

March 6th.

ways; that through them the Government was merely making gestures and not honestly seeking to correct evils.

"Knowing conditions to exist," he said, "they failed to curb them. They deliberately refused to act. Now they are compelled by public opinion to legislate against that which they knew to exist."

Mr. Sinclair "went after" the Prime Minister for his "stock" argument that the Liberal Leader never contributed "a single constructive suggestion."

"But," said Mr. Sinclair, "the Government has been forced to adopt my suggestions. The Attorney-General has been forced to change the law, and their bill today is an admission by the Government that they have failed."

Practically every new proposal in the act, said Mr. Sinclair, had been suggested by him—not only in his speech of the 1929 session, but more recently, in the Liberal election handbook, and in his recent radio address at Waterloo.

Continuing, Mr. Sinclair declared that Colonel Price had not solved the problem that he, the Attorney-General, said had threatened the people for twenty-five years. He suggested that, even though Government members said that Colonel Price had dealt with the bootleggers under the O.T.A., the Attorney-General couldn't stop the bootleggers under the Security Frauds Prevention Act.

The Liberal Leader stated that it had been said that an invitation had been extended to the various Provinces to join in a conference. But, said he, according to press reports, Colonel Price had told the Provinces, "We will handle the brokerage situation in our own way."

Forced Into Conference, He Says.

Later, he declared, Ontario had been forced into the conference.

But, said he, the conference had too much suggestion and not enough law. He declared that there was no law on the listing of securities, no law on trading practices, no law on clearing-house practices, no law on records to be kept by brokers.

"I say," Mr. Sinclair stated, "that the suggestions and regulations should go further, and be incorporated in the bill."

"Why," the Liberal Leader continued, "should we leave it to the Attorney-General to pass resolutions? On the Government side there are some eminent lawyers who could assist him."

Mr. Sinclair went on to say, that, according to statements made some months ago, the Attorney-General said he had not received a complaint from any citizen.

No Answer, Is Claim.

Mr. Sinclair stated that a John R. Byce of Forest Falls had written him, the Liberal Leader, on Feb. 26. And Mr. Byce, he continued, had said that he had written the Attorney-General about being "gypped" in a stock deal, and another person had written the Attorney-General, and also a lawyer had made a complaint. But no answer was received, said Mr. Byce.

"He said," Mr. Sinclair stated, "'Are they all dead up there in Toronto?'"

"If," the Liberal Leader continued, "he was here he would know they were dead."

"Any one who wrote my department got an answer quickly," Colonel Price retorted.

Mr. Sinclair, continuing with his address, declared that it would be better for the Attorney-General to forget politics and get in line with the other Provinces. He expressed the opinion that "the Government is not so much anxious for the welfare of the people as to bolster up its own position and pull a few stones out of the wall of the Ottawa Government."

Referring to the brokerage situation, Mr. Sinclair made reference to the fact that two members of the House had been bondsmen when arrests were made.

Immediately A. Coulter McLean (Conservative, Toronto-Eglinton) arose, said he: "I went security for one broker. He was a close friend of mine. I believe that, according to British jurisprudence, he is innocent until he is proved guilty. Though I am a member of this House, it is my privilege to act as I did. And I resent those remarks of the honorable member."

Then General Donald M. Hogarth (Conservative, Port Arthur) rose and declared: "I am also in that category. But if I want a lesson in ethics or honor I won't look to the Leader of the Opposition to give it to me."

He stated emphatically that he had given bond for a "friend," and, he continued, "I believe him innocent."

Conservative members applauded.

Confirms His Remarks, He Says.

"Well," said Mr. Sinclair, "the honorable members confirm what I said. I take nothing back."

Then Mr. Sinclair referred to the suggestion that the Attorney-General had relatives in the brokerage business, and to the press replies when that suggestion was made in the House some weeks ago.

Premier Ferguson broke into these remarks with the statement that the principle of the bill was to be discussed rather than the interjection of personalities.

