

M.P.P.'s Cider, Not Shell, Caused Big Explosion Near Paris During War

Mysterious Warehouse Blast, Blamed on German 80-Mile Gun, Now Attributed to 'Kick' in Horace Colliver's Brew

When Horace Colliver, Conservative member for Prince Edward, spoke before the Agriculture Committee of the Legislature yesterday, he may have cleared up—if quite unconsciously—a mysterious warehouse explosion which occurred on the outskirts of Paris back in 1913, and which, at that hectic time in the life of the French Capital, was attributed to the "beaucoup bombard" of the Germans' famous 80-mile gun.

Mr. Colliver, who is an apple-shipper of considerable prominence, as well as a tried and faithful supporter of the Henry Government and of the Ferguson Administration before that, has, during his business career, engaged in the manufacture of high-grade ciders, and in 1918 was "hard put," so to speak to find a home market for the apple concoction he was then turning out. Much of his product had to be treated with a special powerful preservative to maintain its sweetness, and had to be put up in 120-gallon casks for purposes of the long storage which the uncertain markets necessitated.

On one occasion, when Mr. Colliver was looking anxiously around for buyers, he managed, more by chance than anything else, to negotiate a sale to the French trade. It did not take him long to root out his oldest cider stock and despatch it to Montreal and a waiting ship.

On the Montreal dock, however—as Mr. Colliver related the incident to the committee yesterday—a number of the containers blew up. The rest got safely away—to Paris—and, as far as Mr. Colliver knows, to the very suburb of the city wherein occurred the long-unsolved explosion for which "Heinic" for years has had to take the blame.

"I'd hate to think that those cider casks of mine raised all that row in Paris," said the Prince Edward member to The Globe last night.

"You never can tell," parried The Globe.

"That's true," said Mr. Colliver. "You never can tell. And, come to think of it, that stuff certainly had one awful kick in it."

Registration Sought Of Ontario Barbers

Provincial registration of all barbers and their places of establishment in Ontario is said to be sought through a bill of which Fred G. McBrien (Conservative, Toronto-Brockton) has given notice to the Legislature, and which, it is expected, will be introduced to the House at an early date.

At the present time the legislation is reported to be under consideration of Hon. Dr. J. M. Robb, Minister of Health. The bill, it is said, would provide for an annual license fee, and for stiff penalties for any contravention of regulations which, it is understood, would later be requested to implement the legislation.

Old-Age Pensions For 36,932 Persons

Persons receiving old-age pensions in Ontario now total 36,932, according to a statement made in the Legislature yesterday by Hon. W. G. Martin, Minister of Welfare, in answer to questions by F. R. Oliver (U.F.O., Grey South). The total amount paid under old-age pensions up to the end of the last fiscal year was \$6,546,000. Mr. Oliver also asked: "How many farmers, whose wives and children own the land on which they are living, are depending on the act?" The Minister replied that there was no statistics regarding this matter.

INCOME TAX BILLS UP ON WEDNESDAY

Civic Entertainment and Police Pensions Measures Approved

Announcement that a special body, either a commission or a committee, would be appointed to study the entire Municipal Act in a leisurely and thorough way before the next session, was made by Hon. Leopold Macaulay, Provincial Secretary, at yesterday's meeting of the committee of the Legislature on municipal law. The Provincial Secretary stated that the purpose of such a body would be to bring the Municipal Act up to date, and to this end deputations would be heard from various communities and their cases studied.

Several bills affecting Toronto and other municipalities were passed at yesterday's sitting of the Committee on Municipal Law. It was announced that bills respectively to abolish and to make optional municipal income taxes, would come up at the meeting of the committee next Wednesday. F. G. McBrien (Toronto-Brockton) was successful with several bills before the committee. These included amendments to increase the amount of money Toronto can spend on entertainment from \$20,000 to \$30,000 yearly; to permit the city to pay pensions to the dependents of policemen killed in the performance of duty, and to create a new Ward 9. Mr. McBrien's bill to enable cities to reduce the speed limit in parks to a lower rate than fifteen miles per hour, was defeated.

Considerable discussion arose over a bill introduced by Wilfrid Heighington (Toronto-St. David), at the request of York Township, to enable municipalities adjoining cities to regulate the location of incinerators. Other city members voiced opposition to this on the ground that Toronto was seeking legislation to enable it to buy a site for incinerators outside the city limits. Mr. Heighington explained that the bill would not prevent the city establishing an incinerator in another community, but would simply give the township the right to regulate its location. The bill was carried. Another bill, sponsored by Mr. Heighington, was carried, which provides that after a property is sold, taxes owing, and assumed by the purchaser, shall not disqualify the vendor from election to public office.

REFERENDUM PLEA GETS COLD HEARING BY LEGISLATORS

ories Adhere to Recently Stated Policy and Vote Solidly

NIXON ATTEMPT BEATEN

Liberals, U.F.O. and Progressives Vote Together—Labor With Conservatives

The principle of referendum and plebiscite in dealing with the liquor question was decisively defeated in the Ontario Legislature yesterday.

The motion which would put the House on record as adhering to this principle was voted down by 81 to 16. Conservatives stood as one against the motion, and they pounded desks to welcome the support of the lone Labor member in the Opposition benches—Earl H. Hutchinson, Kenora.

That was the only extra help the Government members got from the Opposition side yesterday. Progressives, U.F.O. and all the Liberal members in the House voted for the motion by Harry C. Nixon, Leader of the Progressive group.

Ironical Welcome.

Mr. Nixon rather ironically welcomed the Liberal support, contrasting it to the "Damon and Pythias" attitude of the Liberal House Leader and the Government of the day before.

William E. N. Sinclair, in support of the motion, stated that it was substantially the same principle he had advocated in the last election, and upon which his constituents in South Ontario had returned him to the Legislature.

Premier Henry, opposing the motion, restated the Government's position that the liquor question and all important public questions should be settled by the Administration on its own responsibility. The principle of referenda, plebiscites and recalls, shifting responsibility from where it properly rests—with the Government—was incompatible with British institutions, he declared. His support of a plebiscite in 1924 he defended as a transition move back to responsible government from the unusual conditions following the wartime measure of the Ontario Temperance Act.

The Call for a Vote.

Mr. Nixon's motion read as follows: "That this House affirms its adherence to the principle of referendum and plebiscite, and believes that an opportunity should be given to the people of Ontario to vote on the liquor question in this manner when a sufficient public demand for such action is apparent."

The debate carried speakers back into recent and more remote history of plebiscites and referenda on the liquor question in this country. Mr. Nixon's point that the Conservative Administration itself had adopted the principle with the approval of such leaders as Sir William Hearst, Hon. G. Howard Ferguson and Sir George Foster was countered from the Government side with statements that plebiscites had been held by Liberal statesmen, Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir George Ross, but that the prohibition majorities had never been implemented with legislation.

To Reduce Spending.

One of the outstanding pleas of the