

ONUS ON APPLICANTS UNDER SINGER BILL

Amended Measure Is Approved by House Committee

Fred Singer's bill "to put an end to a practice on the part of fire insurance companies of discriminating against applicants for insurance on the ground of their race or religion" was approved by Legal Bills Committee of the Legislature yesterday after an amendment had been inserted which puts the onus of proof of discrimination upon the applicant instead of compelling the companies to prove no discrimination, as the original wording of the bill in effect provided.

The amending clause, as drafted by R. Leighton Foster, Superintendent of Insurance, says: "Any licensed insurer which discriminates unfairly between risks within Ontario because of the race or religion of the insured shall be guilty of an offense."

Fred G. McBrien (Conservative, Toronto-Brockton) tried to have the bill hoisted for another year, but his motion that it be shelved found no seconder. Much publicity had been given to the matter, he contended, and he felt that the situation would work itself out in twelve months' time.

After much argument, in which the various insurance companies were well represented, Hon. Leopold Macaulay, Committee Chairman, called for the vote, which was unanimous for the bill as amended.

TILLEY FIRM'S FEES REVEALED TO HOUSE

\$150,000 From Government in Six Years—Silent on Hydro Payments

Attorney-General Price's formal reply in the Legislature yesterday to an Opposition order paper question from Hon. Harry C. Nixon, Progressive Leader, reveals that since 1926 the legal firm of Tilley, Johnston, Thomson & Parmenter has received from the Ontario Government fees and retainers totalling \$150,000.

Of this sum \$82,500 was received by the Tilley firm for work done under brokerage prosecutions during the past two years. Work in connection with the separate school litigation brought \$50,000.

In connection with the brokerage cases, the fees were as follows: General, \$20,000; Rex v. Mowatt and Rex v. McGillivray, \$2,000; Rex v. McLean, \$1,000; Rex v. Wray, \$1,000; Rex v. Draper, \$1,000; Rex v. Solloway and Rex v. Mills, \$2,000; Rex v. Hepleston and Rex v. Shutt, \$2,000; Rex v. Smart, \$3,500; Rex v. Young, \$3,500; Rex v. Patterson, \$3,500; Rex v. Campbell, \$3,500; Rex v. Stobie, \$3,500; Rex v. Forlong, \$3,500. In the additional cases against Solloway and against Mills—twelve charges of theft being laid against this brokerage firm—the fee charged by the Tilley firm was \$10,000. In the appeals launched by the brokers, the Tilley firm's fee for perusal, preparation, etc., was \$10,000 when convictions were confirmed. In 1928, the Wenige v Judd action brought the firm \$150. Fees for water power reference, as paid in 1929, but covering work extending from 1926 to 1928, and also the Georgian Bay Canal charter matter, were set by the Tilley firm at \$15,000; \$12,500 was the retainer paid by the Government in connection with the Stimson Company prosecutions.

The separate school litigation bill was paid partly in 1926 and 1927, and the balance in 1928, although services rendered by the firm in connection therewith extended from 1924 to 1928, inclusive, and included travelling expenses and disbursements. For services of Strachan Johnston, K.C., in connection with the Security Frauds Prevention Act, the Government paid the firm \$2,000 in September, 1930.

With only one sitting day of the session left, the Government has still to answer Mr. Nixon's question as to what fees and retainers have been paid the Tilley firm by the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission since Jan. 1, 1926. This question has been standing on the order paper of the House since Feb. 18.

NO ACTION TAKEN ON VOTERS' LISTS

Supporting Nesbitt Move, Premier Suggests "Next Session"

IN TIME FOR ELECTION

On the undertaking of Premier George S. Henry that "something might well be attempted next session of the House," Russell Nesbitt, Conservative member for Toronto-Bracondale, yesterday withdrew his Legislature resolution calling for the appointment of a special select committee to consider the best means of improving the method of preparing the voters' lists for Provincial elections.

The Prime Minister agreed with Mr. Nesbitt's attitude that steps should be taken to provide a more up-to-date list, and, furthermore, expressed the belief that expenditures pertaining thereto should be borne largely by the Province. He felt that the present situation could be taken care of—in time for the next Provincial election—by appointing a committee in the early hours of the 1933 session with power to investigate and report back its findings and recommendations.

"And they might have a little look over the Election Act at the same time," put in Hon. Harry C. Nixon, Progressive Leader.

"If my honorable friend thinks there is anything wrong with the Election Act," returned Mr. Henry, "we might look at that, too."

Mr. Nesbitt, who has been a doughty fighter for years for a better system of preparing the lists, reiterated to the House yesterday his argument of a year ago, stating that, while it was too late now to name a committee this year, he hoped the Government would see its way clear to appoint such a body "at its convenience," and that much good would come out of any inquiry authorized to its care.

Liberal Leader William E. N. Sinclair claimed that Mr. Nesbitt's argument deserved the support of every member in the House. It was a funny thing to him, he said, that no practical voters' lists, either in the Dominion or Provincial arenas, were available to members of Parliament. In his belief much of the responsibility for the situation was due to the placing of preparation of lists in inexperienced hands. A special committee of members, he felt, would be able to straighten conditions out in a comparatively short while.