

March 27th

SIGNS OF BUCKETING SEEN AT CHRISTMAS BY TAX INSPECTORS

Qualifications of Investigators Discussed by Accounts Committee

SOME ARGUMENTS OCCUR

Information that inspectors of the Department of the Controller of Revenue of the Ontario Government found signs of bucketing in their inquiries into brokerage affairs before Christmas, 1929, was given at the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature yesterday. This discovery was passed on to the Attorney-General's Department, it was stated.

H. R. Boal, Chief of the Inspectors of the Controller's Department, testified before the committee, in reply to examination by W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal Leader. There may or may not be another sitting of this committee. This matter will be decided today, and depends on the Opposition's decision as to whether or not other officials will be asked to testify on the subject of the \$620,314 stock transfer tax in the public accounts.

During yesterday's sitting there were some moments of argument between Mr. Sinclair and Hon. William Finlayson, representing the Government, such as characterized the first meeting of the committee.

Previous Callings.

A statement before the committee showed the previous vocations of inspectors under Mr. Boal as follows: Manufacturer and salesman, commercial traveller, business, high school, bookkeeping, clerk in Registrar-General's Department, and accountant.

When Mr. Boal gave details of the brokerage inspection he stated that now stock deals were incorporated in the reports. He expressed the opinion that the Province did not receive the full tax in past years.

He stated that there were quite a few instances in which the tax was not paid. Moreover, he said, it was shown that in the past there were some cases in which dues were not paid on house accounts.

Mr. Boal stated that the audit in connection with the Security Frauds Prevention Act should aid in collection of taxes in his department, so far as auditing was concerned, but he emphasized that his inspectors were not called on for an audit, but an inspection.

Former Schoolboy.

Mr. Sinclair recalled that one inspector was a "former high school boy." He wondered how Mr. Boal could expect this chap to go into an office and make a report. "He's a very efficient man," said Mr. Boal.

Mr. Sinclair also pressed questions in regard to the work of an inspector who was a former commercial traveller. Mr. Boal declared in regard to all this that the inspectors were well qualified, because they had to deal with one act, and not with the many matters which concerned chartered accountants.

Mr. Boal, in reply to other questions, stated that his department had evidence of bucketing before Christmas, 1929, though it was not considered positive until a check-up was made.

Mr. Sinclair read regulations of 1911 in regard to affidavits from brokers. Mr. Finlayson maintained that the regulation was not an order, but "permissive."

NAMING COMMITTEE BRINGS QUICK END TO OPTOMETRY ACT

Special Body Will Report Back to Legislature Next Year

AIMED AT MAIL ORDER

The Optometry Act of 1930—a very contentious measure, which was aimed directly at the mail-order business in optical supplies, and which had one airing before the Municipal Law Committee of the Legislature—met an unexpected fate before this body yesterday afternoon when last week's adoption of the principle of the measure was rescinded, and the Legislature, as a whole, was asked to appoint a special committee to study the question during the recess, and to report back at the 1931 session.

The bill, as a consequence, expired on the spot.

Karl K. Homuth (Conservative, South Waterloo) and Wilfred Heighington (Conservative, St. David's) were the mover and seconder of the motion resulting in a year's hoist for the measure.

Dr. Paul Poisson (Conservative, North Essex) precipitated the aforesaid action, indirectly or otherwise, when he claimed that too important a question was involved in the bill "to pass it so late this session."

Earle Lawson, one of the counsel supporting the principle of the bill, endeavored to address the committee before the Homuth motion was put, but was howled down.

THRESHERS' LIEN BILL OUSTED IN COMMITTEE

Essex Member Advised to Bring It Back Again

Municipal Law Committee of the Legislature yesterday rejected the bill of Austin B. Smith (Conservative, South Essex) providing for giving threshers a lien in certain cases.

Most committee members took the attitude that there were insufficient farmers' threshing debts to warrant the passing of such a law. Mr. Smith stated that he would not be endorsing the bill if he thought it would work a hardship on the farmers.

Hon. William Finlayson, Chairman of the committee, suggested that Mr. Smith "bring the bill back another year."

ABOLITION OF DOGS FOR HUNTING DEER IS FLATLY REFUSED

Far More Killed by Wolves, in Opinion of Game Committee

LOSS OF LIFE FEARED

Proposals that the use of dogs in the hunting of deer be abolished were emphatically quashed by the Game and Fish Committee of the Ontario Legislature yesterday.

Even the suggestion of Hon. Charles McCrea, Minister of Mines, that the committee, in the interests of conservation and as an experiment, might well eliminate the dogs in the open season section lying north of the French River, was met with a point-blank "No!"

Chief opposition to the "cut-out-the-dogs" movement developed from Thomas H. Bell, Conservative member for Bellwoods; Coulter McLean, Conservative member for Eglinton; Hon. William D. Black, Conservative member for Addington, and D. J. Taylor, Progressive member for North Grey.

Would Stop Hunting.

"Stop us using dogs," warned Mr. Bell, in belligerent tones, "and I am through. I'll never go hunting again. And neither will the Grenville Hunt Club, of which I am a member. And neither, I submit, will 75 per cent. of the hunters who now go into the bush after deer."

Further suggestion that the use of dogs might be discontinued in municipalities protesting against them was also frowned upon—this time, by Mr. Black, who said that any "patchwork" system of application was out of the question.

"What would happen?" he argued. "As soon as the season opened you would find residents of those districts that had abolished the dogs throwing their rifles over their shoulders, slipping chains around their dogs, and invading territory where the dogs could be run."

Preponderance of opinion among the committee members was that far more deer were killed by wolves than by hunters using dogs; that even if the use of dogs increased the kill in deer it more than made up for this by cutting down the loss of human life in the bush.

Due to Still Hunting.

Speaking from 27 years' experience as a physician in the district of Algoma, Dr. J. M. Robb told the committee that in that time he had had to attend seven or eight cases of shooting accidents, and that, in every instance they had been due to still hunting.

Mr. Taylor, who is a well-known sportsman and naturalist, felt that rather than do away with the use of dogs, the committee should recommend prohibition of the killing of deer in the water. It was only in the water that deer chased by dogs were killed. The majority of hunters posted on runways nowadays, were so "green," he said, that they couldn't for the life of them hit a moving deer.