

SPEAKER READS HOUSE LECTURE UPON DECORUM

Plea for Less Use of Personalities Follows Stormy Session

MORE LEGISLATION DUE

Hon. Nelson Parliament, Speaker of the Legislature, took occasion yesterday to read some rules of conduct to the members of the House, and to ask that they observe the courtesies of debate and stop the too liberal use of personalities.

"I ask the honorable members to obey the rules of the House," said the Speaker. He said that he desired to see the debates kept on the highest possible plane, and the members give the best that was in them when speaking, but he did not want the too free use of personalities.

Follows Stormy Session.

The Speaker's ruling came after a rather stormy session. There had been several matters called to the attention of the House before the orders of the day were called, and the last one, a question by G. G. Halcrow of Hamilton East of T. Tooms, Peterboro' West, the latter said he refused to answer. Then Mr. Parliament read from the Manual certain definitions of decorum during debate. H. H. Dewart, Southwest Toronto, asked what that had to do with Mr. Halcrow's question, and the Speaker explained that matter was settled; that he was bringing this matter to the attention of the House after several days' deliberation on the subject. There was a passage-at-arms between Mr. Dewart and the Speaker, the Speaker calling peremptorily for order and telling the Southwest Toronto member that a rule of the House was that no member could speak while the Speaker was on his feet.

Premier Drury intimated to Hon. Howard Ferguson that he would bring down some more legislation this session, but he did not care at this time to say what this legislation would be.

ASSESSMENT BILL DIES IN COMMITTEE

Only five members of the Private Bills Committee of the Legislature supported the bill sponsored by H. P. Hill (Conservative, Ottawa), at yesterday's committee meeting, and the measure was thrown out. Mr. Hill's bill proposed exemptions which, according to Assessment Commissioner Forman, would have meant the loss of \$20,000,000 in assessment to Toronto alone.

When the committee came to consider the measure there were presented telegrams from Galt, Windsor, Brantford, Sarnia and Fort William, recording the strong opposition of those cities. Windsor claimed it would lose \$1,000,000 in assessment if the measure became law. Ottawa's representative said the Capital city would lose \$4,500,000 in assessment. George F. Henderson, K.C., Ottawa, supported the measure, claiming that the present law amounted to double taxation.

The chief proposal in the defeated measure was that no person should be assessed "in respect of dividends derived by him from shares in the stock of a corporation carrying on a mercantile or manufacturing business, which is also subject to business assessment."

It also provided that subscriptions to charitable and educational objects should be allowed as deductions from income to the extent of 15 per

OUTSIDE FIRMS AFRAID TO TAKE CHIPPAWA JOB

GABY GIVES TESTIMONY

The increase in the cost of the construction of Chippawa, due to the jump in prices of materials, labor, interest charges and duty, between 1917 and 1921 totalled approximately \$28,500,000, F. A. Gaby, Chief Engineer for the Hydro-electric Commission of Ontario, told the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature yesterday. These increases do not include additional costs due to sales tax and higher freight rates.

Mr. Gaby told the committee that the increases were made up as follows: Payrolls and labor, about \$12,500,000; cement and material, from ten to eleven millions; duties, about one million; interest charges, about four millions.

Increases Over 1921 Estimates.

Answering a question of Sam Clarke, Mr. Gaby said the increases over the estimates of January, 1921, were due to various factors. The shovels came six weeks late, and that held up the work. These shovels did not do the amount of work anticipated, falling down in that respect about 40 per cent. The forms purchased for concrete work in lining the canal, though the best that could be obtained at that time, were a failure, and they had to be redesigned. In all, the commission lost about three months on the concrete work. Other additional costs were for the more scientific design of the intake to cope with ice troubles. He said the Government had submitted a detailed cost of installing five units to the Government in February of this year.

Costs Rose 66 to 80 Per Cent.

Mr. Gaby said that over the period 1916 to 1921 there was an increase in the cost of materials of from 66 to 80 per cent. The bulk of the cement used, said Mr. Gaby, was during 1920 and 1921. He said that, allowing 80 per cent. for the increase in the cost of materials, there would be from ten to eleven millions of dollars for the increased cost of material entering into the work. The increased cost of duty would be included to some extent in this. He had not yet worked out what the increases would amount to in the case of surtax and higher freight rates.

Mr. Gaby was asked if the commission had gone on the assumption that the machinery would be obtained free of duty. He said it had, and the duty had amounted to from three-quarters of a million to a million dollars. The commission was unable to purchase the machinery in Canada, as it was not made in this country.

Interest charges were approximately about four millions over and above what they were estimated to be. In 1916 the commission had an estimate for interest providing for \$1,628,000. The actual interest charges were due not only to increased cost of the work, but to the increased rate of interest. The increased rate brought the actual interest charges to about six millions. Operations on the canal had been proceeding since 1917, so that there was an average approximately of 10 per cent. interest over the total capital charge on the job.

Overhead Not Costly.

Overhead for administration and engineering costs did not exceed 2½ per cent. of the total cost, Mr. Gaby said. The labor cost was around 50 per cent. of the total. Administration in overhead included items in contracts charged to contractors.

Up to 1920 conditions of labor and material were chaotic, and up to that time not more than 25 per cent.