

CITY'S BILL PASSES HOUSE COMMITTEE; HAMILTON'S IS CUT

Expenditure of Not Over
\$180,000 Provided for
Centenary

GRANT TO WESTERN U.

Toronto's municipal measure received unchallenged approval from the Legislature Committee on Private Bills yesterday, but the most contentious clause of the Hamilton bill was summarily rejected.

The Toronto bill provided for: Annexation of a part of the westerly approach to the Lake Shore bridge, over the Humber; extension of the agreement whereby the city pays the Toronto Transportation Commission deficit on ferry operation, last year amounting to \$36,000; expenditure of not more than \$180,000 for celebration of the Centenary, a special committee of ratepayers to supervise all outlays; lumping of still unspecified grants in a sum not to exceed \$75,000; validation of tax sales; authorization to reduce frontage rates of properties on main traffic arteries, or exempt such properties, the city to bear the amount of any special assessment involved.

From the Hamilton bill was knocked out the clause whereby the Board of Health was to gain authority over school health services. This clause was opposed by the Board of Education because the city's measure would make permanently binding an agreement which the Trustees still regard as tentative only. "It's practically putting the Board of Health over the public schools," said Attorney-General Price, committee Chairman, in opposing the clause.

Hamilton's measure formed the occasion for committee jollity. "What Hamilton wants today, the rest of us want tomorrow," remarked Mr. Price. Two clauses validated repayment of taxes which the city had had no authority to collect: \$6,369 in local improvement rates to the Separate School Board and \$78 to the Peerless Wire Fence Company for non-existent water service. Another clause authorized alteration of sewer rates on East Sixteenth Street.

Kingston's bill received approval, and provided for acquisition of property from the Dominion Textile Company and validation of a \$75,000 debenture issue for the purpose. The London bill, as explained by City Solicitor Meredith, authorizes a grant of \$25,000 to the University of Western Ontario for construction of a library as a relief work; construction of the Richmond Street bridge, also a relief work; creation of endowment funds for Victoria Hospital and the War Memorial Children's Hospital; and payment of \$13,500 to defray expenses of the General Hospital's building campaign. All received assent.

The Collingwood bill's main provision, as explained by J. E. Jamieson, M.P.P., was concerned mainly with assuring elasticity in the town's financing, and was unopposed. The Brantford Y.M.C.A. gained approval for an act permitting it to acquire property outside the city.

HUTCHINSON FILES QUESTIONS IN HOUSE

Answers From Government
Sought by Durham, South
Renfrew Liberals

Pursuing subjects brought up in his contribution to the debate on the Address in the Legislature, Earl Hutchinson (Labor, Kenora) yesterday filed a series of questions of the Government.

Mr. Hutchinson asks if the Department of Northern Development entered into a contract with Crawley & McCracken three years ago for feeding men on Government work. Further, he wishes to know if tenders were called, and, if so, who bid for the job. He is interested in the personnel of the firm, the situation of its head office, and in details of their arrangement with the Government and with their receipts to date. Did the Government, he asks, guarantee a minimum number of men at any time, and what was this number? On what date was the rate cut, and on what date in 1933 increased?

Renewed broadcasts of questions were directed against the Government by Liberal members. Under the name of W. J. Bragg (Durham) appears a set of queries concerning C. Alfred Maguire, Hydro-Electric Commissioner. "Has the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario any property insured with Maguire & Cannon?" asks Mr. Bragg. "If so, what is the amount? Is the Mr. Maguire of that firm C. Alfred Maguire of the Hydro-Electric Commission? Is C. Alfred Maguire the Canadian representative of the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool, England? Has the Hydro any property insured with the Royal Insurance Company? If so, what amount?"

In another question, Mr. Bragg wished to know whether licenses of timber limits are permitted to use their concessions as security for loans or debts.

T. P. Murray (Liberal, Renfrew South) asks if the Abitibi Power and Paper Company holds undeveloped water power on the Long Sault Rapids, Abitibi River, and on what terms?

NO CONCLUSIONS REACHED IN DEBATE UPON ROD LICENSES

Pros and Cons Are Thrashed
Out by Toronto Anglers
Association

DECLARED A DRAW

Heralded as "the big fight of the year," the debate over rod licenses came to an inconclusive issue last night and was declared a draw when the members of the Toronto Anglers' Association, filling the auditorium of Foresters Hall, divided evenly in the vote on the question.

Champions of the license baited their opponents with taunts of not paying a cent towards the maintenance of the fishing grounds of Ontario, and declared that if they did contribute to the revenue of the Fish and Game Department, they would be in a position to insist on action toward restocking accessible waters and otherwise looking after the interests of Toronto anglers.

The negative anglers cast back with declarations that there was enough of taxing for this and that already, that if the Government once got its financial hooks into this new source of revenue there was no telling where it would end and that the money raised probably would never be spent on improving fishing, anyway.

Gregory Clark and Frank Cooper spoke for the affirmative; Harvey McCool and Dave Reddick for the negative.

Free Public Fishing.

The recent ruling by the department that farmers might charge for public fishing in restocked streams, said Mr. Clark, practically eliminated such free public fishing as had ever been enjoyed in Southern Ontario. With the payment of rod licenses, anglers could press their rights for the restocking of public waters in accessible places and advocate with some right that the Government lease banks of streams stocked at the general expense for public fishing. "Dollars," he said "is the language Governments listen to." Late, in his reply, Mr. Clark declared that from one year's revenue from a rod license, the finest bass hatchery on the continent could be established.

Strong doubts that the Government would use such revenue in the interest of fishing was expressed by Mr. McCool. Mr. Cooper quoted figures to show that in the last three years hunters and non-resident anglers had contributed \$1,100,000 to the department. Mr. Cooper explained that the proposal would be to have one license for a family including children up to 16 years.

"Like Bribes to Children."

The arguments in favor of rod licenses were like the bribes parents offered children to take castor oil, declared Mr. Reddick. The Government did not need the workingman's dollar to replenish streams. Let them, he said, use the profits from tourists. He was skeptical that the tax would remain at the dollar mark.

The debate was conducted by Vice-President James McHardy, while the President, William Lang, occupied the chair for the other part of the meeting which was featured by a demonstration of knot tying by Frank Cooper, and moving pictures of Alaska and the Yukon.