

## WALDRON TO APPEAR BEFORE COMMITTEE, DECISION REACHED

House to Suspend Judgment Pending Report, Henry States

### SPEAKER EMPOWERED

Gordon Waldron, K.C., is to be called before a special committee of the Legislature in connection with his statement that E. J. Murphy (Conservative, St. Patrick's) was paid to introduce the bill to repeal the Optometry Act of 1931. This was the decision arrived at yesterday on the motion of Premier Henry to this effect.

The committee will have full power to call for the production of all papers, papers or documents, and can take the evidence under oath. The Speaker will have power to issue any warrants necessary. The committee consists of: Hon. Charles McCrea; J. F. Hill, Hastings East; A. B. Smith, Essex South; P. W. Wilson, Windsor East; and C. E. Richardson, Perth South, Conservative; S. C. Tweed, Liberal, Waterloo North, and D. J. Taylor, Progressive, Grey North.

Mr. Waldron is quoted as saying: "If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution." Mr. Murphy withdrew his motion to have a special committee appointed, and Premier Henry moved one in its place, setting out the offense and the jurisdiction of the committee.

The Premier stated that this was the procedure usually followed in such cases, and that the House would suspend judgment pending the committee's report. "The alternative would be to summon the distinguished gentleman before the Bar of the House. That might be followed; but I do not think it is the usual procedure, or one we would care to follow. It has been a long time since any one has been before the Bar of the House, if there ever was one."

W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal House Leader, maintained that the proper procedure would be to have Mr. Waldron called before the Bar. "I submit that, as the matter complained of affects this Assembly, it is necessary to have the person charged before this Assembly. He should be brought before the Bar to make any statement he cares to make before he goes to a committee."

Mr. Murphy declared that the remarks of Mr. Waldron were vilifying and scurrilous, and that a mere apology would not be enough. There were penalties in the Legislative Act to cover the case, he said.

## Subcommittee Urges Probe of Milk Prices

The Subcommittee on Dairying sitting at Queen's Park yesterday recommended that the Ontario Department of Agriculture institute an inquiry into milk prices "if the department was not satisfied with the investigation at Ottawa." The motion was sponsored by T. P. Lancaster (Conservative, Peterboro' County). At present the Provincial Minister of Agriculture is co-operating with the Ontario Milk Producers' Association on the question.

## ALL-PARTY SUPPORT GIVEN TO PRINCIPLE OF MORTGAGE BILL

Will Apply to Renewals Under Three Years Where Interest Is Up

### IS SENT TO COMMITTEE

All parties in the Legislature favor the principle of the Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, brought down by Attorney-General W. H. Price. During the discussion of the bill yesterday, only two Conservative members, Wilfred Heighington (Toronto-St. David) and E. C. Graves (St. Catharines), raised objection to its provisions, and no member of the Liberal or Progressive groups opposed it. It was given second reading and referred to committee for the ironing-out of the details.

Two members, Hon. James Lyons (Conservative, Sault Ste. Marie) and D. J. Taylor (Progressive, Grey North), thought that the bill might have gone further than it did and provide protection in the case of those who had a large equity in their properties. Some provision should be made to protect this equity, they said.

In speaking to the bill, Colonel Price said that there had been many suggestions made, which could all be taken up in committee. Last year's act had applied to principal alone, but there had been many renewals. It had been suggested that the present bill should not affect renewals. The act, he said, would apply only in case of those renewals for a period of less than three years, and where there had

been an increase in interest. Asked by Hon. Harry Nixon if he was going to bring in amendments, Colonel Price said that he would suggest them in committee.

Another suggestion was that where a person had kept up his payments during the six months' period, as instructed by the Judge, he should have a right to another six months. "Naturally, we couldn't have it drag on indefinitely. There would have to be some limit. Then there is the covenant. The Judge would have to bring all parties to the covenant before him," Colonel Price noted.

"There will be some small amendments to make it more clear, and there might be some recommendation as to where the applications can be made. There is also the question of an appeal. I do not think there should be any appeal. The Judge's decision should be final. It has also been suggested that the mortgagee might have the same privilege of making an application as a mortgagor. That is another thing to be taken up. And this bill does not affect taxes, and has no effect on the municipalities. That should be made clear. It is purely for the relief of mortgagors and owners of properties."

W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal House Leader, stated: "It would appear to me to be an honest effort to deal with the problem and to deal fairly with people on both sides. On the one hand there is the principle of abiding by contracts made in good faith," he said, adding that care should be taken not to frighten people from investing money.

In his attack on the bill, Mr. Heighington did not think that the bill maintained an even balance between the debtor and creditor and thought it was a "serious inroad on contractual rights." Mr. Graves wanted to know what would happen the widow who was living on the interest of a mortgage. Colonel Price replied that she would be probably better off, as the Judge would see that some payments were made if the mortgagor could make them, while if he could not she would get nothing any way. If she did foreclose she would not be able to sell the property.

## ABUSES ARE CITED UNDER PENSION ACT

Bill Would Prevent Property Being Transferred to Heirs

### NEGLIGENCE IS SEEN

Members of the Legislature are of the opinion that there should be a general tightening up of the regulations of the Old Age Pension Act so as to eliminate abuses which have crept into the workings of it. They took advantage in the House yesterday of citing several of these abuses when Hon. W. G. Martin's bill to amend the present act, so as to provide that lands owned by pensioners should be registered, and upon such registration they could not transfer them without consent of the Commission, was being discussed. The bill was given second reading.

The Minister of Public Welfare gave instances of pensioners who had transferred properties they owned to heirs so as to prevent the Commission from recovering from the estate the amount which had been spent in giving the pension.

"As a result of the rigid inspectorial work of the Old Age Pensions Commission during the past two years hundreds of pensions have been cancelled or reduced. This represents a yearly saving of about \$500,000," he said. "In addition to this many thousands of dollars have been recovered in refunds from persons who secured pensions by some fraudulent means or by misrepresentation of assets."

"With all the inspectors there are, it is coming at a late date to say that \$500,000 has been recovered," said J. A. Sangster (Liberal, Glengarry). "That should never have been paid out. All this should have close scrutiny. This should not have gone on for two or three years. There must have been negligence somewhere."

Hon. James Lyons (Conservative, Sault Ste. Marie), remarked: "Candidly I do not think we are going far enough. The Pension Board should be protected against transfers during the two or three years prior to pensionable age. It is being abused and the act is being violated in more ways than one." He stated that one man made an application in his city for a pension and it had been found that he had \$7,000 in the bank. In another case a man had appealed to the city to provide him with wood. He had a \$5,000 home; \$3,000 paid-up insurance; his father-in-law who was living with him was getting \$20 a month pension, and his mother-in-law had a bank-book showing \$2,000 credit. "And the old man's showed another \$2,000."

Hon. Harry C. Nixon, Progressive Leader, favored the pension system, but wanted to know if a proper check-up was being made as to the ability of children to pay for the upkeep of the parents. W. Newman (Liberal, Victoria North) stated that in his county a list of the recipients of pensions was published, and this stopped rumors as to who was and who was not getting the pension.