

LIQUOR-CONTROL BILL GETS SECOND READING BY MAJORITY OF 38

Series of Amendments Are
Moved by Progressives
and Voted Down

TWO LEADERS IN CLASH

Premier Warns Mr. Raney
Against Attempting Ob-
struction Tactics

Premier Ferguson got second reading to his Liquor Control Act at 11.30 in the Legislature last night after a day of argument, confined almost solely to the Opposition side of the House and some last-minute tactics on the part of Hon. W. E. Raney, Progressive Leader, which were viewed by the Prime Minister as being purely "obstructionist" in nature, and which were also protested warmly by Liberal Leader William E. N. Sinclair as "out of order" and interfering with the process of getting down to "actual business" on the Government-control measure.

Vote Is 69 to 31.

The Prime Minister's motion for second reading carried by a vote of 69 to 31. He was supported in the vote by every Conservative member present in the House and by four Liberals, namely: A. Belanger (Russell), J. A. Pinard (Ottawa East), T. Legault (Sturgeon Falls), and E. Proulx (Prescott), the four French-Canadian members constituting the "wet" wing of the Liberal party. The seventeen other Liberal members, the entire Progressive group and F. R. Oliver (U.F.O., Grey South) opposed the motion. The bill will go to committee today.

Mr. Raney forced a division on the motion, notwithstanding the fact that three earlier divisions on amendments had resulted in each case in sweeping majorities for the Government. To be exact, Mr. Raney was much to the fore all night, and his determined opposition to the passing of the bill drew repeated taunts from the Government benches. He insisted on a division on the Lethbridge amendment, which expressed the opinion that the Control Board should be a non-partisan body, with authority to employ and discharge its subordinates without interference by the Government of the day.

He saw that amendment defeated by 31-70. He forced a division on his own amendment, which interrogated the principle of vesting the power of "legislative enactment" within the Commission. He saw that amendment defeated by the same lop-sided vote. Then, with the Speaker about to put Premier Ferguson's original motion, he launched another amendment. It read as follows:

Surprise Amendment.

"That no Government liquor store ought to be established in any municipality without opportunity being given to the electors or to the Council of such municipality to express a point of view on the subject."

Premier Ferguson was at once on his feet. "I don't understand," he said, "the motive of my honorable friend, unless it be to retard the business of this Legislature. He knows very well—and the Province knows, too—there will be no liquor store in what nominally has been known as a "dry" area. For the life of me I cannot conceive what my honorable friend's attitude in moving an amendment at this stage can be. It can achieve no good purpose. The point he stresses is already in the law—if he takes time to read the act.

"I take it that the people have voted on this great question. And let me say that if there is to be evidence of purely obstructionist tactics—if we are not to have constructive criticism—if there is going to be delay instead of action—I'm not so sure that I'm going to sit here until spring listening to that sort of talk." (Applause.)

Liberal Leader Sinclair promptly agreed with the Prime Minister that little object was to be gained "by further amendments at this stage of the proceedings."

Mr. Raney rose to clarify his amendment, stating that "as usual the Prime Minister had misinterpreted it."

Outlines New Scheme.

Theo. Legault (Liberal, Sturgeon Falls), who, speaking on Thursday last, made a plea that the Government-control system allow for five-cents-a-glass sale of strong beer, continued, as the first speaker in the debate yesterday, to outline a scheme which would provide for such sale without "returning to the days of the bar."

"I hold no brief," said he, "for the bar in the sense in which it was known years ago. Yet years ago the good wife knew where to get her husband, and she knew that the bartender was not a bootlegger or a female.

"But here is my suggestion," he went on: "We are to have Government stores. Why not Government taverns, and finish the job?"

He proposed that the Government rent premises in hotels from hotelmen, and establish beer and wine parlors. These parlors should be operated by Government employees on salary. The hotelmen would not be interested in the profits from the sales in such parlors, and would not allow drunkenness or disorderly conduct.

The Government bartender would not be interested in profit from the sale personally, and would, therefore, strictly enforce the rules of sale and rules of conduct. Mr. Legault thought that these taverns might be established on the basis used in chain-store systems. Beer and wine should be invoiced to every bartender at retail price, and the stock could easily be checked up.

