

Mar. 23.

# NIXON AMENDMENT SCORES GOVERNMENT FOR TAX INCREASES

Should Have Obtained People's Mandate Before Acting

## RULED OUT OF ORDER

The attempt of Hon. Harry C. Nixon, Progressive Leader, to move an amendment to the resolution on the corporation tax declaring that the Government had no mandate to increase taxation in view of its platform promises of reductions was quashed in the Legislature yesterday when it was ruled by T. A. Murphy, Chairman of the Committee of Supply, that the amendment was out of order, since it had the effect of negating the original resolution.

Mr. Nixon's amendment read: "That the following words be added to the resolution: 'This Government has no mandate, in view of the platform promises of tax reductions on which it was elected to office, to impose such new and increased taxation, in some instances as high as 300 per cent., without first submitting its new policy to the electors in a general election.'" Later, across the floor of the House, Mr. Nixon changed the "300 per cent. increase" to "400 per cent. increase."

### Says He Has Mandate.

The view of the Progressive Leader that the Government had not a mandate from the people was strongly opposed by Premier Henry, who declared: "We have a mandate to carry on the business of administration. Our first responsibility is to present a balanced Budget."

The imposition of the corporation tax, W. E. N. Sinclair, the Liberal Leader, averred, showed how hard put to it the Government was to get money.

"We don't overlook an opportunity of getting a dollar for Old Man Ontario," Hon. E. A. Dunlop, the Provincial Treasurer, countered.

Mr. Sinclair considered that the Government was open to the most severe criticism. "It seems to me," he said, "that it is time for financiers to get together and decide at what rate issues can be sold to the people, and stop experimenting with the public."

"I am afraid the taxpayers will not think these are emergency taxes at all," he went on. "They will think they are very serious taxes. It is most unfortunate that the Treasurer, in a year like this, must increase taxation." Mr. Sinclair thought that a tax of \$200 would be severe on small branch banks in rural districts, where they were established for the benefit of a small community, and he foresaw the closing of many such branches.

Mr. Nixon reminded the Government benches that no attention had been paid until the end of the last session to a resolution, early introduced by the Opposition, urging the need of rigid economy.

"The Government," he thought, "is rather belated in bringing forth suggestions of economy, which burst forth in the most picayune—is that the right word?—way." He stated that \$1,500,000 had been thrown out to rich money-lenders in connection with the loan, "and yet they reduce the tobacco allowance of the poor devils in the reformatories from one small package for four days to one small package for five days."

"Most of these big corporations are going to pass on the tax to the little fellow," he continued. "The Government should agree not to proclaim these taxes till after a general election. I would promise that, if they were returned, and if I were in the House, I would raise no objection then to the taxes."

Mr. Nixon reiterated his suggestion that three-man Commissions should be reduced to one. "I don't see why one man of a Commission should receive more than the Prime Minister."

"That is the one thing I agree with you on," commented George Shields (Conservative, Woodbine).

"Who was performing the duties of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board when he was in the Pyrenees Mountains for sixty days?" J. A. Sangster (Liberal, Glengarry) asked. Mr. Henry replied that the Government was not niggardly with its civil servants, and that that period was little more than the usual vacation period.

It was felt by William Newman (Liberal, Victoria North) that such corporations as milling concerns would find the burden very heavy.

## M'CREA UNDER FIRE FROM OWN BENCHES FOR BAN ON DOGS

Toronto Member-Sportsman  
Deplores Introduction  
of Measure

### SECOND READING GIVEN

At 12.30 this (Wednesday) morning the Ontario Legislature gave second reading to Hon. Charles McCrea's Game and Fisheries Act amendments, providing, among other things, for a Province-wide ban on the use of dogs in the hunting of deer. Debate on the dog issue, for no other amendments were even considered—occupied a good two and a half hours of the House's attention.

