

MEMBERS OF HOUSE REBUKED BY HENRY FOR UNREADINESS

Sponsors of Public Bills
Not Prepared for Sec-
ond Readings

BILL IS WITHDRAWN

Members of the Legislature who have introduced public bills were rebuked at yesterday's sitting by Premier Henry for not being prepared to speak to their second reading. Of the fifteen such bills on the order paper of the House awaiting their second reading, only one could be dealt with, because those sponsoring the others had various excuses to make as to why they were not ready to proceed.

After a brief session, on this account, the Prime Minister reminded those present that the Legislature was now in its fifth week. "I would urge those with bills to be ready to go ahead with them. This (that introduced by W. Newman, Liberal, Victoria North, respecting threshers' liens) is the only bill for today. All the other members gave some excuses, and asked that their bills be allowed to stand."

Objections Raised.

Mr. Newman's bill, which would have given threshers preference over most other creditors in the matter of collecting debts, and which would have allowed them to put a lien on sufficient grain to pay for the threshing, was withdrawn after there had been an overwhelming objection registered to it. At present threshers can take enough grain to pay them for the work, provided they take it with them when they leave the farm after threshing.

After Mr. Newman had explained the purpose of the bill, and stated that it would lower the costs of threshing to farmers, as the threshers would be able to do it more cheaply if they were assured of getting paid, Hon. T. L. Kennedy, Minister of Agriculture, recounted how a similar bill had been twice previously defeated. He was, however, willing that it should go to a committee, where it could be decided how it would affect the farmers.

Most of the opposition to the bill

came from Mr. Newman's colleagues on the Opposition benches. F. W. Elliott (Liberal, Bruce North) declared that it would give special consideration to one class of creditor.

"Probably the machine men are at the bottom of this," observed J. A. Sangster (Liberal, Glengarry). "I believe in fair play to all, and I cannot see any merit in the bill. The claim that it would reduce the price of threshing is the most absurd part of it."

A. B. Smith (Conservative, Essex South) favored it. It gave preference to the thresher who went in and made the crop marketable, he said. "It should be killed right now," commented C. A. Robertson (Liberal, Huron North). "I have yet to find any one who is worrying over it." W. H. Elliott (Conservative, Rainy River) was the third member to support it. Fifty per cent. of the threshing costs in his constituency were in arrears, he said.

Progressive's Viewpoint.

"It is true that the ability of the farmer to pay is impaired. But the merchant and every one else are in the same position as the thresher. If the Minister can see any benefit to the agriculturists in this, then he has more foresight than I have. It is purely a class bill, and there is no need for it," stated D. J. Taylor (Progressive, Grey North).

W. J. MacKay (Liberal, Bruce South) stated the bill would enable threshers to take the grain at threshing time when it was cheap and hold it until the price went up, thus profiteering. Hon. Harry C. Nixon, Progressive Leader, objected to the clause stipulating that permits must be taken out for each threshing machine. Some farmers, in more prosperous times, had purchased machines of their own.

Henry Urges Withdrawal.

Observing the opposition to the bill, Premier Henry urged its withdrawal, as it was not proved that it would benefit the farmer. Hon. James Lyon, H. S. Colliver, (Conservative, Prince Edward) and T. P. Murray (Liberal, Renfrew South) also opposed it.

Hon. H. C. Nixon, Progressive Leader, introduced his bill which would have the effect of preventing the present Legislature from continuing on into a "lame-duck session." Mr. Nixon contends that the legislation providing for a five-year term for a Legislature was not intended to apply to the present Administration. His bill would allow the present Legislature to run for four years from the fifty-fifth day after the issuing of the writs for the 1929 election. This would end it in November of this year. The bill would not apply to subsequent Legislatures, which would run for the five-year term. The bill was given its nominal first reading.

First Reading Given.

First readings were also given to Hon. William Finlayson's Northern Ontario Appropriation Act for 1933, setting the appropriation at \$3,000,000—last year it was about \$5,000,000; and to another prohibiting settlers who are given nursery stock from selling it.

Second reading was given to a City of Toronto bill clearing up the deed to the Toronto Harbor Commission of lands south of the Toronto Terminals Railway right of way and between Yonge and Berkeley Streets. Arrangements for the deed were made between the Commission and the Toronto General Trusts Corporation and the National Trust Company in 1913, and a supplemental deed was given in 1931. Second readings were also given to bills validating debentures of Cornwall and Ottawa, and allowing Welland to give a fixed assessment to the Empire Cotton Mills.

COMMITTEE AGREES TO DON VALLEY BILL

Amendment Allows Rate-
payers to Pass Previous-
ly on Debentures

ARGUMENTS ARE HEARD

While the Don Valley improvement bill was given approval by the Municipal Committee at Queen's Park yesterday, consent was not received before several heated passages occurred regarding the use of unemployed on road work at low wages. Amendment to the bill, made in committee stage, will allow the rate-payers of interested municipalities to pass on the debentures before the work can proceed.

The bill of Liberal House Leader Sinclair providing that all cities may have Boards of Control, was approved but certain minor amendments will have to be made before it can reach the House.

The City of Toronto bill providing that the income of a deceased partner in a company be subject to income tax was thrown out. The proposed legislation asked that income of the deceased partner, which now goes to the estate and escapes income tax, be taxable the same as that of the remaining partner.

When the Don Valley improvement bill was being considered citizens and Councillors from East York voiced strong opposition to it. The deputation declared East York would not countenance the placing of men on relief at this work unless they were paid wages on a level with the township's wage scale.

"I am opposed to using men in work as serfs for the benefit of wealthy men," asserted Deputy Reeve John Doggett. "What do you mean by serfs?" he was asked. "Men working for grocery tickets," replied Mr. Doggett.

Hon. James Lyons (Conservative, Sault Ste. Marie), and Mayor of that city, declared that East York was using more petty politics than real argument. "I am amazed," said he, "when I hear men admit that the cost of municipal relief is around \$50,000, and in the next breath refuse to let people pay a share of the cost." Hon. William Finlayson, Chairman of the committee, agreed the municipalities should have the issue of debentures authorized by the ratepayers, but observed that East York "didn't go to the people to ask if we (the Government) would pay 80 per cent. of the relief costs."