

Wednesday, Feb. 17th

a much thinner piece of literature put up for consideration." As he had stated before, he thought that the mover and seconder of the Address had difficult positions to fill because of "the meagreness in material in the Speech."

Speech Resembles 4.4.

The Speech from the Throne, he continued, was a very brief record of what the Government believed it had done. But it was probably "a handbook before an election—something with which the electors will be easily fooled."

"It bears," he said, "a very close resemblance to 4.4 beer—palatable, refreshing and non-intoxicating."

"And no kick in it," said Mr. Raney.

"I am glad to see," Mr. Sinclair continued, "that the Government says that prosperity is returning."

"What's that?" asked Mr. Ferguson.

"Prosperity," Mr. Sinclair repeated. "I say I am glad the Prime Minister recognizes prosperity, because before Oct. 29 that word was not in his vocabulary."

He went on to deal with matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne. First was the work of the Agricultural Inquiry Committee. "The farmers," he said of this, "are looking for something more than reports. They are looking for definite, concrete action."

It was stated in the Speech that legislation relative to township school boards would be brought in to stimulate discussion on the proposed changes from the section system. "This was brought in before and opposed," said Mr. Sinclair. "The Prime Minister is not scared of the O.T.A., but he is scared of this."

Mention had been made of progress in the study of the bilingual

problem. "But nothing in the way of a report," said Mr. Sinclair. "As it was in the beginning, is, and ever shall be."

"For Political Effect."

Coming to Hydro-Electric affairs, Mr. Sinclair emphasized that it involved a big question, in which not only the Ontario and the Dominion Governments were interested, but also the United States. He stated that if some people were trying to create the impression that Ottawa was delaying progress in Hydro matters, it was purely for political effect.

"What of the Liberals of Quebec?" asked F. H. Keefer.

"I'm not a Legislative Secretary," replied Mr. Sinclair. "You might as well ask me about the Liberals in England."

When he read from a letter on Hydro matters which, he said, had been sent by Mayor Foster to the Provincial Government, Hon. R. J. Cooke, Hydro Commissioner, wanted to know if the letter hadn't been sent to the Federal Government. "As for the Minister of Power," said Mr. Sinclair, turning toward him, "there is no more zealous passer of the buck to Ottawa, and God help the Hydro-Electric." Mr. Cooke retorted that Mr. Sinclair was evidently trying to deceive the House. Mr. Sinclair replied that if Mr. Cooke didn't see his point he couldn't help "his inability to think."

Legislative Revision.

Going on to refer to the Statute Revision Committee, Mr. Sinclair read reports of a meeting of the committee to show that it had been working to repeal statutes passed in the House. Immediately Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Nickle sought to deny that the committee had any such power. "The situation," declared Mr. Sinclair, "is, in my mind, unconstitutional in the extreme. Its duty is simply to codify the laws. The Commission has no right to suggest to this Legislature that acts should be changed. It is a malicious principle."

Fault of Redistribution.

He thought that in the Speech there should have been mention of the redistribution bill. This bill, said he, had been put through the House on the last day "in indecent haste." As evidence, said he, of how carefully members had studied the

changes, it was now found out that a section of Toronto's Hill district had been left out, and that apparently Col. J. A. Currie, who lived in the section not in any riding, had voted himself out of a vote. He thought that Mr. Currie should jack up his ward committee, and he thought that the Government should at least bring in an amendment to look after the district missed. Anyhow, he said, the bill did not really mean redistribution. It just meant more city and fewer rural ridings.

He referred to the Highway Traffic Act put through in 1925. It had been made law that after Jan. 1, 1926, motorists must hold either chauffeurs' or operators' licenses. And yet there was no machinery to grant such licenses and every motorist was a law violator. "It is another case," said he, "of the Minister of the Crown being above the Legislature." He felt that Hon. Mr. Henry might not want to enforce the measure before an election for fear of creating dissatisfaction.

Hon. W. E. Raney, House Leader for the Progressive group, was the next speaker on the debate. Mr. Raney paid some complimentary references to the speech of Mr. Sinclair, commented on the illness of the Clerk of the Legislature, W. H. Sydere, and then spoke to the matter of adjourning the debate.

Preferred Adjournment.

Mr. Raney stated that he had approached Premier Ferguson with meekness and with deference, suggesting that in view of the fact that Mr. Sinclair's speech would likely occupy the greater part of the afternoon, the House should rise at its conclusion. Mr. Ferguson's reply had been to the effect that he, Mr. Raney, should continue the debate.

"I ask, Mr. Speaker," said Mr. Raney, "that the Premier reconsider his decision. Frankly, I may say that I am prepared to move an amendment to the Address, and I am willing to enter into a bargain with the Premier and pass a copy of my amendment across the House to him and his supporters—"

"Under no circumstances," said the Premier, "will I be a party to any bargaining with regard to the debate. As a matter of courtesy, I might be inclined to concur with my honorable friend. But I do not propose that the Leaders of the Opposition groups should string their publicity out."

Accused of "Publicity."

At this juncture the Premier inferred that a great deal of Mr. Sinclair's speech had been carried by The Toronto Star before the speech was made. "If that isn't publicity," said the Premier, "I'd like to know what it is."

Firm denial to the statement was given by Mr. Sinclair, who said: "My speech isn't in The Star, because I didn't give it out to any one." Under the fire of gibes from the Government side of the House, he admitted that he had been interviewed by a Star reporter, and might have synthesized a few of the points in his address.

"But if I haven't the right to speak to a reporter," said Mr. Sinclair, growing indignant in the face of Government laughter, "for God's sake let me know what right I have."

Sees No Pressure.

Returning to the fray, Mr. Raney said it was no question of publicity or anything of that kind. There was no indication, he claimed, of pressure on the House. There was not a half-hour's business on the order paper. And he would press his motion that the House stand adjourned until 3 o'clock Wednesday.

"All I ask," said Premier Ferguson, "is that the House give a few hours to Government business. We have been overcrowded at the close of former sessions because we allowed the work to pile up on us. I repeat that a couple of hours tonight will be no hardship on any one."

Division Is Taken.

Mr. Raney stuck to his guns, however, and called for a division of the House. Fifty-seven members