

BENEFITS OF PROHIBITION VIGOROUSLY BROUGHT OUT BY PARRY SOUND MEMBER

R. R. Hall Takes Up Proposal to Submit Referendum on O. T. A., Defending Present Legislation—K. K. Homuth of Waterloo Claims People Want New Vote

MUCH PATRONAGE, SINCLAIR CLAIMS

DEFINITE ANNOUNCEMENT of a move in Ontario for a plebiscite on Government-controlled sale of liquor was forthcoming in the Legislature yesterday, when Karl K. Homuth, Labor member for South Waterloo, said it was his intention to introduce a resolution calling for a referendum. The House heard the announcement in silence—in an atmosphere, indeed, almost of tenseness—and no member indicated by applause or otherwise his approval or disapproval of such a proposal.

Debate on Address.

Three members contributed to the debate on the Address at yesterday afternoon's session. W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal member for South Ontario, leading off, followed by Mr. Homuth and R. R. Hall, Liberal member for Parry Sound. All three, while brief, covered a great deal of ground, and gained the applause of their respective parties. W. F. Nickle, K.C., moved the adjournment at 6 o'clock for D. M. Hogarth, Conservative member for Port Arthur.

In more than one respect, yesterday's three-hour sitting was the most momentous so far this session. More members contributed to the debate—ten have now spoken—than on any other previous afternoon this session. The House heard Mr. Homuth interject into legislative debates the controversial issue of Government sale of beer and wines and spirituous liquors. And, as the third big item of the day, the House received and gave first reading to Attorney-General Raney's promised bill to prohibit publication of racing information calculated or likely to help the handbook men. In the absence of Speaker Nelson Parliament, who is ill, Hon. Thomas Crawford, a former Speaker, Conservative member for Northeast Toronto, occupied the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Sinclair, in his address, was extremely critical of the Government's record. He started out by protesting the Premier's suggestion of the day previous that his absence on Friday last was due to a desire to obstruct or delay the business of the House. He stated that such a motive was farthest from his thought, and he advised Premier Drury not to be so zealous for speed at the expense of the proper carrying on of the administration of the

affairs of the Province. Hon. Mr. Drury explained that his remark had been misinterpreted.

Sinclair Is Critical.

Mr. Sinclair proceeded to say that there had been no rush on the part of members on the Government benches to take part in the debate, and consequently members on the Opposition side of the House had been called upon to take up more than their share of time in discussing the affairs of the Province. It might develop that Government members would later take more time; probably they would, as for most of them it would be the last opportunity they would ever have of being heard on the floor of that House.

The South Ontario member went on to condemn some remarks which had appeared recently in *The Farmers' Sun*, criticizing the proceedings in the Legislature, and coming to the Speech from the Throne, he described it as a "wonderful document."

"Probably," he said, "there never has been such a wonderful document produced in the history of the Legislature, because of the little which the Speech speaks of doing, and because of the amount which it speaks of having been done. It is strange that, instead of looking forward, the Government has turned round and is looking backward."

The Government, he proceeded, had certainly succeeded in covering up in the Speech from the Throne what were its intentions during the session. Whether the idea of this was to have a short session he could not say, but the Speech was "certainly full of words and vague of ideas."

Calls It Propaganda.

Mr. Sinclair drew a humorous imaginative picture of what he said probably took place in the Council Chamber when the Speech from the Throne was under discussion and the remarks made by the Premier and the members of the Cabinet when the paragraphs referring to their particular departments came up for inclusion in the Speech. The conclusion the Government ultimately arrived at, he suggested, was that they should submit a Speech looking backward, and not forward, so that it would be good election propaganda for the people. The Council meeting, he observed, probably broke up with the singing of "What Will the Harvest Be?"

In criticizing the Government's publicity efforts he covered much the same ground as Hon. G. Howard Ferguson did on Friday last, and characterized certain advertisements as political propaganda. The Government, he said, undoubtedly had in view the proximity of a general election, and, whatever the results of its efforts on behalf of a Province, it was certainly alive to its own interests.

He found fault with the methods pursued in extending relief to fire-stricken Northern Ontario. Instead of going at the work of assistance piecemeal and inviting municipal contributions in unfair proportions, he said the Legislature might well have been convened for a day and made a general grant for immediate and speedy relief.

Commissions and House committees also came under the scope of his criticism. He contrasted the commission record of the Drury Government with the old Hearst Administration, and concluded that the present powers had numerically outdistanced their predecessors. A House