

torial) sincerity on the prohibition question, and for his attack on the Prohibition Union and the policies that union formulated.

"No one," said Dr. Simpson with considerable fire, "can accuse Mr. Newman of being insincere. He is one of the most sincere and most courageous men I have ever known. And sneers at the Prohibition Union, coming from a temperance man, are things that I can scarcely conceive."

Dr. Simpson held up Ontario's annual expenditure on liquor of approximately \$55,000,000 as an excessive amount. "I'm not speaking as a dried-up old temperance crank," said he, "but this Government cannot go on spending \$55,000,000 a year in this way—as much, almost, as it takes to conduct the business of Ontario."

Cut Down Outlay.

Temperance men, in his belief, should start to work, not on old questions like the referendum, but on the Conservative members of the House. These members were responsible for the Liquor Control Act under which such a huge annual expenditure was taking place. They should, more than anybody else, endeavor to influence the Government to cut down the expenditure by at least one-third, and thereby divert some \$20,000,000 into other channels.

"I think," said Dr. Simpson, "that the people of this Province would be satisfied with less liquor, and the present rate of expenditure should be brought down. Expenditures are falling in every other line. Why not on booze?"

Mr. Honeywell informed the House that he was prepared to accept the sincerity of the views expressed by the Opposition members of the House, but that was more than he could do for certain members of the Prohibition Union, who, during the last two Provincial elections, played a part, he charged, that was highly improper, and one that should be investigated by the Attorney-General. Mr. Honeywell threw out veiled suggestions of "misrepresentation," and of "money spent" that was not spent as it should be spent.

The Ottawa member ridiculed the principle of the plebiscite, and drew an alarming picture of what had happened at the last election to Blake Miller East Elgin; P. W. Pearson, North York and Chris Gardiner, East Kent, two Liberals and a Progressive, who had championed its cause enthusiastically.

"Surely their fate," said Mr. Honeywell, "is sufficient indication to my honorable friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon) that the referendum has long since been relegated to the limbo of forgotten things."

Mr. Sinclair's remarks on the debate were brief but blunt. Conservative members persisted, he stated, in getting up in the House and flaying the referendum principle in the face of a clause in the Municipal Act at the present time that permitted referenda on certain things.

Attacks Inconsistency.

"Let these members repeal that clause," argued Mr. Sinclair, "if they want to be consistent in their point of view."

The Opposition Leader stated it was plain to see that the Government benches would never get over the defeat of Sir William Hearst in 1919. They were inclined to blame the temperance people for the licking, but the temperance people were not to blame at all. "When one hears them talk about the defeat of Hearst," said Mr. Sinclair, "one would imagine they actually thought that by the grace of the Almighty when they came into power in 1905 they were to stay there for all time."

Mr. Sinclair jocularly turned Mr. Honeywell's accusation regarding the Prohibition Union into charges against the Attorney-General, and the latter's failure to clean up the situation which Mr. Honeywell alleged to have obtained

in union ranks at the last two elections.

If, by terms of the Municipal Act, the referendum was a good thing for the municipalities, it was then a good thing for the whole Province, and the Legislature should say so, submitted Mr. Sinclair. "This Government seems to take it into its head," said he, "that it comprises the brains and judgment of the people of Ontario, and that the people should have no right to think for themselves."

Mr. Sinclair maintained that he had always played fair with the people of his riding. The votes he had received from time to time indicated, in his mind, they were prepared to trust him to carry out the pledges he had made them. Inasmuch as he had been elected on the principle of the referendum, he would, he stated, support Mr. Nixon's motion.

Claims Indefiniteness.

In opening his address Premier Henry complained of the indefiniteness of the motion's provision that a plebiscite should be held "when a sufficient public demand for such action is apparent."

"I think," said the Premier, referring to the supporters of the motion, "that they are not expecting to advance this motion very far in the House. I do not wish to impute motives, but I think they simply wish to fan the air and give the public the impression that they are the only prohibition party and that temperance legislation cannot be expected from a Conservative Administration."