Curb Bootlegger, He Claims.

Such a system of beer and wine parlors, said he, would do much to check bootlegging. He claimed that bootleggers would become active when the Government stores closed up each day. But if the bars were open at night it would offset such bootlegging activities.

On the subject of licenses, he suggested taxing hotelmen a nominal fee of \$25; that permits for purchase at Government stores should be issued to people whose names were on the voters' lists, at a charge of \$2 each, and that aliens should be charged \$10 each for a permit. This would tend to force aliens to become naturalized, and get on the voters' lists, he thought.

Tourists' permits, said he, should cost \$5 each, but they should be good for two months. He thought that the Government should at least make \$7,000,000 a year out of the sale of tourists' permits. He gave an illustration of how visitors would buy liquor. "Five men from Kentucky visited Sturgeon Falls last summer," said he. "They stocked up for a camping trip. They bought \$42 worth of grub from me, and they went to a bootlegger and bought \$400 worth of liquor."

Brantford Member Sarcastic.

Rev. William G. Martin (Conservative, Brantford) occupied a few moments in picturing Ben Spence and Hon. W. E. Raney as "bedfellows" who had had "a lot of nightmares together." He said that the advent of Government control, which, he claimed, had more "flesh and blood" in it than the O.T.A. ever had had, would prove that there was no genuine cause for all their alarms, and that they had been suffering merely from "disordered stomachs" or "distorted imaginations."

Mr. Raney wanted to know if Mr. Martin had not worked at one time under Mr. Spence and for the Prohibition Union, of which he was inclined to be so critical. Mr. Martin said that on his return from overseas he, on request, had given support to the O.T.A., thinking at that time that it was working in the best interests of the people of Ontario. Since then, however, his opinion had greatly changed.

Mr. Martin termed the recent reported intention of the Prohibition convention to oppose the Government-control system at the next Provincial election as "most unfair" and "un-British," and an attitude of mind that was the "arch enemy of all true tolerance."

Opposes Sales at Meals.

Switching his argument to the regulations of the new act, he expressed himself as "glad that liquor was not to be served in hotel dining-rooms." That, he contended, would not be Government "control." Were such practice allowed, he said, there would be immediately cries of class legislation—a thing that had to be avoided. Liquor at hotel meals would mean eventually, he contended, liquor for the workingman with his ten-cent lunch.

Mr. Martin fancied that much of the complaint from hotelkeepers about "disorderly parties" in hotel rooms, by virtue of the fact that registered guests will be permitted to have liquor in their rooms, could be attributed to an effort to have the Government "loosen up" with "drinks with dining-room meals."

He was also glad, he said, that there was to be no "beer by the glass" in the new act. He hoped that the Government would not yield "one iota in this regard." It was not fair for members, regardless of what side of the House they belonged to, to get up and advocate that a "beer-by-the-glass" plank be reinserted in the measure.

Mr. Sandy Scores Bill.

That the Government-control bill was "not British," but "more like the law of the jungle," was the opinion of Frederick G. Sandy (Progressive, South Victoria). In the old days, he said, the man who was put on the Indian list was usually "put on by his wife." The new bill provided for such a prohibition, "but why," said Mr. Sandy, "should the Government put that load on the unfortunate wife? Simply because certain persons want to make money or others are too desirous of having a glass when they want it. Is such a bill to be called British?"

The Premier, he said, had declared that there should be an attempt to educate the people of the Province in temperance measures. A very good thought, said Mr. Sandy. He suggested that Mr. Ferguson and Attorney-General Price go about on lecture platforms spreading the cause of temperance. Hon. Dr. Godfrey, Minister of Health and Labor, he thought, should busy himself organizing Good Templar Associations.

Mr. Sandy thought that the Government could not rightly put in its coffers profits from the sale of liquor when that money told the story of suffering and privation in homes ruined by liquor.

Profits from liquor sales might well be expended by the Government "to salvage the waste brought about by the sale of liquor."

He suggested further that part of the profits from the liquor sale be spent in a vigorous advertising campaign in newspapers and billboards picturing the evils of drinking and furthering the cause of temperance in the Province.