



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

JOURNALS
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

From JANUARY 25th, 1921, to MAY 3rd, 1921
(BOTH DAYS INCLUSIVE)

IN THE ELEVENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF
OUR SOVEREIGN LORD, KING GEORGE V.

Being the Second Session of the Fifteenth Legislature of Ontario.

SESSION 1921

Printed by order of the Legislative Assembly.

VOL. LV



TORONTO:

Printed and Published by Clarkson W. James, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty

1921

Printed by
THE RYERSON PRESS

INDEX

TO THE

FIFTY-FIFTH VOLUME

11 GEORGE V, 1921

ACTON, VILLAGE OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 21. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 34), introduced and referred, 109. Reported, 180. Second reading, 189. House goes into Committee on, 209. Third reading, 222. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 94.)

ACCOUNTS, PUBLIC:—See *Public Accounts*.

ADDRESS:—See *Lieutenant Governor*.

AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS ACT:—

Bill (No. 99), introduced to amend, 68. Second reading, 89. House goes into Committee on, 99. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 29.)

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 30.*) Printed.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT:—

1. Bill (No. 97), introduced for the promotion of, 68. Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 105-7. Second reading and referred to Select Committee to be named, 107. Committee named, 110. Reported, 127. House goes into Committee on, 250. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 32.)
2. Bill (No. 98), introduced to finance, 68. Second reading and referred to Select Committee to be named, 107. Committee named, 110. Reported, 127. House goes into Committee on, 253. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 31.)

AGRICULTURAL AND EXPERIMENTAL UNION:—

Report presented, 319. (*Sessional Papers No. 32.*) Printed.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES:—

Report presented, 86. (*Sessional Papers No. 42.*) Printed.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT:—

Bill (No. 100), introduced to amend, 68. Second reading, 89. House goes into Committee on, 99, 253. Third reading, 253. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 30.)

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION :—

1. Committee appointed, 29. Report, 352.
2. Members added, 30, 36.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF :—

1. Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 29.*) Printed.
2. Report of Statistics Branch presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 46.*) Printed.

ALGONQUIN PARK :—

1. Question as to purchase of licenses within limits of, 185.
2. Question as to timber sold in, 222.

AMUSEMENTS TAX ACT :—See *Billiard Rooms.*

ANATOMICAL ACT :—

Bill (No. 167), introduced, 172. Second reading and referred to **Legal** Committee, 189. *No report.*

APPLE EXPORT :—See *Fruit.*

ARCHITECTURE :—

Bill (No. 227), introduced respecting the practice of, 253. Second reading and referred to a Select Committee, 328.

ARCHIVES PROVINCIAL :—

Reports presented, 276, 319. (*Sessional Papers No. 52.*) Printed.

ART PURPOSES :—

Committee appointed, 20. *No report.*

ASSESSMENT LAW :—

1. Bill (No. 70), introduced to amend, 31. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 96. Reported, 320.
2. Bill (No. 83), introduced to amend, 44. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 136. Reported, 320.
3. Bill (No. 87), introduced to amend, 44. Second reading negatived, 96.

4. Bill (No. 92), introduced to amend, 66. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 98. Reported, 320.
5. Bill (No. 103), introduced to amend, 81. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 155. Reported, 320.
6. Bill (No. 140), introduced to amend, 131. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 154. Reported, 320.
7. Bill (No. 149), introduced to amend, 141. Order for second reading discharged, 339.
8. Bill (No. 151), introduced to amend, 145. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 175. Reported, 320.
9. Bill (No. 190), introduced to amend, 200. Second reading negatived, 231.
10. Bill (No. 260), introduced "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921," 321. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 375. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 67.)

ATHLETIC COMMISSION:—See *Ontario Athletic Commission*.

ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF:—

Question as to any amounts received by any Official, for Counsel Fees, or costs, upon appeals, or motions to quash convictions *re* O.T.A., or other legal matters, 167.

AUDIT ACT:—

Bill No. 133), introduced to amend, 120. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 164. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 9.)

AUDITOR, PROVINCIAL:—

Report presented, 165. (*Sessional Papers No. 54.*) Printed.

AUTOMOBILE MARKERS:—

Question as to where purchased; if tenders asked for, 58. See *Motor Cars*.

BACKUS, E. W.:—

Return ordered, of correspondence etc., relating to Lake of the Woods Pulp Concession and White Dog Rapids Water Power, 380. *Not brought down.*

BEECHWOOD CEMETERY COMPANY:—

Petition for Act respecting, 21. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 22), introduced and referred, 64. Reported, 138. Second reading, 154. House goes

into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 136.)

BEE-KEEPERS' ASSOCIATION:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 37.*) Printed.

BELANGER, J. N.:—

Question as to superannuation of, 150.

BELLEVILLE, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 21. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 3), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 71. Second reading, 97. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 145. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 95.)

BILLIARD ROOMS, POOL ROOMS AND BOWLING ALLEYS:—

Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's Assent signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 176. Bill (No. 178), introduced to license, 181. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 224. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 14.)

BILLS:—

1. Introduced *nem. con.*, 160. 171. 194. 200. 235. 260.
2. On suspended Rule, 201. 245. 308.

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGE ACT:—

Bill (No. 222), introduced to amend, 252. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 326. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 50.)

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES AND DEATHS:—

Report presented, 139. (*Sessional Papers No. 20.*) Printed.

BOAL, R. A.:—

Question as to identity of, 82.

BOND BUILDING:—

Question as to leasing of, etc., 133. See *Buildings.*

BRANTFORD, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 21. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 7), introduced and referred, 64. Reported, 180. Second reading, 189. *Not proceeded with.*

BREAD:—

Bill (No. 113), introduced to amend Municipal Act respecting delivery of, 90. See *Municipal Law*, 10.

BRUTON, TOWNSHIP OF:—

Question as to settlement between Hydro-Electric and, as to purchase of properties in, 243.

BUILDINGS:—

Return ordered, showing what buildings, in Toronto, are employed for Government use, outside Legislative Buildings, 151. Presented, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 91.*) Not printed.

BURDEN, S. K.:—

Question as to leave of absence, or suspension, 114.

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT:—

Bill (No. 108), introduced to amend, 82. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 155.

BURLINGTON BEACH ACT:—

Bill (No. 181), introduced to amend, 193. Second reading, 224. House goes into Committee on, 230. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 34.)

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT:—

Question as to submission of necessary Plans, under the, 111.

CANADIAN COPPER COMPANY:—

1. Resolution that it is the duty of the Government to institute proceedings under the Mining Tax Act, to recover from the, areas of taxes, etc., and Debate on adjourned, 70. *Debate not resumed.*
2. Question as to what lands, or mining rights, in Sudbury Nickel Belt, leased to, etc., 100.
3. Return ordered, of correspondence with George E. Buchanan relating to leases of nickel bearing lands in Township of Creighton, 117. Presented, 171. (*Sessional Papers No. 79.*) Not printed.

CANADIAN NATIONALITY:—

Question as to printing of pamphlets, etc., 47.

CARLETON, COUNTY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 44), introduced

and referred, 81. Reported, 227. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 257. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 96.)

CARS:—See *Motor Vehicles. Motor Cars.*

CEMETERIES ACT:—

Bill (No. 110), introduced to amend, 88. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 118. Reported, 352. House goes into Committee on, 369. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 86.)

CENTRAL ONTARIO POWER SYSTEM:—

Question as to what work were acquired by Government, on purchase of, 362.

CHARRON, PIERRE:—

Petition for Act respecting the Title to certain lands, devised under the Will of, 38. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 50), introduced and referred to the Commissioners of Estate Bills, 88. Reported adversely, 166.

CHATHAM, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 18), introduced and referred, 35. Reported, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 97.)

CHILDREN:—

1. Bill (No. 60), introduced respecting the Legitimation of, by subsequent intermarriage of their Parents, 25. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 98. Reported, 188. House goes into Committee on, 224. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 53.)
2. Bill (No. 109), introduced for the protection of, of unmarried parents, 88. Second reading, 126. House goes into Committee, 165. 206. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 54.)
3. Bill (No. 120), introduced respecting the adoption of, 97. Second reading, 189. House goes into Committee on, 205, 223. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 55.)
4. Question as to data, with regard to employment of, 322.

