

BRACKIN AND PINARD DENOUNCED IN HOUSE BY LEADER SINCLAIR

Instigators of "Wet" Amendment Charged With Abandoning Policy They Helped to Form and With Attempting to Create Discord in Liberal Ranks

GIVEN NO SUPPORT BY OFFICIAL PARTY

Business Connection of Each With Liquor Trade Precludes Expression of Recognized Views on Temperance Issue, Says Mr. Sinclair — Brackin Promises Reply

Charging R. L. Brackin, K.C., and J. A. Pinard, member for West Kent and East Ottawa, respectively, with endeavoring to create discord in the ranks of the Liberal party by abandoning and denouncing a policy they themselves had helped to create, W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal Leader in the Legislature, yesterday made it quite plain that under no circumstances was the anti-O.T.A. feeling embodied in the Brackin-Pinard amendment, now before the House, to be construed as the attitude of the Liberal group. Neither Mr. Brackin nor Mr. Pinard, he declared coldly, should be recognized as speaking for the Liberal party of the House on temperance questions. **Helped to Frame Policy.**

In exposing the alleged "about-turn" tactics of the two members, Mr. Sinclair went as far back as June, 1919, to show that they—as representatives of their ridings—had attended the Provincial Liberal convention in Toronto at that time, and had been members of the Policy Committee which framed the policy of "progressive temperance legislation" there and then adopted by the convention and upheld to the present day by the Liberal party.

Claiming that neither member had consulted the Liberal party and the policy to which it has subscribed before "sowing the discord," Mr. Sinclair said of their action:

Business Precludes Stand.

"They have a right to their individual opinion on any question, but they do not speak for the Liberal party when they speak and act as they have done in this debate. I will go further and say that no member of the Liberal party in this House, while he conducts a business in another Province which by law is illegal in this Province, as does the member for East Ottawa (Mr. Pinard), and no member of the Liberal party in this House who holds a retainer as solicitor for distillery interests, as does the member for West Kent (Mr. Brackin), will be recognized as speaking for the Liberal party in this House upon the temperance question."

Referring to the action taken by Mr. Pinard (last Thursday) in unexpectedly moving the adjournment of the debate for Mr. Brackin, Mr. Sinclair declared that this move had interfered with a custom which had been in vogue in the House for years. Harold Fisher, member for West Ottawa, was, Mr. Sinclair explained to the Legislature, the recognized financial critic for the Liberal party, "and it was his right to move the adjournment and speak first."

"Members of all parties in this House," he said in conclusion, "will regret the episode which has occurred and will discountenance the effort made to disrupt this Legislature on a question which thoughtful men wish solved by careful thought and disinterested parties."

Mr. Pinard offered no reply to Mr. Sinclair. Mr. Brackin declared he would have an opportunity, later, of answering the Leader of "this official Liberal party — whatever that is." Eliciting the information that he might speak further on the debate, he said: "I'll make good use of that opportunity, too."

"Ample time to get your ammunition ready?" smiled Premier Ferguson from across the House.

"I won't need much ammunition," said Mr. Brackin, with a significant look at Mr. Sinclair.

FERGUSON CONCEDES NEW RANEY MEASURE CONTAINS GOOD POINT

Bill to Prohibit Brewers' Contributions Given Second Reading in House

PROGRESS IS MADE

Hon. W. E. Raney's bill to prohibit political contributions by brewers, distillers, standard hotel keepers, public contractors, Crown lessees and certain corporations got second reading in the Legislature yesterday, after a stormy passage, in which Mr. Raney, as usual, was made the target of considerable Government gibing, but out of which he emerged flushed, but plainly delighted with the suggestion from Premier Ferguson that the measure be given its reading, and referred to the consideration of the Special Committee on Election Law.

During a half-hour address, Mr. Raney repeatedly appealed to the intellectual honesty of the House. "Let us all admit," said he, "there are campaign funds." This appeal met with disclaimers from a number of Conservative members, including John Joynt, North Huron; A. C. Lewis, Northeast Toronto, and C. R. McKeown, Dufferin. Mr. Joynt was especially emphatic in disclaiming knowledge of "the campaign fund," declaring he was prepared to take an oath that he had never known such a "thing" to exist.

Liquor Contributions.

Through a storm of interruption, featured by several efforts on the part of J. A. Currie (Conservative) to have the Speaker compel the ex-Attorney-General to withdraw "the innuendo in his statements," Mr. Raney continued his explanation of the measure. The bill, he stated, made no condemnation of campaign funds or expenditures for publicity purposes, either in the form of literature or in payment of speakers; made no condemnation of the practice of lending assistance to candidates whose financial rating would not permit them to run otherwise; but it did aim, he pointed out, at the eradication of a practice that was inimical to the welfare of the State. Every one knew, he contended, that for years liquor interests and others had contributed support to the party which in their opinion was best situated to serve their needs.

In suggesting that the bill be given its second reading, Premier Ferguson concurred with Mr. Raney on several points, but he did not believe, he said, that the Province was as corrupt as the statements of Mr. Raney might lead one to suspect. The Province, he said, had its "dark spots," like any other country, but almost invariably these "spots" had been condemned, and those responsible had been made to suffer the consequences. While he believed that the standards of public life in Ontario were higher, morally, at the present time than ever before, it should be the desire of every one, he said, to aid honest effort tending to further advancement in this line.

Hon. H. C. Nixon was informed by the Ministry that \$4,363,000 in fire insurance was carried on the property of the Province.

Replying to Mr. Lethbridge's interrogation regarding the audits, Provincial Treasurer Price tabled a statement as to the departments in which a special audit have been made, and as to how far back the audit extended, viz.: Attorney-General's, 1921; Department of Education, 1919; Health and Labor, 1923; Lands and Forests, 1922; Provincial Secretary's, 1914; Mines and Fisheries, 1922; Provincial Treasurer's, 1908; Agriculture, 1920; Provincial Highways, 1917. In answer to Mr. Kemp, the Treasurer said that "irregularities" prior to the coming into power of the Drury Administration had been discovered through these investigations.

Information supplied Mr. Kemp showed that \$859,000 in revenue had been received by the Government from fire, life, casualty and marine insurance companies under the Corporations Tax Act in 1925.