

hoped to be able within the next fortnight to name an officer as head of the police whose name would meet with the general acceptance of the Province.

Wellington Hay (North Perth) criticized the way estimates were presented. There were main estimates, supplementary estimates and further supplementary estimates. Why not have them all brought down at one time, he suggested. There ought to be a whole new system of accounting.

"Come in after the session and talk it over," suggested the Premier.

Mr. Dewart objected to coming in after the session. They got no progress that way. He agreed with Mr. Hay regarding the way estimates were prepared.

The Premier said estimates had to be prepared for such a long time ahead it was difficult to present them in any other way.

Hon. Howard Ferguson concurred in this view.

## NATURAL GAS BILL IS GIVEN APPROVAL

### PRINCIPLE OF NEW MEASURE APPROVED IN SPITE OF OPPOSITION VOICED

After hearing objections to the proposed Natural Gas Bill from delegates of municipalities from Hamilton to Windsor, the special committee of the Legislature considering the bill yesterday morning approved the principle of the new act. The motion to approve was made by J. C. Tolmie, Windsor, and seconded by Wilson Crockett, Wentworth, and carried unanimously.

Following this the committee heard objections from the delegates to various clauses of the bill, and then adjourned to take these up at a future session.

The chief objection voiced by the attending delegates was the principle in the bill of giving power to the Referee under the act to interfere with contracts. W. Morrison, Hamilton, said bluntly that the Government should take over the gas companies if it was going to alter contracts. Municipalities would show more willingness to change contracts if the Government was in control, he said.

C. St. Clair Leitch, representing several municipalities in Elgin county, said the proposed bill was revolutionary, as it destroyed vested interests, contracts and municipal government. W. H. Cameron, Southwold, protested against the right given to enter upon private property with the permission of the Referee. Solicitor Waddell of Hamilton said the act was far too drastic, especially that part giving the Referee power to fix prices.

"As a Legislature," said J. M. Pyke, K.C., of Chatham, "apparently some of you are willing to take away the rights of one party to a contract without compensating the other party."

Objections in a similar strain were made by several other speakers, following which the committee approved the bill. Official Referee Henderson spoke approving the bill.

## To Arbitrate Damage From Sulphur Fumes

A bill entitled the Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act was introduced into the Legislature yesterday by Hon. Manning Doherty and Hon. W. E. Raney, and given first reading. The bill provides an arbitrator to determine damage caused by sulphur fumes. The person aggrieved must give notice to the other party within seven days of the damage, and if satisfaction is not received within four months he has the right of appeal to the arbitrator, whose decision is to be final.

# HICKS' CHARGES OF BRIBERY COME TO A SUDDEN COLLAPSE WHEN IN LEGISLATURE PROBE

Globe Reporter in London,

Ontario, Tells of London People Corroborating His Report of Ex-Ald. Ashplant's Charge in London City Council — Another Newspaperman Also Says It's Correct

## COMMITTEE HAS ANOTHER SESSION

Ex-Ald. Ashplant Not Present at Investigation — Globe Man is Cross-examined by Mr. McCrea, Who Was Mentioned by the London Ex-Alderman

The Andrew Hicks charges of "appalling" offerings being made to members of the Legislature for their influence with respect to certain measures more or less evaporated when the U. F. O. member for East Middlesex faced the Privileges and Elections Committee at the Parliament Buildings yesterday. In effect Mr. Hicks' testimony was that one day in the corridors of the Legislature he had understood M. C. Fox, U.F.O. member for South Essex, to say that he could have had \$20,000 to switch his vote on the Beach Protection Act. He had since learned that there was no such meaning to be taken from what Mr. Fox had really said.

With reference to Mr. Fox's statement to Mr. Hicks, a letter from Mr. Fox was placed in as evidence, in which Mr. Fox said: "I desire to say that no one ever approached me, either directly or indirectly, with any offer of money or other corrupt proposal in connection with this legislation. Not only so, but no one has ever approached me since I have been a member of the Legislature with any offer of money or corrupt proposal in connection with any matter whatsoever."

He went on to explain that he had told Mr. Hicks of the details of a proposed settlement whereby the Sandusky company offered to pay Pelee Island township \$50,000 to settle a dispute between them.

### Newspaper Report Correct.

Mr. Hicks, on the stand, said that he would admit that the newspaper report of his utterance at the last Middlesex U.F.O. picnic last June was correct. He was not absolutely sure that he had made a subsequent statement to the newspapers denying the accuracy of the report, and blaming the reporters' mishearing of his statement on the high wind. The member for East Middlesex stated that the seriousness of the charge never dawned on him until after a certain amount of furor had been raised in connection with it. In that there had been no acceptance of the offer he understood to have been made, he thought it insufficiently serious to report to the Government.

T. H. Lennox, K.C., rather pressed Mr. Hicks on this point, but Mr. Hicks maintained that in his judgment it had not seemed necessary or advisable to take it up with the Government or the party of which