

time we will give this matter very careful attention," he said.

"Does my hon. friend expect to receive the final report in time for legislation this session?" asked Mr. Rowell.

Sir James said if the House was in session there was no doubt the Government would be able to introduce a bill.

Mr. Allan Studholme advocated a special session to consider a workmen's compensation bill.

"So far as we on this side of the House are concerned we are prepared to sit here long enough to receive the final report and pass a workmen's compensation act this session," remarked Mr. Rowell.

"The workmen have waited with a great deal of patience," continued the Opposition leader. "They were promised an act this session. Anybody who has knowledge knows that the report can be brought down in time this session. If the Government has taken six years and cannot make up its mind, how much longer have we to wait?" said Mr. Rowell in conclusion.

#### Draft Bill Changed.

The bill as presented to the House is somewhat changed from the draft discussed by representatives of the workmen, manufacturers and insurance companies two weeks ago. The act still adheres to the individual liability principle, but there have been tacked on to it schedules designed to apply to a collective system. Schedule 1 defines what industries are to be grouped, in which there are over forty. Schedule 2 defines those industries which are not to be grouped. In this latter schedule are municipal and public utility corporations, railways of all kinds with the shops and works incidental thereto, telephone and telegraph companies, steam vessels and works connected with their construction and operation.

The machinery for the collective liability principle is undeveloped in the act.

#### Schedule of Benefits.

Some of the blanks in the first draft have been filled in. The schedule of benefits provides a minimum payment of \$20 per month to a widow and \$5 per month for each child up to four until they attain the age of sixteen years, when the compensation ceases. In no case must the aggregate amount of \$40 per month exceed 55 per cent. of the average wage for the preceding three years. Where total disability follows the result of an injury the workman is entitled to \$20 per month for life with a similar allowance for the children, but if this amount does not equal 55 per cent. of the average salary, then the compensation may be scaled up to that point. In the case of death if the \$40 per month is above the 55 per cent. it must be scaled down.

There is more or less overlapping in the act. In cases where the wife has been the breadwinner and meets with fatal injuries the act feelingly refers to the "invalid husband."

## WHY DID MR. COLCOCK LEAVE ONTARIO'S EMPLOY?

### THIS IS A QUESTION THE GOVERNMENT HESITATES TO ANSWER.

Did Mr. N. B. Colcock, the Ontario Government Agent in London, resign or was he dismissed?

Liberal members of the Legislature tried for nearly half an hour last evening to obtain from the Minister of Agriculture an answer to that question. But Hon. Mr. Duff opened not his mouth.

After sidestepping for fifteen minutes or more several straightforward questions of Opposition members, the Minister vouchsafed the meagre information in response to a question by Mr. Rowell that "we are trying to get more efficient service."

Hon. Mr. Duff balked again when the Opposition leader inquired what the deficiency was. Col. Hendrie, Hon. Mr. Lucas and Hon. Mr. Hearst, who were sitting beside him, had been putting the answers he had previously given into his mouth. Now Hon. Mr. Lucas undertook to furnish the information desired. He gave the inquirers a few crumbs during the course of some general remarks in which he hinted that Mr. Colcock had been ill, etc. Then Mr. Johnson (West Hastings) came to the aid of the Minister of Agriculture. He had been in London last year, and Mr. Colcock had told him he wanted to resign. Another Conservative member said the Opposition queries were out of order, whereat Mr. Anderson (South Bruce) said if they did not tell them the reason for Mr. Colcock's dismissal then they were bound to find out later. Mr. Rowell charged that the Minister of Agriculture "sits silent and deliberately withholds information to which this House is entitled." Conservative members cried "carried, carried," and the incident ended.

# GOT MURALT TENDER FOR HYDRO WORK WITHDRAWN

## F. H. McGuigan Arranged Agreement by Which He Got Contract and Sublet It at Price Quoted by Competing Company

Mr. F. H. McGuigan of the McGuigan Construction Company was a witness before the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature yesterday in connection with the investigation into the contract for the construction of the Hydro-electric Niagara transmission line. Mr. McGuigan was a careful witness, and was not able to give Mr. Rowell a great deal of information about the granting of the contract.

The Opposition leader, however, did elicit the fact that an agreement had been made with the A. B. Murlalt Company, whereby the tender of that concern was withdrawn in order that the contract might be secured by the McGuigan Company, to be later sub-let to the Murlalt Company at the price of its own tender. Last week a comparison of these tenders was made, and it was shown that the McGuigan lump tender was about \$145,000 higher than the Murlalt tender, but the equalization was brought about by the adding of \$40,000 for contingencies.

On one point Mr. McGuigan contradicted himself. In reply to a question by Mr. Rowell, he stated that he knew the amount of the various tenders before the time set for opening them, but later denied

this, with the statement that he knew nothing whatever about them.

#### Feared Murlalt Company.

Mr. McGuigan paid no attention to the other tenderers, except Murlalt. He was not afraid of their competition, because they were unfamiliar with work of such magnitude, but the Murlalt Company was used to such large contracts, and he feared their competition. He went to Mr. Enge of the Murlalt firm and ascertained from him the amount of their tender, and this opened the way for the negotiations to withdraw their tender.

Mr. McGuigan assured the Opposition leader that there was nothing in the agreement or sub-contract that would throw any light upon the investigation, as he understood it, but Mr. Rowell asked for the production of these documents. He did not discuss his agreement with Murlalt with anybody but the late Mr. Cecil B. Smith.

Before leaving Mr. McGuigan said: "If the hardship has been on anybody in this matter it has been on me. I am the principal sufferer. I feel that the Government of the Province of Ontario does not want to rob anybody, but they have robbed me."

"The Opposition are trying to make out that you have robbed the Government," said Mr. McGarry.

# EVERY AUTOMOBILE DRIVER MUST CARRY A LICENSE

## Sweeping Amendment to Motor Vehicles Act Adopted by Legislative Committee—Other Important Changes Made

In future every driver of a motor-car in the Province must carry a license and be prepared to produce it when asked to do so by officers of the law.

This is provided for in a sweeping amendment to the motor vehicles act adopted yesterday by the Municipal Committee of the Legislature following a stormy discussion.

Ontario Motor League members supported the amendment, which was suggested by Mr. George H. Gooderham, and which, briefly, means that 20,000 automobiles now in use in various parts of the Province will be subject to a complete system of registration, and that each member of a family as well as private owners who drive cars other than "cars for hire, pay or gain" will be compelled to carry an official license.

Efforts put forward by Mr. Gooder-

ham to prevent the use of glaring searchlights on automobiles in city streets were only partially successful.

Mr. Gooderham has a bill to amend the municipal act by providing that Councils of municipalities that have power to regulate traffic may compel all vehicles to carry lights after night-fall, and the committee took the view that this power should be extended to searchlights, and declined to make a general provision in the act.

Reciprocity with the United States in auto licenses was exceedingly unpopular.

Provincial reciprocity was provided for without a dissenting voice.

Loud objections were made concerning the clause that compels all vehicles to halt before coming to standing street cars, and it was held over.

By the adoption of another clause, persons convicted of violating the rules of the act three times forfeit their permit.