

NO EXTENSION OF PROVISION FOR MOTHERS

Amendments to Pensions Bill Are Voted Down in Committee

ONE CHANGE ACCEPTED

Premier Willing to Make Act Applicable to Naturaliz- ed Subjects

After considerable discussion, certain amendments to the Mothers' Pensions Bill, introduced by Mr. Curry, were voted down in the Legislature yesterday while the bill was in committee. An amendment by P. Heenan of Kenora met the same fate.

Mr. Heenan's amendment was to the effect that the clause stating that widowed mothers of two or more children were entitled to receive aid should be changed to read widowed mothers of one child or more. Mr. Curry's amendment included this and also asked that where the bill read widows, the word should be changed to "mothers without adequate support"; that the clause relating to those receiving aid that they should be British subjects by birth, should be changed by adding the words, "or by naturalization"; and that a clause should be added reading that "mothers" should include mothers of illegitimate children.

Hon. Mr. Raney voted for Mr. Heenan's amendment, and Mr. Assmussen voted against Mr. Curry's amendment.

Later, Mr. Dewart asked the Premier if he would accept the portion of the amendment regarding naturalization, and the Premier said he would. The bill now stands for third reading.

Bill an Experiment.

Mr. Curry held that the act should include mothers of children and not only widows. Deserted wives should be considered as well as the mothers of illegitimate children. This view was strongly supported by Karl Homuth, R. L. Brackin and Peter Heenan, and opposed by Mr. Rollo, the Premier, Hon. George S. Henry and General Ross, on the ground that the bill was an experiment, and it would not be wise to load it up with too much detail at the start. Mr. Dewart held that Mr. Curry's amendment embodied the stand taken on the question at the Liberal Convention, and for that reason, he said, the party supported it.

A standing vote was taken on the amendments.

An amendment to make the municipality responsible for 25 per cent. instead of 50 per cent. was voted down.

Should Avoid Aspersion.

Mr. Homuth introduced discussion by bringing up the problem of illegitimate children, who, he said, should be considered. Mr. Curry agreed with this, and wanted to know why the bill considered only the children of widows. An illegitimate child, he said, might be of greater value to the State than those born in lawful wedlock, and there should be no aspersion cast on such a child.

Dr. Stevenson agreed with this view, and Mr. Tolmie said it was not a matter of charity, but what the State owed to the children. Mr. Rollo objected to the proposed changes, as they did not want to load up the act and make it so cum-

bersome that they could not give anybody anything.

"Many unmarried mothers have no home, so the State would have to establish homes in which to keep the children. Is Ontario prepared to do that? Are you prepared to establish individual homes for unmarried mothers and bring up their children?" he asked.

Owe It To Children.

Mr. Brackin brought up the question of deserted wives. Whether the fault was that of the mother or the father, the State owed it to the children to see that they did not suffer. A husband would run away, perhaps to the United States, and it was impossible to bring him back.

"Would that not put a premium on desertion?" asked Mr. Rollo.

Mr. Brackin thought not. If a man was so low as to leave his wife and children for a possible pension they would get, he would desert them anyway. He also objected to the bill giving aid to a widow who was the mother of two and more children, but not to the mother of one child. "If there are two babies they get a decent show in life; but if only one, it shifts for itself," he pointed out.

The Premier thought that paying money to deserted wives would put a premium on desertion. There was no question, he said, but that a great many ill-assorted couples were held together by the common affection for their children. Moreover, there were two sides, in most cases, to desertion, and it was a question if the woman who was the cause of the desertion were a fit person to take charge of the children. "Let us take one step at a time," he said, "and not three steps and fall down."

Bring Husbands Back.

R. R. Hall, Parry Sound, suggested that the Government get busy and bring back husbands who had run away, and make them support their wives. Mr. Homuth agreed with this, and also suggested that they should make deserted children heirs to any property the father might have.

Mr. Heenan and Mr. Curry then introduced their amendments, which were opposed by Hon. George Henry and General Ross. The two latter were in sympathy with the bill, but felt that too much should not be put in at first. Mr. Dewart said that the Liberal party had taken a stand on the matter, and hoped the Government would accept the suggestions. Replying to a criticism from Mr. Henry, that members had not read the report on which the bill was based, Mr. Dewart said that he had read the report and had drafted a bill based upon it, but had not introduced it when he heard that the Government was going to introduce a bill covering the problem.

SANDY BILL AWAITS ITS THIRD READING

MAKES IT LEGAL TO TRANSPORT LIQUOR FROM ONE HOUSE TO ANOTHER

The Sandy Bill, stopping the short-circuiting of liquor in Ontario, passed Committee of the Whole at the Legislature last night. One word struck out makes it legal to transport liquor from one dwelling house to another dwelling house. Members pleaded that this should be legal, as in many cases sickness developed in homes, and liquor which would be beneficial could be brought in from a neighbor's place. Hon. W. E. Raney pointed out the difficulty of discriminating on illicit and legal traffic between dwellings. The bill now awaits third reading.