

March 17

Asks Legislators To Forget Party In House Division

**South Grey Representative
Says No Real Criticism
Yet Offered—Heighing-
ton "Hopes" Figures Are
True**

ACRES ON ATTACK

A plea that the Opposition forget party lines and vote with the Government on the Budget was made in the Legislature last night by Farquhar Oliver (U.F.O., South Grey). No real criticism of the Budget had been offered by the Opposition, he claimed, and it would be a fine act if they made approval unanimous.

"Party lines are not drawn so tightly as they once were," said Mr. Oliver. "This is a good Budget—a sound, business-like statement of our financial affairs."

Lauds Minimum Wage.

The U.F.O. member praised the Minimum Wage for men. He said farmers, generally speaking, look with suspicion on a minimum wage and trade unions, and one could hardly blame them. But the minimum wage for men would increase purchasing power and this increased power would mean increased markets for products of the farm.

"If employers were all Good Samaritans we would not need a minimum wage act, workmen's compensation, and all the other social legislation now on the statutes," he said. "But there is the employer who grinds the faces off the workers and it is to protect men from this type that we must have legislation of this kind. I hope the day is not far distant when farmers will have a set price for their products. That would be all the minimum wage the farmers would want."

Government Commended.

The Government's rural Hydro policy came in for praise, Mr. Oliver pointing out that 1,500 miles of rural line would be constructed this year, as against 800 miles last year. The reduction in the service charge and the twenty-year contract were of great benefit to the rural communities, he emphasized.

Turning to various aspects of the Budget, Mr. Oliver commended the Government on its financial policy and voiced approval of the Provincial income tax and the strengthening of the succession duty tax. Both taxes were sound and equitable, he claimed. The handing back of tax reductions to the public could not be commended too highly, for it showed that the Government was seized with the principle that any surplus rightly belonged to the taxpayers who made it possible.

Mr. Oliver agreed that the amusements tax on lower-priced tickets was a nuisance tax and was rightly abolished, but he expressed the opinion that people who could afford to pay \$2 for admission to a wrestling bout or a theatre could well afford to contribute something to the Provincial Treasury.

The Hepburn Government's methods of collecting succession duties was described as "reactionary gouging," by Wilfrid Heighington, in the Legislature yesterday. Delivering an address on the Budget, the Toronto Conservative labelled the Budget as "superficially brilliant" and an "election budget."

Immediate objection to the criticism of the succession duties policy was taken by Premier Hepburn,

who said he resented the words, "reactionary gouging."

"The Government doesn't gouge," declared the Prime Minister. "We collect from estates where fraud has been shown."

"Not one case has been given where fraud has been shown," declared Mr. Heighington. "If there is fraud, there is a criminal code to which these people should be subjected. I insist that the Government's policy is open to the suggestion of retroactive gouging."

Hopes Figures Correct.

Mr. Heighington quoted an excerpt from the Premier's Budget speech in which he said that if people came forward voluntarily and gave information to the treasury officials concerning monies due from their estates, they would be given a complete discharge and no penalties other than interest, would be inflicted.

"In other words, if you come forward and admit your sins, all will be forgiven," said Mr. Heighington.

"Which is true Christian ethics," retorted the Prime Minister.

"There are such things as condoning a felony," retorted the member for St. David. "The Government had better be careful. Culprits should be taken to court, not dealt with in this manner. The Government has gone to great lengths to collect this revenue."

As far as the Budget surplus was concerned, Mr. Heighington said he hoped the very rosy figures were true. He hoped they were more reliable than the facts and figures on which the Attorney-General persuaded the House to repudiate the Hydro contracts.

Hurls Many Charges.

A. H. ("Holly") Acres (Cons., Carleton) crowded a half-dozen major charges into forty minutes of debate. He attacked the Government on its Budget presentation, its highway, Liquor Board, Milk Board administration, its agricultural policy, its administration of unemployment relief, and wound up his address by charging the Government had no specific policy on anything.

The House reacted with laughter on a score of occasions as members tried to interrupt the Conservative in his lengthy blast of charges. He would permit no interference.

"What's your policy?" J. J. Glass (Lib., St. Andrew's), asked once.

"If I had the final say in this Province, not one man would be unemployed by the first of May," retorted Mr. Acres.

"What work would you give them?" Mr. Glass pressed.

"If they were all like you it wouldn't be hard to keep them going," he replied.

The Conservative addressed a remark to the Premier, who reminded Mr. Acres he had been in the House all afternoon. "I've been sitting in back bench," said Mr. Hepburn. "I wouldn't miss this treat for anything."

Sees No Ontario Vote.

J. J. Glass (Lib., St. Andrew) took it on himself to prognosticate that there would be no Provincial election this year, and that another session would be held and another Budget brought down before that election occurred.

"How close are you to the Government?" asked Opposition Leader Henry.

"I'm sufficiently close, like every other Liberal member, to know what's going on," replied Mr. Glass. "There are no closed doors."

"How many caucuses have you held this year?" asked Mr. Henry.

"It doesn't matter whether we've had two or twenty caucuses," snap-

ped Mr. Glass. "The fact remains the Government takes us into its confidence, and we aren't a lot of rubber stamps like the Conservatives were when their Government was in power."

Charges Dictation Attempt.

The back-concession farmer would be handed back only one dollar of the seven-million-dollar surplus reported in the Budget, J. A. Craig (Cons., Lanark) charged in his analysis of the Government's financial position.

"I think some slick, smooth American has come over here and told the Prime Minister that unless he sold new timber it would go to rot," Mr. Craig continued, switching his argument to an attack on the Government's timber policy. He questioned the wisdom of selling ripe timber for pulp purposes. Ontario would profit only \$10 a cord from the pulpwood, but the American interests would ultimately profit \$50 per cord, he said.

Dealing specifically with the Budget, Mr. Craig declared the Prime Minister was "apparently trying to run every municipality in the Province" by dictating the manner in which the one-mill subsidy was to be spent.

Osler Once Tied to Tree

Dr. Tanner Refers to Physi- cian's Life While Child- ing Conservatives

Sir William Osler, one of the world's greatest physicians and surgeons, was chained to a tree when he was a child because his mother was too poor to have some one look after her offspring, Dr. G. E. Tanner (Liberal, Simcoe East) informed the Legislature last night.

This interesting chapter in Sir William's history was revealed by Dr. Tanner when he took the Conservative Opposition to task for having tried to make political capital in the recent East Hastings by-election out of the case of a youngster who was tied to a tree in summer and to a chair in winter because mental hospitals were so crowded no attention there was available to him.

"That was foolish," chided Dr. Tanner. "Lots of kids are chained to trees or tied to them to keep them out of mischief. Why, even Sir William Osler—and I'm familiar with his history—was tied to a tree when he was a child because his mother was too poor to have some one look after her children. Surely Sir William was not mentally deficient."