

Duty of Government.

"It may be new to the Attorney-General, but it is as old as Parliamentary practice," said Mr. Ferguson. It was the duty of the Government, which was the Executive of the House, to look into this bill and tell the House what it meant. Every bill introduced by a private member should be allocated to its proper department, and gone over by the Government officials.

Mr. Raney raised a point of order. He thought Mr. Ferguson was out of order. Mr. Ferguson said he would move the adjournment of the debate. Mr. Raney pointed out that Mr. Lewis had not yet finished his speech. The Conservative Leader said he moved the adjournment of the debate with the consent of Mr. Lewis—and Mr. Lewis did not object.

The Conservative Leader declared that every bill that came into the House affecting a branch of the Administration should be allocated to the Minister having charge of that branch, reported on by officials of the Crown, and that information should be available to members of the House. The Government, he continued, should be in a position to tell the members what the bill was, and how it affected the laws on the statute books, and he maintained that there were plenty of eminent authorities to back him up as to the soundness of that doctrine.

Need for Legal Advice.

J. C. Ramsden, Southwest Toronto, observed at this point that if the bill had been introduced by one of the lawyer members representing Toronto, instead of by a layman, they could have the bill properly discussed.

Thomas Marshall, Liberal member for Lincoln, said that, from his experience and observation in the House, he thought the practice as set out by Mr. Ferguson was generally followed. Some member of the Government, he said, had always previously been prepared to direct the House as to the bearing of proposed legislation. He recalled that bills had been delayed in coming before the House because the Government used to say it had not yet considered them. He instanced the late Hon. W. J. Hanna in this respect.

J. C. Tolmie thought it was a mistake to send a bill to committee, and more or less endorsing the principle, without discussing this principle. It was up to the Government, he thought, to tell the House what the principle of this bill was. Mr. Hall thought the bill should be discussed in the House.

Obstructionist Tactics?

The Attorney-General said that "all the dust raised" about precedent "in that corner of the House" was for the purpose of delay. "It is not in order for a member of the House who introduced a private bill to put the onus of explaining the bill on someone else," he asserted. Personally, he said, he was always willing to help any member with a bill. In this particular case, he thought, it was quite idle to suggest that the mover was not qualified to bring in the bill, as he understood the member for Northeast Toronto had had several years of experience in assessment matters. If a private member, who introduced the bill, did not acquaint himself with the contents of a bill, they could not blame the Government.

Mr. Nickle resented the expression of the Attorney-General about "raising dust." Why were members not entitled to ask Ministers to have a memorandum prepared so as to give the House the purport of bills? he asked. There was so much legislation being introduced into the House, said Mr. Nickle, varying statutes by leaving out a comma here, and changing a word there, that he found himself swamped in keeping up to the task of finding what bills meant.

Has Information on Tap.

"I have an elaborate memorandum on this bill, and I am prepared to give it to the House when the time comes," said the Attorney-General.

Mr. Nickle said then, to use a sporting phrase, "his hat was in the ring." The Attorney-General had a memorandum. He knew what the law officers had said about what the bill meant.

"I have a right to know what the law officers say that bill means," said Mr. Nickle. If the Attorney-General had the memorandum he should give the members information. There was no justification in keeping them in the dark. Private

members were entitled to information from paid officials of the Government.

M. M. MacBride, South Brant, said he thought the bill should be defeated.

The Attorney-General said that, when Mr. Lewis had completed his motion introducing the bill, then he would make the explanation.

Mr. Lewis then made a short explanation of the bill, and Mr. Raney said the information contained in the memorandum would be at the disposal of private members. The bill then passed second reading.

The bill, the provisions of which have already been explained in The Globe, gives municipalities the right to assess for income tax the profits of partnerships, in the same manner as those of incorporated companies are now assessed.

RANEY'S AEGIS AVAILS NAUGHT

He Adopts Bill Which Later
Meets Defeat in
House

WOULD SET ASIDE WILLS

The bill introduced by Edgar Watson (North Victoria) to secure adequate provision for the maintenance of the wife and children of testators was defeated yesterday on second reading in the Legislature.

The attack on the bill was led by Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, W. F. Nickle (Kingston), and Charles McCrea (Sudbury). Hon. W. E. Raney, Attorney-General, spoke in favor of the bill and said the Government was quite content it should go to committee and be enacted into legislation.

When the standing vote was taken it was found that the Opposition members were solidly against it and about a dozen Government supporters, including Hon. R. H. Grant, Minister of Education, also voted against it.

Override Faulty Will.

The contentious clause in the bill was as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or statute to the contrary, where any person, hereinafter called the testator, dies, leaving a will and without making adequate provision therein for the proper maintenance and support of his or her wife or husband or minor child, the court may, in its discretion, on the application by or on behalf of such wife, husband or child, order that such provision as the court thinks adequate, just and equitable in the circumstances shall be made out of the estate of the testator for such wife, husband or child."

Mr. Watson, in explaining the bill, said it had been asked for by leading women's organizations. It enacted that where, in the opinion of the court, adequate provision had not been made for the wife, husband or children of a testator, then the court could order payment out of the estate for their maintenance.

Mr. Nickle said he could hardly believe his ears when he heard the Attorney-General say he approved the bill. The bill, he said, struck at the very foundation of individual liberty, and said a man would not be allowed by will to make disposition of his own property.