Mr. Sinclair retorted that it was up to the Attorney-General, not the Premier, to take exception.

"As a member of this House I have the right to take exception when I see that the procedure is not observed," Mr. Ferguson retorted. "I rise to a point of order."

"My honorable friend has not followed the argument," Mr. Sinclair returned.

"Yes, I have," Mr. Ferguson replied.

Mr. Sinclair again began an argument. Again the Premier started an interjection. Mr. Sinclair continued: "Well, the Speaker has a note from the Clerk, which is too common in this House. I leave it to the Speaker."

To Discuss Principle of Bill.

The Speaker stated that he "appealed" to Mr. Sinclair to discuss the principle of the bill.

"I've been in this House quite a while, and I'll try to keep within the rules as well as the Attorney-General," Mr. Sinclair stated.

Attorney-General Price immediately stated that Mr. Sinclair could declare his views in the Budget debate. "I have no objection," said Colonel Price.

Mr. Sinclair, in reply, declared that "the Attorney-General has fallen down on his job." The Liberal Leader declared that he could get a radio or rent a hall and tell the people his views. "And I'm not scared to say anything on a public platform that I would not say here this afternoon," he added.

In conclusion, Mr. Sinclair said that he approved the principle of the bill, but that he might have to lead the way for the Attorney-General.

Mr. Nixon then adjourned the debate.

AGRICULTURAL BODY ACCUSED OF APATHY; ATTENDANCE IS SLIM

Too Many Professional Men on Committee, Declares Lambton Member

HOG SITUATION SERIOUS

Forceful condemnation of the composition of the Agriculture Committee of the Legislature, and the alleged general apathy of that body toward its duties, was voiced yesterday by Howard Fraleigh, Conservative member for East Lambton.

At the conclusion of the committee's regular meeting—a meeting in which at no time were there more than 12 of the 63 appointed committeemen present—Mr. Fraleigh bluntly extended his sympathy to Hon. John S. Martin, Minister of Agriculture, and his staff, for the way in which they were trying "to get along" without the apparent support of the committee members.

"This committee, in my opinion," said Mr. Fraleigh, "is suffering from sleeping sickness. I would recommend that we let it die for this year, and start afresh next session."

Too Many Doctors.

The East Lambton member stated that he had come down to the Legislature in the hope that he might be able to do something "agriculturally" for his constituency, and he had found that the Agriculture Committee had more doctor and lawyer members on it than "tillers of the soil."

"Looking around this room right now," he said, "I can see more doctors than farmers. That state of affairs should not exist, particularly when the Department of Agriculture and the industry it is fostering is more important than all the other departments of the Government put together."

Offers Alibi.

R. A. Baxter (Liberal, South Oxford) regretted that he had been unable to attend the meeting, due to the fact that a meeting of the Municipal Committee, of which he was also a member, had conflicted. Dr. H. J. Davis, Elgin East, said that, while the Municipal Committee had to meet, and laws had to be framed, committee meetings should not conflict, and that more attention should be paid by the members to the Agriculture Committee and its work.

"We get too much law here," observed H. A. Acres, Conservative, Carleton, "and too little business."

Hog-grading was the question discussed by the committee yesterday, with R. W. Wade, head of the Live Stock Branch of the Agriculture Department, and Mr. Pearsall, who is in charge of hog-grading for the Dominion authorities in Toronto, leading the discussion.

Serious Situation.

From Mr. Pearsall the committee had the warning that something had to be done by the farmers immediately, if a serious situation now threatening the country in the hog-raising industry was to be averted. Carload after carload of United States pork was being shipped into the Province and sold here, he stated, and Ontario producers were not producing enough pork to meet the Province's own domestic requirements. Last year, he stated, production of hogs was down 150,000 on the previous year.

"Our farmers," he said, "have got to get down to business, not only in the hog line, but in other lines as well, and show that they can compete with other countries of the world in the production of agricultural commodities."