CHILDREN, NEGLECTED AND DEPENDENT:—

Report presented, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 27.*) Printed.

CHIPPAWA COMMISSION, 1920:—See *Members. Privileges and Elections.*

CHIROPODY:—

Bill (No. 150), introduced to regulate the practice of, 145. Order for second reading discharged, 158.

CIVIL SERVANTS:—

Question as to the total number of inside, in employment; how many French Canadians, 156. See *Civil Service*.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER:—

Report presented, 276. (*Sessional Papers No. 87.*) Printed.

CIVIL SERVICE AND EMPLOYEES:—

1. Motion for return of correspondence with J. H. Mallon, *re* naming a commission in connection with appointments for; withdrawn, 37.
2. Question as to number of, in service, 174.
3. Question as to number of, superannuated, etc., 185.
4. Question as to how many added, since November, 1919, 218.
5. Question as to leave of absence for military training, 246.

COATSWORTH, JUDGE:—

Report of presented, on criminal justice and treatment of prisoners in United States and Toronto, 227. (*Sessional Papers No. 56.*) Printed.

COLE, A. A.:—

Question as to appointment of, on Peat Committee, 115.

COMBINES, GROCERS:—

Question as to fees paid in, *re*, 99.

COMMISSIONS:—

1. Question as to number of, appointed since November 11th, 1919, and those appointed by order of the Legislative Assembly, in 1920, 44-7.
2. Question as to number appointed since November 13th, 1919, names of, etc., 52-4.

COMMITTEES, STANDING:—

1. Resolution *re* appointment of, 16, 20.
2. Members added, 30, 36.

COMMUNITY HALLS:—

Question as to number of Municipalities, applying for assistance under, 56.

COMMUNITY HALLS ACT:—

Bill (No. 204), introduced to amend, 227. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 258. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 70.)

CONFINEMENT:—See *Women*.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND:—

Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 311-12. Bill (No. 252), introduced for raising money on the credit of, 312. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 371. Third reading, 378. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 7.)

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT:—

Bill (No. 192), introduced to amend, 206. Order for second reading discharged, 329.

CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETIES:—

Bill (No. 123), introduced respecting, 105. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 54. Recommended to be referred to a Special Committee to be named, 188. Committee named, 314. Member added, 353. *No report*.

CORONERS:—

Interim Report presented, 182. (*Sessional Papers No. 80.*) Printed.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT:—

Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 120-23. Bill (No. 136), introduced, 125. Second reading, 194. House goes into Committee on, 205, 353. Third reading, 354. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 12.)

COUNTIES REFORESTATION ACT:—

Bill (No. 172), introduced to amend, 177. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 207. Third reading, 332. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 81.)

COUNTY JUDGES ACT:—

Bill (No. 201), introduced to amend, 221. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee, 277, 306. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 37.)

CRIMINAL JUSTICE:—

Report presented, of Judge Coatsworth, on, in United States and Toronto.
227. (*Sessional Papers No. 56.*) Printed.

CROWN ATTORNEY:—

Bill (No. 66), introduced respecting the office of, in the City of Toronto and County of York, 30. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 152, 212. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 44.)

CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT:—

Bill (No. 216), introduced to amend, 245. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 325. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 43.)

CROWN TIMBER INVESTIGATION:—

Question *re* supply of Evidence to Counsel, 60.

CURRENT RATE OF INTEREST ACT:—

Resolution introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 310. Bill (No. 251), introduced, 312. Second reading, 338. House goes into Committee on, 370. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 8.)

D AIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 38.*) Printed.

DAIRY STANDARDS ACT:—

Bill (No. 95), introduced to amend, 68. Second reading, 87. House goes into Committee on, 99. Motion for third reading and amendment proposed and negatived, 271. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 75.)

DEHAITRE, J. H.:—

1. Question as to appointment of, as License Inspector for County of Prescott, 128.
2. Question as to whether still acting, 150.

DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN:—

Bill (No. 238), introduced respecting, 280. Order for second reading discharged, 368.

DISTRICT NURSES:—

Question as to number of motor cars purchased for, 57.

DIVISION COURTS:—

Report of Inspector presented, 38. (*Sessional Papers No. 5.*) Printed.

DIVISION COURTS ACT:—

Bill (No. 200), introduced to amend, 217. Second reading and referred to Legal Committee, 244. Reported, 319. House goes into Committee on, 336. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 38.)

DOG TAX AND SHEEP PROTECTION ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 71), introduced to amend, 35. *Dropped.*
2. Bill (No. 155), introduced to amend, 160. Second reading and referred to Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 175. Reported, 352. House goes into Committee on, 369. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 82.)
3. Bill (No. 244), introduced to amend, 300. Second reading and referred to Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 337. Reported, 352. House goes into Committee on, 369. Third reading, 376. See *above*, 2.

DON QUIXOTE IN FINANCE:—

Question as to purchase of pamphlet entitled, 202.

DOWER LAW:—

Motion for Select Committee to consider the question of, and referred to Select Committee on Bill relating to Liens of Mechanics and others, 381.

DOYLE RULE:—

Question as to adoption of, in measurement of logs and timber, 84.

DRAINAGE, PROVINCIAL AID TO:—

Bill (No. 205), introduced respecting, 228. Second reading, 261. House goes into Committee on, 283, 325. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 28.)

DUPUIS, GILBERT:—

Question as to identity of, 220.

E DUCATION:—

1. Bill (No. 62), introduced to provide free text books in schools, 26. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 85. *No report.*
2. Bill (No. 85), introduced to amend The Public Schools Act, 44. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 118. *No report.*
3. Bill (No. 142), introduced to amend The Public School Sites Act, 131.

- Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 189. Reported, 319. House goes into Committee on, 336. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 91.)
4. Bill (No. 153), introduced to amend The Public Schools Act, 153. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 175. Reported, 279. House goes into Committee on, 324. Third reading, 253. See *below*, 7.
 5. Bill (No. 168), to amend the Board of Education Act, 173. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 189. Reported, 209. House goes into Committee on, and rises without reporting, 230.
 6. Bill (No. 203), introduced to amend the School Attendance Act, 1919, 226. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 244. Reported, 260. House goes into Committee on, 275. Third reading, 375. See *below*, 7.
 7. Bill (No. 231), introduced to amend the School Laws, 270. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 334. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 89.)
 8. Bill (No. 245), introduced respecting Vocational Education, 300. Second reading, 328. House goes into Committee on, 335. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 90.)
 9. Regulations and Orders-in-Council presented, 25, 26, 71, 159, 191, 251. (*Sessional Papers No. 61.*) Not printed.
 10. Report of Department presented, 251. (*Sessional Papers No. 17.*) Not printed.
 11. Question as to number of Public School Teachers trained at Guelph, 57.
 12. Return ordered, shewing dates when tenders called for; tenders received and names of tenders, for production of Ontario Public School Readers, etc., 71. Presented, 103. (*Sessional Papers No. 66.*) Not printed.
 13. Select Committee appointed to advise on Educational matters—to sit during Recess, 367.

ELECTIONS AND ELECTION LAW:—

1. Notifications of vacancies, 2.
2. Certificates of Elections, 3, 4.
3. Reports from Judges; certificates, 4-12.
4. Return from Records of By-elections presented, 16. (*Sessional Papers No. 51.*) Printed.
5. Bill (No. 254), introduced to amend the law, 320. Second reading, 339. Order for House to go into Committee on, discharged, 378.

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS:—

Bill (No. 241), introduced respecting the examining and licensing of, Journeymen Electricians, 292. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 328. *No report.*

ELLIOTT, J. C.:

Question as to employment of, 282.

EMIGRATION TO PROVINCE:—

Question as to encouragement of, 243.

ENGINEERS:—See *Professional Engineers.*

ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 3.*) Printed.

ESSEX BORDER UTILITIES COMMISSION:—

Petition for Act to amend and consolidate Acts respecting, 22. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 15), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 183. Second reading, 189. House goes into Committee on, 209. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 99.)

ESTATE BILLS:—

Referred to Commissioners, 88. Reported, 166.

