farmers who were formerly Conservatives would have nothing more to do with the game. He also foresaw a Conservative victory at the next elections.

## BRICKBATS HURLED AT HOMUTH'S BILL; ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

**But Despite Fury of Attack  
It Is Defeated by Only  
Five Votes**

### ODD DIVISION OF HOUSE

By a standing vote of 33 to 28 the Ontario Legislature yesterday threw out the "one man, one vote" bill of K. K. Homuth, Labor member for Waterloo. Last year the member for Waterloo was able to advance the same measure into committee stage before its eventual defeat, but members opposing it yesterday strongly submitted the view that, if the bill was deemed wrong in principle, it should be killed upon second reading.

Labor was the only group in the House which displayed any semblance of unity on the question of the right of property holders in more than one ward to vote more than once on money by-laws. The U.F.O. members divided about evenly for and against, with Hon. Manning Doherty alone, among the few Cabinet Ministers present, casting his vote against the measure. Only two Conservatives, Messrs. Hill and Lewis, favored Mr. Homuth's bill, and the Liberals split up their vote pretty well.

Besides Mr. Homuth, Hon. Walter Rollo, M. M. MacBride (South Brant), Dr. H. A. Stevenson (London) and G. G. Halcrow (E. Hamilton)—all Labor members—the bill found a champion in the Attorney-General. He conceded some rights to property to be represented in voting on money questions, but thought the present provision of the ward unit an incorrect method of according recognition. A proper method, he suggested in passing, might be a vote for each unit of wealth—say \$500 or \$1,000—upon which taxes were paid.

W. H. Casselman, U.F.O. member for Dundas, characterized the principle embodied in the bill as an "absolute outrage"; T. Crawford, Conservative member for Northeast Toronto, opposed it on principle, and "because there was no demand for such legislation"; H. H. Dewart, K.C., spoke against it, at the same time criticizing what he termed the "vacillating" attitude of Provincial Secretary Nixon, who, although opposed last year, said he would not stand in the way of the measure this year; and Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, Conservative Leader, concluded the debate with a brief condemnation of the bill.

## THIRTEEN ANSWERS GIVEN RAPID-FIRE

**Timber Sales, Film Censoring  
and Unemployment Facts  
From Cabinet**

### PEAT COMMITTEE EXISTS

Queen's Park Cabinet Ministers made their first onslaught yesterday upon the formidable array of "questions" which Opposition members have been piling up since the session commenced. They disposed of 13 of the 45 standing on the order paper.

In the replies given, Mr. McCrea was informed that the total number of sales of pulp and timber areas from November 1, 1921, to October 31, 1922, was 47; Hon. Mr. Ferguson elicited the information that approximately \$150,000 had been expended