

FINAL OBJECTIONS TO SUPERANNUATION BILL

Liberals Criticize Provisions to Include Dr. Seath and Other Department Officers

In the Legislature yesterday Mr. William McDonald (North Bruce) raised objection to including the Superintendent of Education and other officers of the Education Department within the scope of the superannuation act. Dr. Seath, he said, had a salary of \$4,500 in the civil service, and was, therefore, sufficiently well provided for. He moved to amend the bill accordingly.

Hon. Dr. R. A. Pyne said that Dr. Seath had devoted fifty-five years of his life to the cause of education. He was now seventy-five years old, and in any event could not receive more than \$1,000. He was paying the full proportion of his salary into the fund.

Mr. Dewart objected on principle to treating a civil servant on the basis of a school teacher. If there was to be superannuation in the Education Department there should be superannuation throughout the civil service.

Mr. McDonald's motion was lost on division 23 to 40.

Shortage in Revenue.

When the House went into Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Bowman (West Bruce) contended the Government would fall short in its endeavor to make its revenue meet the expenditure for the current year by over \$4,000,000. "That's certainly making a record," he commented.

"What do you want us to do—withdraw the bill altogether?" asked Premier Hearst.

"Shortest way," said Mr. Studholme.

The supply bill was given first, second and third readings.

Among the bills given third reading at the morning session was one to validate the amendment to the constitution of the Canadian Order of Home Circles.

MORE AMENDMENTS TO TEMPERANCE ACT

LICENSE BOARD GETS WIDE POWER TO DEAL WITH LIQUOR ADVERTISING.

Additional amendments to the Ontario temperance act were introduced in the Legislature yesterday by the Hon. W. D. McPherson. He said they dealt with the manner in which express companies were to do business, and provided that there shall be no convictions unless it could be shown the companies knowingly violated the law.

Mr. Rowell approved the amendments, though he was somewhat dubious regarding the clause requiring proof of intent.

Mr. Rowell asked if under the new powers conferred on the License Commission the Commissioners would have authority to deal with liquor advertising, and the Provincial Secretary replied that such was the intention of the Government and wide powers had been conferred on the Board for that purpose.