ESTIMATES:—

Presented and referred, 72, 270, 299. (*Sessional Papers No. 2.*) Printed. See *Supply.*

ETOBICOKE, AND WESTON GOLF CLUB:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 29), introduced and referred, 109. Reported, 192. Second reading, 209. House goes into Committee on, 257. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 100.)

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:—

Question as to appointment of Clerk of, 50.

EXPENDITURE, EXTRAVAGANT:—

Motion in condemnation of, proposed and negatived, 170.

EXTRA-MURAL EMPLOYMENT:—See *Persons under sentence.*

F ACTORY, SHOP AND OFFICE BUILDING ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 145), introduced to amend, 138. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 155. Reported, 252. House goes into Committee on, 283. Third reading, 321. See *below*, 3.
2. Bill (No. 175), introduced to amend, 177. Second reading negatived, 220.
3. Bill (No. 237), introduced to amend, 276. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 335. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 76.)

FAIR RENTALS AND RENTS:—

1. Bill (No. 170), introduced respecting, of dwelling houses, 174. Order for second reading discharged, 239.
2. Bill (No. 257), introduced respecting fair rents, 320. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on and rises without reporting, 365.

FARM LOANS:—

Bill (No. 96), introduced respecting, 68. Second reading and referred to a Committee to be named, 107. Committee named, 110. Bill reported, 127. House goes into Committee on, 250. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 33.)

FECUNIS, LIMITED:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 30), introduced and referred, 81. Reported, 287. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 137.)

FEMALE REFUGES ACT:—

Bill (No. 232), introduced to amend, 270. Second reading, 309. Order for House to go into Committee on, discharging, 330.

FERRIS, TOWNSHIP OF:—

Petition for Act respecting the division of, 43. Reported, 139. Bill (No. 51), introduced and referred, 140. Reported, 287. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 101.)

FINANCIAL STATEMENT:—

Delivered and Debate on adjourned, 73. See *Supply*.

FIRE DEPARTMENTS:—

1. Bill (No. 89), introduced respecting the Two-Platoon System for employees of permanent, 65. Second reading and referred to The Municipal Committee, 118. Reported, 160. House goes into Committee on, 187.

Motion for third reading and six months hoist proposed and negatived, 254-6. Third reading, 256. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 80.)

2. Bill (No. 124), introduced to amend The Hours of Labour Act in, 105. Second reading and referred to The Municipal Committee, 136. Reported adversely, 160.

FISH AND GAME:—

1. Committee appointed, 29.
2. Members added, 30, 66, 72, 88, 111.
3. Question as to the patrol boat, *Captain Visger*, 115. See *Fishermen*.

FISHERMEN, NET:—

1. Question as to increase of license fee to, 60.
2. Return ordered as to quantity of fish caught in Lakes Nipissing and Nipigon; varieties; price paid, etc., 61. Presented, 221. (*Sessional Papers No. 83.*) Not Printed.

FLAG AND FLEET:—

Question as to book being on list of Readers, 142.

FLEMING vs SPRACKLIN:—

Question as to judgement of Mr. Justice Middleton, *in re*, 48. See *Spracklin, O.T.A.*

FORD CITY, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act to annex certain property to, 22. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 43), introduced and referred, 35. Reported, 193. Recommitted, 209. Reported, 234. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 257. Third reading, 272. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 102.)

FRANKING PRIVILEGE:—

Resolution that Government should take steps and make representations to Post Master-General, to insure continuance of, upon Forms transmitted from any Board of Health, 174-5.

FREE PASSES:—See *Railway Transportation*.

FREIGHT RATES CASE:—

Question as to who appeared for Province, before Dominion Railway Commission, 146.

FRENCH CANADIANS:—See *Civil Servants*.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES:—

Report presented, 73. (*Sessional Papers No. 11.*) Printed.

FRUIT AND FRUIT EXPORT:—

Resolution appointing a Committee to enquire into production, transportation, etc., 117. Committee named, 127. Report, 352.

FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 44.*) Printed.

FUMES, DAMAGE BY:— See *Sulphur*.**G**AME AND FISHERIES:—

1. Question as to number of officials of Department of, discharged, 55.
2. Return ordered, showing fines and confiscations under the Act, 1916 to 1920, etc., 135. *Not brought down.*
3. Report presented, 159. (*Sessional Papers No. 14.*) Printed.
4. Petition to amend Act, 213.

GANANOQUE, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 38), introduced and referred to The Railway and Municipal Board, 35. Reported and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 130. Reported, 192. Second reading, 209. House goes into Committee on, 222. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 103.)

GARAGE:—

Question as to the, at Surrey Place; building of, etc., 51.

GEARING, THOMAS:—

Question as to tenders called, for work done by, 92.

GEORGETOWN, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act to incorporate, 38. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 28), introduced and referred, 81. Reported, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 104.)

GOODYEAR TIRE AND RUBBER COMPANY, LTD. :—

Petition for Act respecting, 245. Bill (No. 215), introduced on suspended rule and referred to Committee, 245. Reported, 313. Second reading,

227. House goes into Committee on, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 138.)

GOLD BONDS:—

1. Question as to uniform price for \$10,000,000 6% 20 year, designated as "S.S.," 156.
2. Question as to uniform price for \$16,000,000 6% 15 year, designated as "R.R.," 156.

GREAT LAKES PULP AND PAPER COMPANY:—

1. Question as to judgment given by Justice Rose, in action against, 256.
2. Question as to date of concession of pulpwood limits to, on Pic and Sturgeon Rivers, etc., 354.

GUELPH, CITY OF:—

1. Petition for Act respecting, 27. Reported, 64. Bill (No. 49), introduced and referred, 65. Reported, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 105.)
2. Bill (No. 255), introduced to confirm a certain agreement between The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, and, 320. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 374. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 22.)

H ALL, ALFRED:—

- Petition for Act respecting and The Law Society of Upper Canada, 22. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 9), introduced and referred, 43. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 86.

HAMMOND, E. D. L. :—

- Question as to appointment of, under the O.T.A., 82.

HARDING, R. T. :—

1. Question as to fees paid to, for legal services, 82.
2. Question as to amount paid to, in the Riddell-Latchford Timber Enquiry, 90.
3. Question as to employment of, except as Counsel before Timber Commission, 128.
4. Question as to amount claimed by, etc., 178.
5. Question as to employment of, in Department of Attorney-General, 281.
6. Return ordered, of correspondence with, etc., regarding an account for \$500 tendered James Hourigan & Co., 382. *Not brought down.*

HASTINGS, DAVID:—

1. Report presented, *re* charges against, 372.
2. Return ordered, of correspondence, etc., relating to dismissal of, 380. *Not brought down.*

HAWKES, ARTHUR:—

Question as to payments to, *re* Royal Radial Commission, 203.

HAWKESBURY, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act to enable the town to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell, 22. Reported, 109. Bill (No. 16), introduced and referred, 109. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 313.

HEALTH, BOARD OF:—

Report presented, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 21.*) Printed.

HEARST AND LOW BUSH TOWN SITES:—

Question as to lots in, disposed of since November, 1919, 133.

HEARST PUBLICATIONS:—

Resolution protesting against admission of, to Province, 381.

HIGGINS, JAMES:—

Question as to appointment of, to position under Government, 174.

HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT:—

1. Resolution introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 124-5. Bill (No. 135), introduced, 125. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 165. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 25.)
2. Bill (No. 152), introduced to amend, 153. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 175. Reported, 208. House goes into Committee on, 243. Third reading, 250. See *above.*
3. Question as to total expenditure for, in 1920, 55.
4. Return ordered, with reference to contribution of Federal Government under Canada Roads Act, 381. *Not brought down.*
5. Petitions for amendments to Act of 1920, 206, 308. See *Provincial Highways Act.*

HIGHWAY TRAVEL ACT:—

Bill (No. 77), introduced to amend, 36. Order for second reading discharged, 158.

HORTICULTURAL SOCIETIES:—

Report presented, 319. (*Sessional Papers No. 43.*) Printed.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS:—

Report presented, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 25.*) Printed.

