### "Tammany" Tactics Charged in Debate On Police Matters

# PRICES OF WINE MUST GO DOWN, HEPBURN SAYS

#### Premier Insists Consumer Benefit From Tax Relief to Industry

The tax relief which his Government is giving the wine and grape industry must be passed on to the consumer in the shape of lower wine prices. Premier Hepburn stated last night.

The Premier's fiat hit into a wine war which has been going on since the Government announced it would repeal the wine tax in the interests of the hard-hit grape growers.

Some wine men are reported as strongly opposed to any use of this tax reduction to cut wine prices. These objections, it is reported, delayed setting of the lower prices, last week, until April 1. Last night, the Premier made it clear that this was only a stay, and that prices must go down in the interests o the whole industry.

The repeal of the wine tax, which has stirred up the grape and wine industry controversy, was put through first reading in yesterday's Legislature.

"A reduction in taxation." Hon.

Harry Nixon reminded Conservatives.

Premier Hepburn's statement after the Legislature killed any winery hope that the Government would permit the tax reduction to be taken up at the winery. The Premier even knifed hopes that the wineries would be required to put more grapes in their gallonage. The Government, he said, was not going to interfere with the making

"The growers are misinformed," the Premier said when informed of the

industry protests.

"The Federal Government made it a condition of the excise reductions of last spring that the various Liquor Control Boards give corresponding reductions in prices. That brought hard liquor prices so much in line with wines that it dropped wine consumption."

The Premier said the Ontario tax was being lifted to benefit the Ontario grape-using wineries. It must be passed on to the consumers.

"The tax reduction is not designed for the wineries, but for the industry as a whole, which can only benefit when it can compete with hard liquors—which they can't do at present. The price of wine is altogether too high in comparison with hard liquors."

#### Bill to Give Councils the Right to Appoint Boards Withdrawn

City Hall" and her Polices and appointments for the past five years were the subject of warm crossfire in the Ontario Legislature yesterday.

#### Party Lines Broken.

Precipitated by the motion of Ian Strachan (Lib., Toronto-St. George) for second reading of his bill which would give the elective Councils of larger municipalities the power of appointing Police Boards, which now rests with the Provincial Government, the discussion broke party lines on both sides of the House before the motion was defeated.

Mr. Strachan's motion, almost inaudible, was interpreted by Opposition members as a request for withdrawal of the bill, but the Speaker ruled otherwise, and discussion began.

Leopold Macaulay (Con., York South) insisted that Mr. Strachan had declared his opposition to proceeding with the bill, and demanded an explanation.

"I can't think of any subject," he said, "that more requires the letting in of light than police affairs, not only in Toronto, but elsewhere. I would like to hear some of the arguments for this bill which must have been advanced to the member for St. George before he undertook to introduce it. I see that the honorable member is being prompted by his Minister to enlarge on his reasons for withdrawal."

#### Not in Sympathy.

"No reasons were given me in support of this bill," retorted Mr. Strachan. "Its object is to place Police Commissions under municipal control. I'm not in sympathy with it. It was introduced along with a number of others."

W. A. Baird (Cons., Toronto-High Park) wanted to know why the Attorney-General replaced the Toronto Police Commission members in 1934, and added that it was clear Mr. Roe-

buck wished to control police administration throughout the Province.

J. J. Glass (Lib., Toronto-St. Andrew) said: "There is a certain amount of politics behind this bill. It is not so innocent as it appears. The Commission at the present time belongs to a political stripe which is slightly different from that of majority of the City Council. It also happens that last year's Mayor was out of sympathy with that stripe, represented by the members at my right. So the Council found itself in a peculiar position.

"The Police Commission was not in political sympathy with the Council, so somebody had this bright idea. Personally, I am opposed to it. The Province, in my opinion, has a larger view of the question of peace, order and good government than have the small municipalities. If I were in Council I would argue against it there, as I do here."

#### Roebuck Protests.

Attorney-General Roebuck protested against Mr. Baird's charge that he was seeking to dominate police affairs in

the Province. "In one-and-a-half years, while this Government has been in power," he pointed out, "only one Police Commission has been changed in its personnel by this department. So that, so far as Commission appointees go, the hand of the old Conservative Administration still controls police affairs, with that one exception, throughout Ontario."

"The idea of this bill," proceeded the Attorney-General with heat, "springs from the Tory idea that abhors the principle of a single Liberal in the Tammany-controlled City Hall of Toronto. This is a bit of political manoeuvring to get the Police Department out of the hands of a Commission and into the control of the political cliques that infest the City Hall. One can hardly imagine anything more disastrous than that I commend the honorable member for St. Patrick for not supporting the bill." He urged that it be killed at once.

Hon. W. H. Price, former Attorney-General, uttered the only support of the measure when he pointed out that it merely gave the Council the right to select the Judges or Magistrates who would join the Mayor on the membership of the board.

#### Poor Showing.

"Incidentally," added Colonel Price,
"I don't think that the Toronto Police
Department showed itself up so well
as it might in one recent report."

"Didn't all the wrongdoing and pilfering occur under your regime?" countered Mr. Roebuck.

"Not all of it," retorted Colonel Price. "And any way, we weren't responsible. Our administration ordered the Dorland probe, which went a certain distance—although I believe it should have gone farther. The further we get away from the idea that when these Commissions act they do so at the direction of the Provincial Government, the better it will be. Steps should be taken to remove the impression that police policies throughout Ontario are being dominated by the Attorney-General's Department."

Mr. Roebuck bluntly asked if Colonel Price supported the bill. Colonel Price admitted it was a poor bill.

Premier Hepburn rose to cut short the discussion. "This bill," he said, "is not acceptable to the Government."

The House then defeated, with one dissenting voice—the dissenter could not be identified—the 'motion for second reading of Mr. Strachan's bill.

## INCOME TAX BECCMES LAW

#### \$100,000 Said Already Paid by Citizens

Ontario's income tax became law when it received Royal assent yesterday afternoon, and it was rumored a few hours later that \$100,000 has been already paid in on the tax.

Some of this, it was reported, was paid more than a month ago. The explanation is that every year wealthy people who are starting on winter cruises have been in the habit of making payments to take care of their Dominion tax, which falls due on April 30.

This year they sent the Ottawa Government another half installment to care for any tax bill that might be coming down to Ottawa from the Ontario Parliament Buildings.