

Saturday-March-2nd

HIGHER SPEED LIMIT FOR TORONTO URGED BY CURRIE IN HOUSE

**Colonel Assails Traffic
"Spotters" and Magis-
trates Who Get Fee Out
of Fine—Highway Min-
ister Would Bar Vehicles
Over 35 Feet and
Coupled Vehicles Over
65 Feet**

LIVELY ARGUMENT IN LEGISLATURE

The dullness of Friday afternoon in the Ontario Legislature was suddenly shattered yesterday afternoon.

It was Hon. George S. Henry's amendment to the Highway Traffic Act, up for second reading, that created the stir. And before it got through this legislative stage, Colonel John A. Currie, the stalwart Conservative from Toronto-St. Patrick; William E. N. Sinclair, Liberal Leader, and P. W. Pearson, North York Liberal, were united in unusual harmony against part of the measure; Government members were up on their feet questioning the Minister about his intention in the bill; and Colonel Currie had taken a stand against part of Mr. Henry's proposals, and he declared that in the committee he would bring in an amendment asking for an increased speed limit in the City of Toronto.

So the outburst of argument that was occasioned yesterday promises to continue in even a livelier and more vigorous form when the bill next appears in committee.

"Motorist as Under-Dog."

It was Colonel Currie who was the chief actor in yesterday's afternoon's drama. And he was a "one-man movie-tone." He presented a picture, and he talked. Before the meagre Friday afternoon audience he presented a review which might well be entitled, "The Motorist as the Under-Dog." He pleaded for the great motoring public that is "held down" by speed limits, the victims of traffic "spotters," who summon them before a Magistrate, who gets his fee out of the fine. He let the members in on a secret, of how the Highways Minister is besieged by "cranks," who don't even own cars,

and as a climax he told the members that they must be kindly to motorists because they are the ones who get the people out to the polls on election day.

When Mr. Henry introduced his bill on Tuesday, he simply stated that the changes were not of very great importance, and that the chief proposal was to increase the allowance of tonnage on heavy trucks from eight tons of a load to ten tons. The ten-ton loads would be allowed on certain roads of the Province, and to meet this situation the roadways would be divided into two classes—"A" and "B."

But yesterday the House was informed by the Minister that the Government, through the bill, was attempting to bar from the highways all vehicles exceeding a length of 33 feet and combinations of vehicles coupled together exceeding a total length of 65 feet. Moreover, another section empowers municipalities bordering on, or adjacent to, a city of 100,000 people to set a maximum 20-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Mr. Henry Explains.

The provision about the vehicle lengths brought even Government members to their feet, questioning Mr. Henry as to its meaning. He explained that the lengths referred to "over-all," or body lengths, and that the section was aimed at a class of vehicles that have appeared on the highways during the last six months, namely, those long trucks which transport new cars and car bodies. While such a method of transporting new automobiles and automotive equipment from factory to dealer has been an important feature of the automotive industry in the United States for several years, it is more or less a new move in Ontario. The Government proposes to eliminate this form of traffic on the ground that it is a menace to the general motoring public.

But this section also affects organizations that use on the highways trucks and trailers which in all exceed 65 feet in length. A unit in the garbage collection system in the City of Toronto is the use of a truck and several trailers coupled to it.

Motorists in the city often encounter these long "trains." They may be held up behind them for blocks when the traffic is heavy, and then when passing they have to dodge the trailers, which often get into a zigzagging motion behind the truck. But Mr. Henry told the House yesterday that this city "service" was not to be affected by the bill, in that such vehicles may be used by special permit.

However, it was the "speed limit" section of the bill that produced the