2. Orders-in-Council presented, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 93.*) Not printed.

3. Bill (No. 246), introduced to amend The Act respecting, 300. Order for second reading discharged, 329.

HOUSE, THE:—

1. Proclamation calling, 1.

2. Adjourns over one or more days, 21, 202, 276, 382.

3. Government orders to go on Monday's Paper, 38.

4. Sits after midnight, 180, 182, 231, 239, 251, 261, 273, 285, 312, 318, 328, 378.

5. To have morning sittings, 351.

HOUSING:—See *Municipal Affairs.***HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER AND POWER COMMISSION:—**

1. Report of Select Committee presented, as to more equitable distribution of, 19. (*Sessional Papers No. 59.*) Printed.

2. Report of Commission presented, *re wages paid to men on construction of Queenston-Chippawa Development*, 152. (*Sessional Papers No. 77.*) Printed.

3. Report presented, 225. (*Sessional Papers No. 49.*) Printed.

4. Question as to settlement, *re purchase of property in Township of Bruton*, 243.

5. Report presented, of R. D. Johnson *et al*, on the Queenston-Chippawa Power Development, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 85.*) Printed.

6. Report presented, of R. S. Lea, on the Queenston-Chippawa Power Development, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 86.*) Printed.

7. Report presented, of H. L. Cooper & Co., on the Queenston-Chippawa Power Development, 286. (*Sessional Papers No. 89.*) Printed.

8. Bill (No. 255), introduced to confirm a certain agreement between, and the City of Guelph, 320. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 374. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 22.)

9 Bill No. 258), introduced to authorize the purchase and operation of certain Radial Railways by, on behalf of the City of Toronto, 320. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 374. Third reading 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 24.)

10. Bill (No. 262), introduced to make more equal provision for cost of, 332. Second reading; House goes into Committee on; third reading, 378. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 21.) See *Power Commission Act*.

HYDRO- RADIALS:—

Question as to reception of interim report, 52. See *Toronto*.

INCOME TAX:—

Bill (No. 132), introduced respecting the collection of, by Municipalities, 120. Second reading and referred to The Municipal Committee, 152. *No report*.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT:—

Bill (No. 225), introduced, fixing a minimum wage for, 253. Order for second reading discharged, 368. See *Young Persons*.

INDUSTRIAL REHABILITATION BOARD:—

Report of Committee presented, 245. (*Appendix No. 1*)
Committee on Privileges and Elections, 161-3. See *Report in Separate Volume*.

INFANTS:—

Bill (No. 171), introduced to amend the law relating to the guardianship and custody of, 174. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 189. *No report*.

INSANE, ONTARIO HOSPITALS FOR:—

Report presented, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 25*.) Printed.

INSURANCE:—

Report presented, 73. (*Sessional Papers No. 10*.) Printed. See *Ontario Insurance*.

INTERNATIONAL NICKEL COMPANY:—See *Canada Copper Company*.

JACKSON, W. T.:—

Question as to residence of, and others, *re Rural Credits*, 102.

JAMES, CLARKSON W.:—

Question as to appointment of, 50.

JUDGES, SUPREME COURT:—

Question as to authority of Dominion Government to deprive, of their pay-
ment for services, while acting as Commissioners, 102.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE:—

Bill introduced *pro forma*, 16.

KAPUSKASING, SOLDIERS AND SAILORS SETTLEMENT

COLONY:—

Return ordered, relating to sale of, etc., 116. Presented, 127. (*Sessional
Papers No. 68.*) Not printed.

KAPUSKASING, TOWN OF:—

Bill (No. 111), introduced to incorporate, 90. Second reading, 168. House
goes into Committee, 182, 205. Motion for third reading; amendment
proposed and negatived; third reading, 237. R. A., 242. (11 Geo.
V. c. 36.)

KENT COUNTY:—

Question as to identity of Registrar of, etc., 49.

KINCARDINE, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 40), introduced
and referred to Railway and Municipal Board, 109. Reported and re-
ferred to Committee on Private Bills, 172. Reported, 213. Second
reading, 244. House goes into Committee on, 248. Third reading,
254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 106.)

KING'S PRINTER:—

1. Question as to appointment of, 50.
2. Bill (No. 194), introduced respecting the office of, 208. Second reading,
244. House goes into Committee on, 238. Third reading, 321. R. A.,
387. (11 Geo. V. c. 5.)

KINGSTON, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 42, 22. Reported, 32.
Bill (No. 11), introduced and referred, 34. Reported *withdrawn*; fees
remitted, 145.

2. Petition for Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 29, 22. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 12), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 72. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 107.)

KITCHENER, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 68. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 52), introduced and referred, 110. Reported, 234. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 258. Third reading, 272. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 108.)

KNOX COLLEGE:—

1. Question as to renting of, 115.
2. Question as to estimated cost of alterations, 219.

L

ABOUR:—

1. Bill (No. 82), introduced to regulate the hours of, 44. Motion for second reading lost, 368.
2. Report of Department presented, 371. (*Sessional Papers No. 16.*) Printed.

LABOUR COMMITTEE:—

Constituted, 19. Committee appointed, 30. Members added, 36. Report, 276.

LAKE HURON AND NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY:—

Bill (No. 162), introduced respecting, 171. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 207. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 131.)

LAKE OF THE WOODS CONTROL BOARD:—

Bill (No. 59), introduced, 140. Order for second reading discharged, 328.

LAKE OF THE WOODS PULP CONCESSION:—

Return ordered, of correspondence; estimates; reports, etc., and E. W. Backus, relating to the, and White Dog Rapids Water Power, etc., 380. *Not brought down.*

LAKES AND STREAMS:—

Bill (No. 58), introduced respecting the construction of certain works on, 140. Second reading, 194. Order for House to go into Committee on, discharged, 329.

LANDS AND FORESTS:—

1. Question as to details that make up the item of, 903, 421. 41 credited to capital receipts of, 92.
2. Question as to Chief Clerk of Lands in Department of, 114.
3. Question as to assistant to Deputy Minister, 229.
4. Report of Department presented, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 3.*) Printed.

LAND, TRANSFER TAX:—

Resolutions put through; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 123-4. See *Real Estate Transfer*.

LANNIN, H. J. :—

1. Question *re* position of, duties, etc., 55.
2. Question as to moneys paid to, 184.

LATCHFORD, A. M. :—

Question as to identity of, 94.

LEGAL BILLS:—

Committee appointed, 30. Report, 188, 260, 319.

LEGAL OFFICES:—

Report presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 6.*) Printed.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:—

Certain statements reflecting on independence and honour of, referred to Committee on Privileges and Elections, 161-3. See *Report in Separate Volume*.

LEGISLATIVE BUILDINGS:—See *Buildings*.

LEMIEUX, JOSEPH:—

Question as to superannuation of, and appointment of J. H. Dehaitre, 128.

LIBRARY:—

1. Report of Librarian presented, 17. (*Sessional Papers No. 53.*) Not printed.
2. Committee appointed, 20. *No report*.
3. Question as to appointment of Librarian, 49.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR:—

1. Speech at opening, 13-15.
2. To be taken into consideration, 16.
3. Motion for Address in reply and Debate on adjourned. 19, 21, 24, 26, 31, 43, 62, 66.
4. Motion carried and Address ordered to be engrossed and presented, 66.
5. Transmits Estimates, 72, 270, 299. (*Sessional Papers No. 2.*) Printed.
6. Assents to Bills, 242, 387.
7. Recommends expenditure of Public Moneys, 87, 106, 120, 123, 124, 176, 209, 310, 311.
8. Speech at close of Session, 8.

LIGHTNING RODS:—

Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified: passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 210-11. Bill (No. 195), introduced to regulate the sale and installation of, 211. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 258. Third reading, 375. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 84.)

LIMITATIONS ACT:—

Bill (No. 80), introduced to amend, 44. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 187. *No report.*

LINE FENCES ACT:—

Bill (No. 164), introduced to amend, 171. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 204. Reported, 279. House goes into Committee on, 305. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 83.)

LIVE STOCK BRANCH:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 39.*) Printed.

LOAN CORPORATIONS:—

Report presented, 73. (*Sessional Papers No. 12.*) Printed.