He stated that he was not in the position of being pledged to any course of conduct to outside organizations. "I have been asked by temperance forces to sign on the dotted line. I have been asked to pledge myself to a certain course in return for support. But my conception of the duty of a man in public life is to have a view of his own. I do not expect those who elect me to ask for pledges. They should elect to public office those in whom they have confidence."

"Newfangled" Systems.

Premier Henry described referenda, plebiscites and recalls as "newfangled, un-British" systems. He quoted from a recent book by Professor Munro of Harvard University, who attributed these systems to "declining public confidence in the efficiency and integrity of legislators, and a readiness on the part of representatives to place on the shoulders of voters responsibilities which ought properly to remain on their own."

Such devices, continued the Premier, were products of republican forms of government, having been tried in France and Switzerland. "In some States of the United States," he said, "if a Judge gives an unpopular decision the voters may recall him. The system of plebiscites does not belong to British institutions. It has never been used in Great Britain, where representative government has been carried to its highest form."

Mr. Nixon—Did not Mr. Baldwin promise a referendum recently?

Premier Henry replied that he did not know what ex-Premier Baldwin's intentions were for the future. Mr. Baldwin, however, made no promise of a referendum while in a responsible position.

Praise for Whitney.

In all history, he declared, there had been no more real progress in temperance than during the Premiership of the late Sir James Whitney. He traced the inception of the O.T.A. as a wartime measure following the election of 1914 on the issue of abolishing the bar. "In the stress of war we reversed the policy on which we had been returned, and with the enactment of prohibition the Government promised a referendum at the conclusion of the war."

Referring to the Drury Administration, he included Mr. Nixon in his castigation of the U.F.O. Government for declining to accept responsibility for

public measures, having them introduced by private members. The attitude expressed by the Conservative Party, then in Opposition, as expressed in an amendment, was the attitude of the Government now. This amendment had affirmed belief in the principle of Ministerial responsibility as the bulwark of British institutions. Referring to Dr. McQuibban's plea that the question should be taken out of politics, Premier Henry observed: "I thought the Liberal convention had removed the question from politics last December."

What About 1924?

Mr. Nixon—You're not going to stop without telling us about 1924?

Premier Henry—What about 1924?

Mr. Nixon—Why, you supported the plebiscite then.

"The vote in 1924," said Premier Henry, "was just an incident in the change back to responsible government from the unusual conditions which followed the adoption of prohibition as a wartime measure, with subsequent referenda. The people believe this Government is sincere in promoting real temperance. It is sincere, and not juggling with motions such as this, which mean nothing except to the boys back of the lines, who will say 'Hurrah for Harry Nixon; he's keeping our flag flying.'"

"I'm prepared to accept the issue as it has been defined," said Mr. Nixon, following the Premier. "The character of this debate has been ample justification for bringing the question up. The Prime Minister failed to avoid speaking on his stand on plebiscites in 1924. In that plebiscite the people did not vote for Government control, as the Government expected. Had they voted for Government control there would be no right-about-face on the question of plebiscites by the Government."

An exchange occurred between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Sinclair. The former, amid laughter, said: "I am overwhelmed by the support of my friend from Ontario South. He states that my motion is in substance the same as his Fort William speech. The people of Ontario were trying for days to interpret that speech. But it wasn't interpreted until he went down to The Globe office and gave an interview to the editor."

Mr. Sinclair—You are making a statement of fact.

Mr. Nixon—I repeat it.

Mr. Sinclair—I have no recollection

of giving such an interview. What date was it?

Mr. Nixon—I don't recall the date. It will be on the files.

Mr. Sinclair—I go there so seldom. I remember every occasion.

In conclusion Mr. Nixon referred to the Liberal Leader voting with the Premier on Tuesday as reminding him of "Damon and Pythias embracing at the execution block."

"The attitude of the honorable member for Ontario South today," he added, "is more in keeping with a Leader of an Opposition group."