

Feb. 21

SIGHTLESS WORKERS GIVEN COMPENSATION IN NEW LEGISLATION

Price Introduces Act Aiming to Encourage Their Employment

NEWSPAPER UNDER FIRE

With the introduction of the new Blind Workmen's Compensation Act figuring as the most important item, the Ontario Legislature yesterday held its shortest sitting of the session—about 20 minutes.

But within that 20-minute period was jammed a good deal of public business. Three new bills were introduced; the Government answered four questions on the order paper, and Wilfrid Heighington (Conservative, Toronto-St. David) indulged in a castigation of a King Street evening newspaper for what he claimed was a misinterpretation of his attitude in the House on Thursday.

The new Blind Workmen's Compensation Act was introduced by Attorney-General Price. The purpose of this act, according to an explanatory note, is to encourage the employment of blind workmen by relieving employers of the apprehension that they might otherwise be under of employing blind workmen, and thereby increasing the possibility of accident and cost of compensation.

Consider Previous Awards.

The act provides that compensation to blind workmen over \$50 will be paid by the Province on receipt of a certificate from the Workmen's Compensation Board. Other sections of the act provide that the board, in allowing compensation to a blind workman, may consider any previous award it may have made to the same individual. For instance, he may have received from the accident causing his blindness 100 per cent. compensation before coming under the terms of this new act. Another section of the act states that it rests with the board to levy a fair assessment on an employer on the wages of a blind workman.

The act further provides that no blind workman shall be deemed to come under the provisions of the act unless he has been properly placed by officers of the Canadian Institute for the Blind.

Paper's Comment Absurd.

Before the orders of the day were called yesterday Wilfrid Heighington asked the privilege of the House to take exception to a report in a Toronto evening newspaper's account of his remarks the day before on the bill to make uniform laws relating to wills. The report, he said, commented that his remarks on this subject indicated signs of dissension among Government followers. Such a comment, he said, was

(Continued on Next Page.)

patently absurd. The legislation had been brought forward for discussion; discussion had been invited by the Attorney-General.

"It is a clear case," he said, referring to the article, "in which the wish is father to the thought. Were it not for the partisan motive behind the comment it would be too parochial to merit discussion. My respect for the Leader of the House and the Attorney-General is undiminished. But I shall continue to take part in discussions on matters of interest to the Province and my constituency which come before this House."

Another act introduced by Attorney-General Price yesterday exempted owners or occupants of premises who install their own lightning-rods from the provisions of the Lightning-Rod Act, which requires manufacturers or installers of lightning-rods to be licensed and to register.

The Government's answers to questions by members provided some interesting information. S. C. Tweed (Liberal, Waterloo North) could not take much information out of the answer to his question, however. The question was: "Did the Ontario Government's representative in Great Britain, Mr. Noxon, have the Government's approval when he advocated Empire free trade in 1929?"

Briefly, Premier Henry replied that the question contravened Rule 24, which provided that no question shall contain a statement of fact.

Hon. Charles McCrea, in answer to a question by W. J. McKay (Liberal, South Bruce) stated that no payments had been made by the Province during the last year under the Iron Ore Bounty Act, and no applications for payments had been received.