LOANS, PROVINCIAL:—

1. Question as to those placed since November, 1919, 59.
2. Question as to "N. N." of \$3,000,000, publicly advertised, 94.
3. Question as to proceeds of, being placed to the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, 272.

4. Return ordered, of correspondence relating to loan "R. R.", 103. **Presented**, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 92.*) Not printed.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 158), introduced to amend, 167. **Second reading and referred** to a Select Committee, 194. **Reported**, 226. House goes into **Committee on**, 238, 246, 277. **Third reading**, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V, c. 61.)
2. Bill (No. 174), introduced to amend, 177. **Second reading and referred** to Select Committee, 204. **Reported**, 226. See *above*.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS STATEMENTS:—

Report presented, 25. (*Sessional Papers No. 12.*) **Printed**.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 56), introduced to amend, 143. **Second reading and referred** to Municipal Committee, 189. **Reported**, 226. House goes into **Committee on**, 246. **Third reading**, 254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 64.)
2. Bill (No. 138), introduced to amend, 128. **Second reading and referred** to Municipal Committee, 152. **Reported**, 178. House goes into **Committee on**, 190. **Third reading**, 253. See *above*.
3. Bill (No. 156), introduced to amend, 160. **Second reading and referred** to Municipal Committee, 179. **Reported**, 352. House goes into **Committee on**, 369. **Third reading**, 376. See *above*.

LONDON, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 27. **Reported**, 80. Bill (No. 37), introduced and referred, 81. **Reported**, 192. **Second reading**, 209. House goes into **Committee on**, 248. **Third reading**, 254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 109.)

LONDON CITY GAS COMPANY:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. **Reported**, 32. Bill (No. 10), introduced and referred, 34. **Reported**, 213. **Second reading**, 249. House goes into **Committee on**, 257. **Third reading**, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 98.)

LONG POINT PARK:—

Bill (No. 187), introduced respecting, 193. **Second reading**, 224. House goes into **Committee on**, 246, 333. **Third reading**, 375. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 35.)

LUKE, LEWIS R. :—

Return ordered, of correspondence relating to the dismissal of, as License Inspector for Ontario County, 37. Presented, 153. (*Sessional Papers. No. 75.*) Not printed.

LUMBER MILLS :—

1. Question as to Government conducting a scale of logs and mill cut, *re* over-run, under Doyle Rule, 163.
2. Motion for Return of Report of officer who has been conducting scale of logs and mill cut, at twenty-six mills, and Debate on adjourned, 177. Debate resumed, motion amended and carried, 366. *Not brought down.*

LUMBERING OPERATIONS :—

Question as to number of persons carrying on, in the years 1917-18-19 and 20, 69.

MCOMBER, A. J. :—

Question *re* settlement with, 243.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY :—

Petition for Act to amend Charter of, 27. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 48), introduced and referred, 65. Reported; fees remitted, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 134.)

McPIERSON, R. V. :—

Question as to identity of, 157.

McVICAR, R. :—

Question as to identity of, 95.

MACKENZIE, M. A. :—

Question as to identity of, 223.

MARRIAGE ACT :—

1. Bill (No. 101), introduced to amend, 68. Order for second reading discharged, 329.
2. Bill (No. 210), introduced to amend, 228. Second reading, 275. Second reading, 275. House goes into Committee on, 284, 377. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 51.)

MARRIAGE LICENSES :—

1. Report presented, of Public Service Commission, *in re* issuers of, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 62.*) Printed.

2. Return ordered, showing number of issuers of, in Province; names, etc., 117. Presented, 139. (*sessional Papers No. 70.*) Not printed.

MARTIN, S. J. :—

Question as to appointment of, to Government Service, 272.

MATERNITY PROTECTION :—

Bill (No. 69), introduced for the protection of Women, 31. Second reading and referred to Labour Committee, 175. See *Women*.

MAXIMUM WORK HOUR DAY ACT :—See *Labour*.

MECHANICS LIENS, WAGE-EARNERS :—

1. Bill (No. 14), introduced respecting, 90. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 155. Referred to a Select Committee, 314.
2. Question of Dower Law investigation referred to same Select Committee, 381.

MEMBERS :—

1. Notifications of vacancies, 2.
2. Certificates of Election, 3, 4.
3. Take Oaths and Seats, 4, 17.
4. The question of alleged attempt of bribery of, referred to Committee on Privileges and Elections, 161-3.
5. The question of a Member being called insincere, as a Member of a Commission, referred to Committee on Privileges and Elections, 208.
6. Full Sessional Indemnity paid to, absent account of illness 382.

MIDLAND, TOWN OF :—

1. Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 64. Bill (No. 46), introduced and referred, 65. Reported, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 110.)
2. Bill (No. 247), introduced on Suspended Rule, and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 308. Reported, 313. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. See *above*.

MILK AND CREAM :—

Question as to how many Inspectors appointed under Act, 57.

MIMICO, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 2), introduced and referred, 33. Reported, 72. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 111.)

MINES, DEPARTMENT OF:—

Report presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 4.*) Printed.

MINIMUM WAGE ACT:—

Bill (No. 165), introduced to amend, 173. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 207. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 78.) See *Industrial Employment*.

MINING ACT OF ONTARIO:—

Bill (No. 129), introduced to amend, 110. Second reading, 175. House goes into Committee on, 214, 230, 277. Third reading, 375. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 16.)

MINING TAX ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 79), introduced to amend, 36. Motion for second reading and Debate on adjourned, 182. Debate resumed and Motion for second reading carried, 326. House goes into Committee on, 370. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 11.)
2. Return ordered, showing amounts paid by each company which made up total, credited to in Public Accounts, 85. Presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 82.*) Not printed.
3. Return ordered, of correspondence relating to proposed increase in mining taxes, 135. Presented, 169. (*Sessional Papers No. 78.*) Not printed.
4. Question as to annual revenue collected since 1907, by Department of Mines, 228.

MONTGOMERY, ALEXANDER:—

Question as to appointment of, as Superintendent of Nipissing Central Railway, 102.

MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 221), introduced to amend, 248. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 325. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 79.)
2. Report of Commission presented, 279. (*Sessional Papers No. 83.*) Printed.

3. Question as to how many investigators appointed under, etc., 69.
4. Question as to applications for allowances in County of Oxford, 141.
5. Question as to applications for allowance in County of Bruce, 142.
6. Question as to applications for allowance in County of Prescott, 151.
7. Question as to applications for allowance in City of Brantford, 168.

MORTMAIN AND CHARITABLE USES ACT:—

Bill (No. 250), introduced to amend, 308. Second reading, 338. House goes into Committee on, 371. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 46.)

MOTOR CARS:—

1. Question as to number of, purchased by Government for use of District Nurses, 57.
2. Question as to number of, at disposal of Ministers, etc., 282.
3. Question as to purchases of, and trucks, etc., 300.
4. Question as to cost to Government of each marker for, in 1920; where purchased, 91.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 76), introduced to amend, 36. Second reading, 107. House goes into Committee on, 126, 164. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 72.)
2. Bill (No. 128), introduced to amend, 110. Second reading negatived, 157.
3. Bill (No. 256), introduced to amend, 320. Second reading negatived, 265.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS:—

1. Report presented, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 47.*) Printed.
2. Report of Bureau presented, on Housing, 372. (*Sessional Papers No. 40.*) Printed.

MUNICIPAL AUDITOR:—

Report presented, 73. (*Sessional Papers No. 8.*) Printed.

