

Wednesday, March 3rd

NO CAUSE FOR HURRY IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, IS GOVERNMENT VIEW

**Premier Refuses to Accede
to Request of Liberal
Leader That Committee
Sit to Hear Hon. Mr.
Lyons's Statements Be-
fore Budget Is Brought
Down**

MEMBER FOR BRANT WOOS OPPOSITION

Premier Ferguson turned a deaf ear yesterday in the Legislature to a request from W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal Leader, that the Public Accounts Committee be called immediately. The Premier's attitude was one of "No hurry!" and he expressed himself accordingly. In fact, he went so far as to say that the House would continue to sit as long as there was public business to transact.

To Follow Lyons's Statement.

Mr. Sinclair made his request before the orders of the day were called. Referring to statements made on Monday to the effect that the public accounts would likely be brought down within ten days, and that the Budget debate would then proceed, Mr. Sinclair said: "It will be March 20 before the Public Accounts Committee will sit. In view of the statements made by the honorable member from Sault Ste. Marie (Hon. James Lyons), made yesterday, that he is eager to have certain matters in which he is interested brought before the committee, and in view of the fact that there will be but two or three sittings before Easter, I am asking the Government to call the Public Accounts Committee at once, so that it may be organized and the work proceeded with, notwithstanding the fact that the public accounts have not been brought down. I feel that the Prime Minister will be inclined to agree with this. I ask the Government to authorize the sitting of the Public Accounts Committee at once."

At Same Time as Debate.

"The Public Accounts Committee is organized for the purpose of dealing with the public accounts," replied Mr. Ferguson. "I can't see how the committee can be called before the public accounts are ready. I agree that the work should go on at the earliest possible date. As soon as the accounts are brought down, notwithstanding the Budget debate, we will consider the suggestion. The Government has no desire to get through by Easter. If any public business is to be done the Government will be here to see that it is looked after."

Mr. Sinclair—After Easter it may be in the minds of the private members that they may be up and down the ridings getting ready for the June elections.

Mr. Ferguson—I hadn't thought of that.

Yesterday's lull appeared to provide, for Government and Opposition forces alike, welcome relaxation from the stormy session of the previous day. Literally speaking, members took it "easy."

Goes After Raney.

Continuing the debate from last week, M. M. MacBride (Conservative, Brant) criticized what he called "the propaganda which has gone on in the House," and took Mr. Raney to task on the ground of change of attitude. "Last year," said Mr. MacBride, "this leader of a nameless group beat tomtoms and shouted long and loud because there was mention in the Speech from the Throne of a Government proposal to amend the O.T.A. Act. This year, he is repeating his shouting tactics, but now he shouts because there is no mention of the act in the Address. What does the honorable member want anyway?"

Lure for Liberals.

Mr. MacBride continued to repeat his ideas, expressed last week, denouncing the Gregory Commission as "wasting money." He presented a score of arguments to induce the Liberals to forsake their alliance with the Progressives. He termed the Liberals "my dear friends," declaring, amid laughter, that he called them this because "we can develop them as we go along."

Touching on "wet" topics, Mr. MacBride scoffed at the idea of brewery and distillery interests supporting any one, saying: "What they get they keep; they give nothing away." In referring to different matters in which Mr. Raney had a hand, the speaker described the Progressive House Leader as a "banty hen running around from this big egg to that, and not being able to hatch anything."

As routine business a score of bills came up for consideration. When the Judges' Enforcement Act came up for consideration, Mr. Raney wanted to know why it was not incorporated in the Judicature Act, declaring that it should be included in that act. Mr. Nickle replied that such matter had always been considered independently.

Acts to amend and consolidate the Crown Witnesses Act, the Fines and Forfeitures Act, the Magistrates Act, and the Crown Attorneys Act were passed in Committee of the House. No changes were planned in the amendment to the Magistrates Act, according to Attorney-General Nickle, who stated that the bill had come to him without comment from the Statutes Revision Commission. On the request of Hon. W. E. Raney, an act to amend and consolidate the Married Women's Property Act was left standing. Mr. Raney intimated that a resolution respecting this measure was to come from his group, and declared that the mover would likely wish to speak to it.