

April 1

# Government Makes \$8,000,000 Errors In Main Estimates

## MR. SHIELDS'S GIBES RILE MR. SINCLAIR AS HOUSE ROARS

### Cartoonist Member Thankful He Is Not a Lawyer

Taking marked exception, in the Legislature yesterday, to a clause in Provincial Treasurer Dunlop's new Succession Duties Bill, which would prevent a lawyer or executor going to the safety deposit box of a deceased client and opening it without some Treasury representative being present, Liberal Leader William E. N. Sinclair got into a prolonged "tangle" with George Shields, the Toronto-Woodbine-newspaper-cartoonist - Conservative member of the House.

"I again take exception to this clause," was Mr. Sinclair's starting shot.

"The law is the same in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and other places," said Mr. Dunlop, "and it has not been found to have worked a hardship on any one there."

**Glad to Learn the Source.**  
"New York, Chicago and Los Angeles," gibed the Liberal Leader. "Well, I'm glad to learn the source of this iniquitous legislation. One cannot always make political speeches to clients in his office. However, when my clients come to me and complain of such legislation as this I will have to tell them, when they object to needless delay and trouble caused by it, that it is another of the Henry Government's acts."

Mr. Sinclair pointed out that there was plenty of succession duties that were never paid; moneys that were hidden where they couldn't be located. In his opinion, there would be evasion of the new legislation. Lawyers could advise clients how to get around the act.

**Mr. Shields Is In.**  
At this point, Mr. Shields—who had "ha-hahed" Mr. Sinclair's remarks earlier in the discussion and had been promptly dubbed "the pet cartoonist of the Telegram" by way of retort—rose in his seat, and quite seriously asked if the Liberal Leader intended the House to believe that lawyers would advise people "to break the law like that." "Does he mean to tell us," he added, "that this mischieving is done on the advice of lawyers?"

"I'll say to my honorable friend that he is not a lawyer," Mr. Sinclair began, but was cut short with Mr. Shields's "Thank the Lord, I'm not."

The House roared. "I've never really known what you were," thrust Mr. Sinclair. "And from some of your work, I wouldn't say it was art."

"Don't get sore," some Conservative member hurled into the argument.

**"So Restful."**  
"It's so restful," smirked Mr. Shields, with a regular Eva Tanguay "I don't care" expression on his countenance.

Mr. Sinclair waved his hand belligerently. "I would suggest," he said, cuttingly, "that my honorable friend go back to his profession, and leave this alone."

"I would suggest," parried the imperturbable cartoonist from the Woodbine, "that my honorable friend go back to the farm he is always talking about."

"I will," snapped Mr. Sinclair, "just as soon as I get away from the sound of your voice."

### They First Showed Retrenchment of \$15,000,000, Then, With Mistakes in Items, Reduction in Province's Program Becomes \$23,000,000

### PRICE EXPLAINS LATEST FIGURES

Errors to the extent of approximately \$8,000,000 that were discovered in the main estimates after their tabling in the Legislature yesterday, and which were called to the attention of the House early this (Wednesday) morning by Attorney-General William H. Price, mean, in effect, that, where the estimates as originally shown registered a reduction of some \$15,000,000 from the estimates of 1931, they now record a retrenchment of practically \$23,000,000.

One vote of \$8,200,000 for "allowances in accordance with the old-age pensions" should have read \$500,000. Colonel Price explained that the Ontario Government anticipated that in 1932 the Dominion authorities would be shouldering the main expenditures on pensions.

Another vote of \$2,569,000 "for allowances in accordance with the Mothers' Allowances Act" should read \$2,250,000. In this connection, the Attorney-General said that a check-up by the municipalities of administration of the act would, in the Government's opinion, save the \$319,000 of a difference between the two figures.

From the look of the main estimates for the fiscal year ending Oct. 31, 1932, which were tabled in the Ontario Legislature yesterday, it would seem that Premier George S. Henry's recently avowed policy of economy and retrenchment for this Province is well under way.

These estimates as tabled, and before the errors were discovered, totalled \$68,002,212—a falling off of \$15,188,853 from the expenditures estimated (at the 1930 session) for the twelve months' business period ending Oct. 31 this year.

#### No Cut in Staff.

No curtailment of existing Government services or of the present staff is indicated in the estimates. The cuts are usually made in bulk items, such as the amount appropriated for contingencies in the different departments and branches. The largest single cut is in the appropriation for the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, which is \$10,605,000, compared with \$28,801,000 last year.

The cut in this one vote alone more than exceeds the cut on the total, but does not indicate an increase in the estimates for any one department. The creation of the new Department of Public Welfare and the reshuffling of the duties of the Provincial Secre-

tary and the Minister of Health necessitated considerable increase in expenditure during the present year, which had to be provided in the supplementary estimates passed by the House yesterday.

#### Education Takes Cut.

Appropriations for the Department of Education are cut by more than \$500,000, largely accounted for by a reduction of \$330,650 in the vote for vocational education. This is expenditure on day and evening classes in cities and towns, grants to schools, special services and contingencies.

Payment to the University of Ottawa for the use of a building, equipment and accommodation for the use of the University of Ottawa Normal School is increased. Travelling expenses and board for students attending the Sturgeon Falls Model School are curtailed from \$30,000 to \$20,000. The University of Toronto receives an increase of some \$30,000 in its grant for providing teachers' training facilities at the Ontario College of Education, the total grant being \$234,175. No change is made in the vote of a grant of \$350,000 to the University of Western Ontario. This is to be paid as may be directed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Queen's University is not mentioned in the main estimates.

The Department of Lands and Forests receives \$2,762,015, compared with \$3,638,090 last year. Included in the curtailment is a cut of \$10,000 in the appropriation for Algonquin Park, which is now \$55,000.

Some light on this was thrown in the House today by Hon. William Finlayson, Minister of Lands and Forests, when he said in a few years he hoped to see the park self-supporting. If revenue from timber was included in park receipts, he said, it would be self-supporting now.

Expenditure on the development of lignite and other deposits in Northern Ontario by the Mines Department, for which \$100,000 was voted last year, is limited to \$50,000. This accounted in large measure for the decrease in the Mines Department estimates from \$523,725 last year to \$443,725 this year.

Estimates for the Game and Fisheries Department are reduced by more than \$250,000, including a cut from \$142,000 to \$90,000 in the vote for erecting ponds and buildings for propagating fish and game, and a cut from \$202,000 to \$270,000 for services and expenses in connection with game law enforcement.

Sharp curtailment in Public Works Department estimates is shown. There is a drop from \$3,384,902 to \$1,057,335. Expenditure on public buildings bears the brunt of this cut, as it declines from \$2,364,817 to \$241,000. To provide additional accommodation in the Government buildings at Toronto, \$50,000 is to be appropriated.

Labor Department estimates are cut by nearly \$100,000, including a cut of \$50,000, or 50 per cent., in the allowance for contingencies, extra help and other matters in connection with the Ontario Government employment offices.

The vote for payment of wolf bounties is cut in half, and is \$50,000. Public accounts of last year, however, show that only a little more than \$50,000 was paid out for this purpose, although \$100,000 was voted. Another miscellaneous item which comes off badly is the allowance for gratuities, which is cut from \$10,000 to \$1,000.