MUNICIPAL LAW:—

1. Bill (No. 64), introduced to amend, 26. Second reading on division and referred to Municipal Committee, 71. *No report.*
2. Bill (No. 72), introduced to amend, 36. Second reading and referred to

- Municipal Committee, 96. Reported, 320.
3. Bill (No. 73), introduced to amend, 36. Second reading and referred to Committee, 96. Reported, 320.
 4. Bill (No. 78), introduced to amend, 36. Second reading and referred to Committee of the Whole, 125. House goes into Committee on, 158. See *below*, 31.
 5. Bill (No. 84), introduced to amend, 44. Second reading and referred to Committee, 96. Reported, 320.
 6. Bill (No. 86), introduced to amend, 44. Second reading and referred to Committee, 96. Reported, 320.
 7. Bill (No. 91), introduced to amend, 65. Second reading and referred to Committee, 98. Reported, 320.
 8. Bill (No. 94), introduced to amend, 66. Second reading and referred to Committee, 118. Reported, 320.
 9. Bill (No. 106), introduced to amend, 81. Second reading and referred to Committee, 98. Reported, 320.
 10. Bill (No. 113), introduced to amend, 90. Second reading and referred to Committee, 151. Reported, 320.
 11. Bill (No. 119), introduced to amend, 97. Second reading and referred to Committee, 175. *No report.*
 12. Bill (No. 121), introduced to amend, 105. Second reading and referred to Committee, 151. Reported, 320.
 13. Bill (No. 122), introduced to amend, 105. Second reading negatived, 135.
 14. Bill (No. 127), introduced to amend, 110. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 177. See *below*, 31.
 15. Bill (No. 130), introduced to amend, 110. Second reading and referred to Committee, 152. Reported, 320.
 16. Bill (No. 131), introduced to amend, 120. Second reading and referred to Committee, 152. Reported, 320.
 17. Bill (No. 139), introduced to amend, 131. Second reading and referred to Committee, 152. Reported, 320.
 18. Bill (No. 141), introduced to amend, 131. Second reading and referred to Committee, 154. Reported, 320.
 19. Bill (No. 143), introduced to amend, 131. Second reading and referred to Committee, 179. *No report.*
 20. Bill (No. 144), introduced to amend, 132. Second reading and referred to Committee, 155. *No report.*

21. Bill (No. 146), introduced to amend, 138. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 175. *No report.*
22. Bill (No. 147), introduced to amend, 138. Second reading and referred to Committee, 179. *No report.*
23. Bill (No. 148), introduced to amend, 138. Second reading and referred to Committee, 155. Reported, 320.
24. Bill (No. 157), introduced to amend, 160. Second reading and referred to Committee, 175. Reported, 320.
25. Bill (No. 160), introduced to amend, 171. Second reading and referred to Committee, 188. Reported, 320.
26. Bill (No. 163), introduced to amend, 171. Second reading and referred to Committee, 188. Reported, 320.
27. Bill (No. 179), introduced to amend, 181. Second reading and referred to Committee, 204. *No report.*
28. Bill (No. 184), introduced to amend, 194. Second reading negatived, 212.
29. Bill (No. 213), introduced to amend, 235. Second reading and referred to the Committee of the Whole, 328. House goes into Committee on, 336, 370. See *below*, 31.
30. Bill (No. 229), introduced to amend, 260. Order for second reading discharged, 307.
31. (No. 259), introduced "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921," 321. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 375. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 63.)
32. Committee appointed, 28 Report, 160, 178, 208, 213, 226, 252, 279, 320, 352.
33. Petition respecting, 86.

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT:—

Bill (No. 212), introduced to amend, 235. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 275. Discharged, 284.

MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND:—

Return ordered, showing operations of, amounts loaned; amounts paid, etc., 61. *Not brought down.*

MUNICIPAL TAX EXEMPTION ACT:—

Bill (No. 196), introduced to amend, 213. Second reading, 244. House into Committee on, 247, 250. Third reading, 254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 68.)

NATURAL GAS:—

Bill (No. 186), introduced respecting, 193. Second reading and referred to Select Committee, 275. Reported, 314. House goes into Committee on, 326, 334. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 17.)

NIAGARA FALLS, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 64. Bill (No. 1), introduced and referred, 64. Reported, 104. Second reading, 118. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 112.)

NIAGARA FALLS AND NEW YORK POWER COMPANY:—

Question as to arrangements made with Hydro-Electric Power Commission, etc., 367.

NIAGARA PENINSULA GROWER'S LIMITED:—

Petition for Act respecting, on Suspended Rule, 201. Bill (No. 188), introduced on Suspended Rule and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 201. Reported, 234. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 258. Third reading, 272. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 139.)

NIPISSING CENTRAL RAILWAY:—

Question as to appointment of A. Montgomery, as Superintendent, 102.

NIPISSING AND NIPIGON LAKES:—

Return ordered, showing total quantity of fish caught in, etc., and marketed in the years 1917 to 1920; varieties; price paid, etc; 61. Presented, 221. (*Sessional Papers No. 83.*) Not printed.

NORTHERN LIGHT RAILWAY ACT:—

Bill (No. 218), introduced to amend, 248. Second reading, 276. House goes into Committee on, 306. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 132.)

NORTHERN AND NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO:—

Bill (No. 75), introduced to provide for Development Work in, 36. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 165. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 18.)

NORTH YORK, TOWNSHIP OF:—

Petition for Act to incorporate a part of the Township of York, to be called the Township of North York, 32. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 27), introduced and referred, 89. Reported, not proceeded with; fees remitted, 287.

NOTARIES ACT:—

Bill (No. 214), introduced to amend, 242. Order for second reading discharged, 329.

O AKVILLE, TOWN OF:—See *Trafalgar*.

OATS, SEED:—

1. Question as to sale of, to Farmers in 1920, 54.
2. Question as to quantity purchased from U.F.O. Company Limited, 84.

OLD AGE PENSIONS:—See *Unemployment Insurance*.

ONTARIO ATHLETIC COMMISSION:—

1. Bill (No. 236), introduced respecting, 276. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 370. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 88.)
2. Statement and Report presented, 152. (*Sessional Papers No. 76.*) Not Printed.

ONTARIO COMPANIES ACT:—

Bill (No. 249), introduced to amend, 308. Second reading, 338. House goes into Committee on, 374. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 58.)

ONTARIO GAME AND FISHERIES ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 126), introduced to amend, 110. Order for second reading discharged, 158.
2. Bill (No. 217), introduced to amend, 246. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 334. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 87.)

ONTARIO INSURANCE ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 107), introduced to amend, 82. Order for second reading discharged, 204.
2. Bill (No. 197), introduced to amend, 217. Order for second reading discharged, 249.
3. Bill (No. 198), introduced to amend, 217. Second reading, 277. House goes into Committee on, 306, 325. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 60.)

ONTARIO INSURANCE COMMITTEE:—

Select Committee appointed to report on Amendments to Law of, 333. Members Added, 353.

ONTARIO PAROLE ACT:—

Bill (No. 209), introduced to amend, 227. Second reading, 257. House goes into Committee on, 261. Third reading, 375. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 92.)

ONTARIO PAROLE BOARD:—

Report presented, 103. (*Sessional Papers No. 57.*) Printed.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE:—

Bill (No. 102), introduced respecting, 88. Second reading, 175. House goes into Committee on, 180. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 45.)

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SYNOD:—See *Provincial Synod of Ontario.*

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:—

Question as to total cost of; who composed, etc., 91.

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT:—

Bill (No. 228), introduced to amend, 260. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 326. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 3.)

ONTARIO PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT:—

Bill (No. 199), introduced to amend, 217. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 277, 283. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 47.)

ONTARIO RAILWAY ACT:—

Bill (No. 189), introduced to amend, 200. Second reading and referred to The Railway Committee, 221. *No report.*

ONTARIO RAILWAY AND MUNICIPAL BOARD:—

1. Report presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 50.*) Printed.
2. Bills referred to, 34, 35, 109. Reported, 130, 137, 172.

ONTARIO SCHOOL READERS:—See *Education.*

ONTARIO TELEPHONE ACT:—

Bill (No. 202), introduced to amend, 221. Second reading, 244. House goes into Committee on, 247. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 62.)

