

Wednesday, Feb. 29th

WILSON RESOLUTION ON BEER-BY-GLASS IS VOTED DOWN; 92-4

House Divides for First Time This Season—East Ottawa Liberal Clashes With Speaker and Pre- mier—Progressive Whip Votes 'Aye,' Then 'Nay'

**POISSON, REID,
HOMUTH, CURRIE**

By a vote of 92 to 4, the Ontario Legislature yesterday sounded the death-knell of Frank W. Wilson's "beer-by-the-glass" resolution.

The result was expected. All that Mr. Wilson accomplished, apparently, in his effort to correct what he termed the one "big fault" in the Liquor Control Act, was to divide the House for the first time this session. On that division he had but the support of W. G. Weichel (Conservative, North Waterloo) and Edmond Proulx and T. Legault (Liberals, Prescott and Sturgeon Falls). Albert Pinard (Liberal, East Ottawa), who clashed with the Speaker, prior to the vote, over his right to state his attitude on the question after the debate had closed, was not in his seat when the poll was taken.

To Make Position Clear.

Mr. Wilson's resolution was discussed on Monday, and the vote was held over, at the suggestion of Premier Ferguson, that members who were absent might have the opportunity of recording their stand on the question. Yesterday, as the Speaker was about to put the resolution, Mr. Pinard rose, stating that, while it was not his intention to make

a speech, he wished to make his position clear before the House. Mr. Ferguson pointed out that the debate had closed. The Speaker concurred.

"Your dictation may come from the Prime Minister," stated Mr. Pinard, "but—"

"Order," interrupted the Speaker.

"No one should address the Speaker in such language," the Prime Minister stated, "or suggest that there is dictation from any one. Having closed the debate, my honorable friend should not suggest that the whole issue be reopened, just because he unfortunately was absent and unable to speak yesterday."

Mr. Pinard persisted in trying to get a hearing.

"You're out of order," said the Speaker.

"But I say—" Mr. Pinard went on.

"Will Not Be Dictated to."

"Order!" snapped the Speaker. Mr. Pinard sat down. "I'm sorry," declared the Speaker, "that my honorable friend made the statement he did a few moments ago. In the discharge of my duties in this House, I have tried to make it clear that I will not be dictated to by any party or by any Leader." (Applause).

The House got considerable fun out of the division. Liberal and Progressive benches were banged lustily when Dr. Paul Poisson (Conservative, North Essex), Fred Reid (Conservative, West Windsor), and Karl Homuth (Conservative, South Waterloo), and Col. J. A. Currie (Conservative, Toronto) cast their lot against the resolution. The biggest laugh, however, occurred when J. W. Widdifield, Progressive Whip, voted "Aye" on the calling of the "ayes" and "nays," and then turned around on the division and voted against the resolution. Had it not been for Mr. Widdifield's action in the first place, no division could have been recorded, for there were only four proponents of the resolution, and to obtain a division five are required.

PRICE DEFENDS LAW AND ASKS ONTARIO TO GIVE IT A CHANCE

Control Act Not Perfect, But Conditions Are Better, He Claims

QUOTES MANY STATISTICS

Says Number of Motor Acci- dents Lower Than in Year Previous

In a three-hour contribution to the debate in the Legislature yesterday, Attorney-General William H. Price appealed to all "reasonable citizens" of the Province to continue to give a "fair show" to the Liquor Control Act, firm in the conviction that, if such cooperation is forthcoming, "the first year of operation of the act will show a very distinct improvement, notwithstanding the special conditions that surrounded its coming into force, and that subsequent years will show that the people made no mistake when they adopted the Government's policy on Dec. 1, 1926."

The Attorney-General claimed that, while the new liquor law had had a test in its first seven months of operation which probably no other new act in the history of Ontario had had to face, it had come through with flying colors.

Better Conditions, He Says.

"The Government does not say," he pointed out, "that conditions have been perfect, or anywhere near perfect. The Government does not say that the Liquor Control Act has cured all evils. But we feel that there is a better spirit abroad today than when the Ontario Temperance Act was in force. There is less talking about liquor. There is less abusing of police and Provincial officers. There is less resentment against other laws. There is a disposition on the part of the public to feel that they are getting a fair deal if they respect themselves and do not abuse their privileges."

Col. Price's speech, while not exactly a fighting one—it was too crammed with statistics for that—had its warm spots, however. These were especially noticeable when he "went after" the "through and through" prohibitionists, who, he charged, had been too busy once upon a time in defending the Ontario Temperance Act to create an educational campaign for temperance and sobriety, and who since the Liquor Control Act had come into force were engaged chiefly in "exaggerating out of all proportions incidents that now occur under its administration which they passed over as a matter of course when they occurred under the Ontario Temperance Act."

Does "Nothing" With Them.

"But," said he, in this connection, "when I read these long-prepared resolutions sent out by Ben Spence to W.C.T.U.'s and similar organizations to be sent in to the Liquor Board and the Government, I do with them as I expect you would do with them—nothing."

In his defense of the new law, Col. Price read letters from municipal officials in a half-dozen cities and towns of the Province commending the new administration; quoted statistics by the bushel to the detriment of the Volstead law in the United States, and in this regard told the Opposition that if