

FLARE-UP OVER ACCOUNTS

RENFREW MEMBER CALLED UP- ON TO RETRACT HOT WORDS.

Conservative Member Resented Mr. Elliott's Insistent Examination of Hon. Mr. Beck—Mr. McDougall Withdrew From Room in Protest.

The insistence of Mr. J. C. Elliott (West Middlesex) in his inquiries concerning Hydro-electric expenditures was not appreciated by the Conservative members of the Public Accounts Committee yesterday.

The Middlesex member had directed attention to the amount of \$18,000 paid for legal expenses, and was inquiring of Hon. Adam Beck what proportion of the amount had gone to Mr. A. F. Lobb, K.C. The Minister of Power explained that the arrangement with the solicitor called for \$400 per month and expenses up to March 1, 1909.

Since that time, however, Mr. Elliott directed attention to the fact that the solicitor had charged sometimes \$30 per day and expenses, and at other times \$40 per day and expenses. At the latter rate he would be drawing \$12,000 per annum.

Hon. Mr. Beck stated that these amounts had not been paid. The commission intended to have the accounts taxed.

Directing attention to the sum of \$37,000 under miscellaneous account, Mr. Elliott asked what proportion of it the municipalities would repay.

"None," replied the Minister.

"Then," said Mr. Elliott, "it is current expenditure, and should not be included in capital account. Should it?"

Before the Minister could reply, Mr. T. W. McGarry (South Renfrew) spoke up, objecting to the Minister being asked concerning a matter of policy.

Mr. Elliott opined that the Minister could take care of himself. "All I am asking is whether what the municipalities are not expected to pay back will go to current account," he said.

Mr. McGarry disputed the repetition. "When the member says so, he states what is deliberately and absolutely false," he declared.

There was an instant scene of disorder. Mr. D. J. McDougall (East Ottawa) demanded a retraction of the unparliamentary language, and appealed to the Chairman (Mr. G. H. Ferguson).

The latter declined to give a ruling beyond the statement that Messrs. McGarry and McDougall must "keep quiet" and let Mr. Elliott proceed.

Mr. McDougall, after lodging a brief and dignified protest, thereupon withdrew.

The withdrawal had its effect, and Mr. McGarry withdrew the offensive comment.

TO PROTECT SHEEP.

Proposal for an Increase in the Dog Tax is Approved.

The Legislative Agriculture Committee decided yesterday morning to increase the tax on dogs, with a view to protecting sheep. Mr. P. H. Bowyer, East Kent, was the sponsor of the measure that received a very vigorous support from the legislators. The Kent man explained that dogs were doing much damage to the sheep throughout the Province. He proposed, with the idea of discouraging the keeping and harboring of vicious canines, that every dog be taxed at two dollars, and every bitch at five dollars. The bill, he explained, did not refer to kennels. Mr. J. J. Preston, East Durham, opposed the bill in all its compulsory features.

The sheepbreeders were present and extolled the bill.

On the suggestion of Mr. Neely, Middlesex, the bill was amended to make the tax \$3 for the first and \$5 for all additional bitches, and thus passed. The committee decided that the law would apply to all municipalities, so that the Province would be under one law. No petitions asking for a repeal of the dog tax law will be considered.