ONTARIO TEMPERANCE ACT:—

1. Report presented, of Committee, with Minority Report, 39. Motion for adoption of report and amendment proposed, that the Minority Report should be adopted and Debate on adjourned, 42. Debate resumed and again adjourned, 138, 144. Amendment to Amendment proposed and Debate on adjourned, 144. Debate resumed and Amendment to Amendment negatived, 261. Amendment then negatived, 261. Main Motion negatived, 261.
2. Question as to total cost of the Committee of Legislature appointed to investigate working of; Members of, etc., 48.
3. Question as to position of W. J. Lannin, etc., 55.
4. Question as to what Department has Enforcement of, 60.
5. Question as to appointment of E. D. L. Hammond, 82.
6. Question as to costs of License Inspector Joseph Stewart, being paid, 102.
7. Question as to net income under, for 1919 and 1912, 114.
8. Question as to number of officials engaged by Board of License Commissioners and Dismissed, 183.
9. Question as to number of applications for clemency under, made to Attorney-General, 222.
10. Question as to applications for clemency and remission of fines, etc., 282.
11. Return ordered, of correspondence *re* Conduct of Magistrates; Justices of the Peace *et al*, with reference to, 61. Presented, 139. (*Sessional Papers No. 71.*) Not printed.
12. Return ordered, of correspondence from Attorney-General, addressed to Police Magistrates or Crown Attorneys, etc., 62. *Not brought down.*
13. Return ordered, showing number of convictions for breaches of Act, in 1919 and 1920, 116. Presented, 251. (*Sessional Papers No. 84.*) Not printed.
14. Return ordered, of correspondence relating to convictions made under, 130. *Not brought down.*
15. Return ordered, showing number of applications to Board of License Commissioners for remission of fines, or sentences, under, in regard to which the Member for S.E. Toronto, Seat "B," was professionally interested, 204. *Not brought down.*
16. Report on operation of presented; 71. (*Sessional Papers No. 28.*) Printed.

17. Bill (No. 125), introduced to amend, 110. Order for second reading discharged, 152.
18. Bill (No. 207), introduced to amend, 227. Motion for second reading; amendment proposed and negatived; Second reading, 277-8. House goes into Committee on, 306. Third reading, 375. See *below*, 19.
19. Bill (No. 220), introduced to amend, 248. Second reading, 278. House goes into Committee on, 334. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387 (11 Geo. V. c. 73.)
20. Bill (No. 230), introduced to amend, 260. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 309. *No report*.
21. Bill (No. 233), introduced to amend, 270. Order for second reading discharged, 337.

ORILLIA, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 14), introduced and referred to the Railway and Municipal Board, 34. Reported and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 137. Reported, 192. Second reading, 209. House goes into Committee, 244. Third reading, 253. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 114.)

OPTOMETRY ACT:—

Bill (No. 243), introduced to amend, 300. Order for second reading discharged, 365.

OSTEOPATHY:—

Petitions for Act to regulate the practice of, 71, 86. *Not proceeded with*.

OTTAWA, CITY OF:—

1. Petition for Act "The City of Ottawa Planning and Development Act," 23. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 32), introduced and referred, 35. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 227.
2. Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 139. Bill (No. 36), introduced and referred, 140. Reported, 234. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 257. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 115.)
3. Petition respecting, 71.

OTTAWA-PRESCOTT HIGHWAY:—

1. Return ordered, showing how many miles included in; how many graded, etc., 129. Presented, 331. (*Sessional Papers No. 90.*) Not printed.
2. Question as to amount expended upon, 275.

PARENTS:—

Bill (No. 177), introduced to provide for the maintenance of, by their children, 178. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 204. Reported, 260. House goes into Committee on, 305. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 52.)

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS:—

Question as to private living rooms in, 280.

PAROLE ACT AND BOARD:—See *Ontario Parole*.

PEAT COMMISSION:—

Question as to the date of appointment of Commissioner Cole, 115.

PEMBROKE, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 5), introduced and referred, 109. Reported, 181. Second reading, 189. House goes into Committee, 209. Third reading, 222. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 116.)

PEPALL, A. H. :—

Question as to identity of, 82.

PERSONS UNDER SENTENCE:—

Bill (No. 234), introduced respecting Extra-Mural employment of, 270. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 326. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 93.)

PETERBOROUGH, CITY OF:—

Petitions for Act respecting, 23, 38. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 4), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 72. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 117.)

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 57), introduced to amend, 143. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 194. Reported, 226. House goes into Committee on, 247. Third reading, 254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 65.)
2. Bill (No. 191), introduced to amend, 206. Second reading negatived, 284.

POLICE MAGISTRATES:—

1. Report of Public Service Commission on, presented, 67. *Sessional Papers*

No. 63.) Printed.

2. Bill (No. 118), introduced to provide for the appointment of, with extended jurisdiction, 97. Second reading, 175. House goes into Committee on, 190. Motion for third reading; amendment proposed and negatived; third reading, 236-7. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 42.)

POLICE MAGISTRATES ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 159), introduced to amend, 167. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 206. Third reading, 382. R. A., 387.
2. Bill (No. 117), introduced to amend, 97. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 205, 223. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V, c. 41.)

PORT ARTHUR, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 39), introduced and referred, 109. Reported, 145. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 118.)

PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM, CITIES OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 22. Reported, 60. Bill (No. 35), introduced and referred, 65. Reported, 145. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 119.)

PORT COLBORNE, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 23. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 13), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 86. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 132. Recommended, 146. Reported, 181. House goes into Committee on, 204. Third reading, 322. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 120.)

POWER COMMISSION ACT:—

Bill (No. 226), introduced to amend, 253. Motion for second reading and debate on adjourned, 310. Debate resumed and motion for second reading carried, 337. House goes into Committee on; third reading, 379. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 20.)

PRATT, JAMES PETRIE:—

Petition for Act to authorize the Law Society of Upper Canada, to admit to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor, 23. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 19), introduced and referred, 64. Reported, 86. Second reading, 98. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 140.)

PRINTING:—

1. Committee appointed, 30. Report, 143, 287.
2. Recommended purchase of certain publications, 143, 291.
3. Recommend printing of certain documents, 291.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES:—

Report presented, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 26.*) Printed.

PRIVATE BILLS:—

1. Committee appointed, 28.
2. Report, 71, 86, 104, 119, 137, 145, 169, 180, 183, 192, 213, 227, 234, 287, 313, 332.
3. Members added, 36, 43.
4. Time extended for presenting reports, 104, 169, 193, 235, 287.
5. Fees remitted on Bill (No. 58), of Session of 1920, 181.
6. Recommend that no extra fees should be charged by reason of extension of time, 332.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS:—

1. Committee appointed, 29.
2. Certain matters referred to, 161-3, 208, 218.
3. To sit concurrently with House, 314, 366.
4. Report, 373. Motion to recommit defeated and report adopted, 373-4. (*Appendix No. 3.*) *See Separate Volume.*

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS:—

1. Bill (No. 208), introduced respecting, 227. Second reading and referred to a Select Committee, 284, 299.
2. Members added, to Committee, 330, 351.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION:—

1. Question as to cost of Committee, appointed to investigate, 58.
2. Reports presented, 73-9. Printed.
3. Bill (No. 105), introduced, allowing Municipalities to adopt in municipal elections, 81. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 168. *No report.*
4. Report, as printed, presented, 227. (*Sessional Papers No. 81.*)

PROVINCIAL AUCTIONEERS:—

Bill (No. 93), introduced respecting, 66. Second reading, 86. House goes into Committee on, 126. Third reading, 253. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 57.)

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR:—

Report presented, 165. (*Sessional Papers No. 54.*) Printed.

PROVINCIAL HIGHWAYS ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 116), introduced to amend, 90. Second reading, 126. House goes into Committee on, 159, 164, 181, 271. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 27.)
2. Petition for amendment, 213.

PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT:—

Bill (No. 253), introduced to amend, 312. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 371. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 6.)

PROVINCIAL POLICE:—

Return ordered, of copy of report of Superintendent of, 116. Presented, 139. (*Sessional Papers No. 72.*) Not printed. See *Smith and Hanna*.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY:—

1. Report presented, 331. (*Sessional Papers No. 19.*) Printed.
2. Announces Prorogation, 390.

PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF ONTARIO:—

Petition for Act to make provision respecting Vestry Meetings, 23. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 20), introduced and referred, 35. Reported; fees remitted, 72. Second reading, 97. House goes into Committee on, 132. Third reading, 146. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 133.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:—

1. Committee appointed, 29.
2. Accounts presented and referred, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 1.*) Printed.
3. Members added, 43, 82, 169.
4. Report, 320. (*Appendix No. 2.*) See *Separate Volume*.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS:—

1. Bill (No. 88), introduced to regulate the Means of Egress from, 44. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 96. *No report.*
2. Question as to branch of Provincial Secretary's Department, specially devoted to repair of, 202.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 104), introduced to amend, 81. Second reading negatived, 119.
2. Bill (No. 112), introduced to amend, 90. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 126. Reported, 178. House goes into Committee on, 190. Third reading, 221. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 74.)
3. Bill (No. 166), introduced to amend, 173. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 195. Reported, 208. House goes into Committee on, 238. Third reading, 253. See *above.*
4. Report presented, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 21.*) Printed.

