

40-Minute Speech Limit Ejected in 40 Minutes

Members of the Ontario Legislature, most of them anyhow, don't want their remarks compressed into the 40-minute period specified by the Roberts-Grummett resolution which came up for discussion in the Legislature yesterday. The resolution was withdrawn by its sponsor and the House, on a vote of ayes and nays, favored this action.

It took just about 40 minutes to dispose of the matter, which was the time limit proposed by the reso-

lution for a single speech by a private member. Premier George Drew said it was not a Government-sponsored resolution and the members were free to vote as they liked. Personally he felt that any honorable member who couldn't make his point well inside of 40 minutes wasn't going to make it at all.

Arthur Williams (C.C.F., Ontario) thought the resolution wasn't democratic, and said he would vote against it. Another C.C.F. member, John J. Kehoe (Cochrane North), also opposed the resolution. A. A. MacLeod (L.P., Toronto-Belwoods) thought it should be withdrawn and expressed a dislike of "gag rule." H. C. Nixon (L., Brant) was another who saw little value in a speech limitation. The C.C.F. Leader, E. B. Jolliffe, favored the principle of the resolution, with some reservations.

In speaking to his resolution, Kelso Roberts (P.C., Toronto-St. Patrick) said that out of 50 members who spoke in House debates, 20 went over 40 minutes. W. J. Grummett (C.C.F., Cochrane South) thought if members didn't ramble from Terehan to Timbuctoo and confined their remarks to Provincial affairs, no difficulty would be experienced in keeping speeches within 40 minutes.

Seeing that the discussion was going nowhere fast, Premier Drew said all members knew exactly how they felt about the matter and a vote should be called. Then Mr. Roberts offered to withdraw the resolution and the members put an end to the 40-minute proposal by agreeing with him.

HEPBURN SEES 'SLUSH FUND' POSSIBILITY

Ex-Premier Mitchell F. Hepburn challenged in the Legislature yesterday the constitutionality of a Government bill to amend the Milk Control Act so as to permit establishment of a fund for salaries and expenses of officials of the Milk Producers' Association.

The bill, introduced for second reading by Highways Minister George Doucett in the absence of Agriculture Minister T. L. Kennedy, stood over pending a ruling by the Speaker as to whether the bill is ultra vires of the Legislature, and whether the measure should have been introduced as a private bill since it provides for private taxation. The levy would be taken from producers' cheques.

"I protest against the introduction of the vicious check-off system into agriculture," declared Mr. Hepburn. "It was largely due to this system that John L. Lewis was able to raise a huge slush fund."

Of this \$500,000 had gone to President Roosevelt's campaign fund, he added. The new bill, he contended, "seeks to impose a tax levy of \$125,000 on the producers for the benefit of a few individuals. It seeks to give a self-constituted private organization the right to tax, and should be introduced as a private bill."

Mr. Speaker said he would give his ruling today.

Among a number of bills receiving second reading was one calling for the two-platoon system for fire departments in urban centres above 10,000 population, and another removing doubt as to the right of the Fire Marshal to enter premises where there has been a fire, and giving power to order removal of buildings within 50 feet of hospitals, schools, hotels, etc., for safety reasons.

Another bill gives municipalities the right to enter into agreement with the Provincial Police for policing their areas. Quite a few requests for this right had been received, Attorney-General Blackwell told the House.