While making it clear that he had no intention of "bolting" from his party on the question—"for I'm with my party, be it right or wrong," he said—Thomas H. Bell, Conservative member for Toronto Bellwoods, and well-known sportsman, gave the Legislature a few electric moments, when from the Government he pleaded "sporting treatment of a sporting proposition," urged that no action with regard to the proposed all-Provincial ban on dogs in deer-hunting be taken until the Black Inquiry Committee had reported, and strongly condemned the last-hour introduction of the legislation that would wipe out the dogs.

### Made Up Mind Year ago.

Mr. Bell deliberately charged that the Government made up its mind a year ago to do away with the dogs,

but in spite of that many sportsmen, at a cost of hundreds of dollars, had been permitted to attend the recent meetings of the Fish and Game Committee of the House, there to renew their stand for the use of the hounds.

"They were called by the committee," explained Mr. Bell, by way of reply to Hon. Charles McCrea, Minister of Game and Fisheries.

"Not to my knowledge," said Mr. McCrea.

Coulter McLean (Conservative, Toronto-Eglinton) and a member of the Black Committee of investigation, warmly supported the attitude of Mr. Bell, and told the House that it was wolves, not dogs, that were accountable for the greatest loss in the deer. **Termed "Brave Man."**

William Newman (Liberal, North Victoria) expressed the view that Mr. McCrea was "a brave man" in bringing down such legislation. His constituents, he said, were all for the dogs, and he felt that the conservation objective which Mr. McCrea sought by banning the dogs could be more readily achieved by extending the anti-wolf policy and adopting other conservation measures common to some of the States of the Union.

D. J. Taylor (Progressive, North Grey), who, like Mr. Newman, is a

member of the Black Committee, claimed that easily 75 per cent. of the hunters in Ontario were behind the dogs, and suggested that, instead of the dog ban, the Government should adopt a buck law and prevent the taking of deer in water.

Mr. McCrea, in his remarks, pointed out that last year dogs had been banned north and west of the French and Mattawa Rivers, and the result has been beneficial. In Canada dogs are banned in the Provinces of Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There are no deer or moose on Prince Edward Island. They are banned, too, in most of the States of the American Union.

Deer had been depleted in recent years and the Government believed that one of the greatest contributing factors was the use of dogs. As far back as 1892 the question had been discussed and an investigating com-

mittee had reported against dogs, said the Minister. Wolves might be to blame in the winter for a large loss of deer, but not in the summer when they could escape into the water. He promised the bill would pay handsome dividends in conservation.

## FIRE INSURANCE BILL NOT TO BE ADOPTED

Singer's Measure Not Acceptable in Its Existing Form

### BACK TO COMMITTEE

Although the House felt that some action should be taken to prevent discrimination such as that of which E. F. Singer, K.C., the Conservative member for St. Andrew's, complained, the decision was reached in the Ontario Legislature at 1.25 o'clock this (Wednesday) morning that his insurance bill, destined to put an end to the alleged practice of fire insurance companies in refusing risks on racial grounds, could not be adopted in its existing form. The bill after being given second reading was referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

Premier Henry said he could not believe that Mr. Singer was fully justified in thinking that his own policy had been cancelled through racial or religious grounds; he had, he said, made inquiries, and found that, simultaneously with the cancelling of Mr. Singer's insurance, some sixty other policies had been cancelled by the same firm. The Premier read out the names of many of these former policyholders, indicating that, as he said, a third of their number did not present the appearance of being of Hebrew or other discriminated race.

It was a strange situation, thought W. E. N. Sinclair, for this country. He hoped that the committee would be able to produce legislation, a hope which was shared by E. J. Murphy (Conservative, St. Patrick's), who suggested that the matter come before the Legal Bills Committee. That the Government should see to the matter was also the view of F. W. Wilson (Conservative, Windsor East), W. W. Staples (Conservative, Victoria South), and C. A. Robertson (Liberal, North Huron).

The House adjourned at 1.30 a.m.