PUBLIC HIGHWAYS ACT:—

Report presented, 331. (*Sessional Papers No. 15.*) Printed.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT:—See *Suburban Areas.*

PUBLIC INQUIRIES ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 55), introduced to amend, 143. Order for second reading discharged, 207.
2. Bill (No. 193), introduced to amend, 207. Motion for second reading and point of order Raised and Debate on adjourned, 214. Speaker's Ruling, 217. Debate on Motion for second reading resumed and second reading carried, 226. House goes into Committee on, 230. Third reading, 236. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 4.)

PUBLIC LANDS ACT:—

Bill (No. 185), introduced to amend, 193. Second reading, 224. House goes into Committee on, 231, 238. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 15.)

PUBLIC MONEYS:—

Motion deploring the imprudent borrowing of large sums without any Vote of the House, appropriating same: proposed and negatived. 170.

PUBLIC PARKS ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 90), introduced to amend, 65. Second reading and referred to

Municipal Committee, 98. Reported, 178. House goes into Committee on, 190. Third reading, 253. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 71.)

2. Bill (No. 161), introduced to amend, 171. Second reading and referred to the Municipal Committee, 188. Reported, 213. House goes into Committee on, 230. Order discharged, 307.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS:—See *Education*.

PUBLIC SERVICE BULLETIN:—

Question as to number of copies printed, etc., 51.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:—

1. Report presented *re* issues of Marriage Licenses, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 62.*) Printed.
2. Report presented, *re* Police Magistrates, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 63.*) Printed.

PUBLIC WORKS:—

Report presented, 73. (*Sessional Papers No. 13.*) Printed.

QUEEN VICTORIA N. FALLS PARK:—

Report presented, 372. (*Sessional Paper No. 9.*) Printed.

QUEENSTON-CHIPPAWA DEVELOPMENT:—

1. Report presented, of R. D. Johnson *et al* upon the, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 85.*) Printed.
2. Report of R. S. Lea presented, 259. (*Sessional Papers No. 86.*) Printed.
3. Report of H. L. Cooper & Co. presented, 286. (*Sessional Papers No. 89.*) Printed. See *Hydro-Electric Power Commission*.

QUESTIONS:—

1. As to Commissions appointed since November 11th, 1919, by Order-in-Council, etc., 44.
2. As to pamphlet "Canadian Nationality" being printed, 47.
3. As to total cost of Committee appointed *re* working of O.T.A., 48.
4. As to judgment of Justice Middleton, Fleming vs Spracklin, 48.
5. As to Registrar of Deeds for Kent County, 49.
6. As to appointment of A. T. Wilgress as Librarian, 49.

7. As to sums of money received in respect to timber dues owing, 50.
8. As to appointment of Clerk of Executive Council, 50.
9. As to appointment of C. W. James, 50.
10. As to number of copies of Public Service Bulletin printed and edited, 51.
11. As to Garage at Surrey Place, 51.
12. As to interim report received on Hydro-Radials, 52.
13. As to Commissions and Committees appointed, 52.
14. As to construction Work on T. and N. O., from Cochrane, 54.
15. As to sale of seed oats to farmers, 54.
16. As to total expenditure of Department of Highways, for 1920, 55.
17. As to number of officials discharged in Department of Game and Fisheries, 55.
18. As to position of W. J. Lannin; duties, etc., 55.
19. As to applications for assistance under Community Halls Act, 56.
20. As to number of Public School teachers taking agricultural training at Guelph, 57.
21. As to number of milk and cream inspectors appointed under Act, 57.
22. As to number of motor cars purchased for use of District Nurses, 57.
23. As to purchase of automobile markers, 58.
24. As to cost of Committee appointed to investigate Proportional Representation, 58.
25. As to number of Loans placed by Government since November, 1919, 59.
26. As to increasing license fees payable by Net Fishermen, 60.
27. As to withdrawal of order for copies of evidence *re* Crown Timber Commission, 60.
28. As to which Department having charge of enforcement of O.T.A., 60.
29. As to number of corporations or partnerships carrying on lumbering operations in Ontario, in the years 1917 to 1920, 69.
30. As to number of investigators appointed under Mother's Allowances Act, 69.
31. As to representative sent to Winnipeg, to report on election there, 69.
32. As to fees paid to R. T. Harding, since November, 1919, 82.
33. As to appointment of E. D. L. Hammond under O.T.A., 82.
34. As to identity of A. H. Pepall, 83.

35. As to identity of R. H. Boal, 83.
36. As to adoption of Doyle Rule in measurement of timber, 84.
37. As to quantity of seed oats purchased, 84.
38. As to cost of Riddell-Latchford Timber Enquiry, 90.
39. As to amount *per diem* paid to Trustees Riddell and Latchford, *re* timber enquiry, 91.
40. As to total cost of Ontario Public Service Commission, who compose, 91.
41. As to cost to Government for each marker for Motor Vehicles, etc., 91.
42. As to details of item \$903,421.41, credited to Lands and Forests Department, 92.
43. As to tenders being called for works by Thomas Gearing, 92.
44. As to details of amounts paid by each Racing Association, 93.
45. As to identity of A. M. Latchford, 94.
46. As to Loan "N.N." of \$3,000,000 being advertised, 94.
47. As to Treasury Bills issued since 13th November, 1919, amounts, etc., 95.
48. As to identity of A. R. MacVicar, 95.
49. As to fees paid to J. S. Lundy *et al*, *re* Combines, 99.
50. As to what lands in Nickel Belt in Sudbury, have been leased to Canada Copper Coy., etc., 100.
51. As to residence and occupation of W. T. Jackson, T. McMillan and M. H. Staples, *re* Rural Credits, 102.
52. As to appointment of Alexander Montgomery as Superintendent of Nipissing Central Railway, 102.
53. As to costs of License Inspector Joseph Stewart, 102.
54. As to submission of Plans under Canada Highway Act, 111.
55. As to net income under O.T.A., for 1919 and 1920, 114.
56. As to suspension of leave of absence of S. K. Burden, 114.
57. As to an official known as Chief Clerk of Lands, 114.
58. As to the renting of old Knox College, 115.
59. As to boat "*Captain Visger*", a fish patrol boat in 1919-20, 115.
60. As to date of appointment of A. A. Cole, on Peat Commission, 115.
61. As to employment of R. T. Harding, except as Counsel before Timber Commission, 128.
62. As to superannuation of Joseph Lemieux, and appointment of J. H. Dehaitre, 128.

63. As to number of Counsel paid at Spracklin trial, 129.
64. As to the leasing of the Bond Building, 133.
65. As to disposition of lots, since Nov. 1919, in the townships of Hearst, Lowbush, and Fauquier, 133.
66. As to date of employment of Rev. J. O. L. Spracklin, etc., 141.
67. As to application for Mother's Allowances in County of Oxford, 141.
68. As to applications for Mother's Allowances in County of Bruce, 142.
69. As to book "Flag and Fleet" on list of readers, 142.
70. As to who appeared for Province on Freight Rates Case, 146.
71. As to work carried on by Soldiers' Aid Commission, 147.
72. As to superannuation of J. N. Belanger, 150.
73. As to whether T. H. Dehaitre is still acting as Provincial Officer, 150.
74. As to applications for Mother's Allowances in County of Prescott, 151.
75. As to continuance of Soldiers' Aid Commission, 156.
76. As to uniform price obtained by Government for \$16,000,000 and \$10,000,000 six per cent gold bonds, designated as "SS" and "RR", 156.
77. As to total number of inside Civil Servants in employment; French-Canadians, 156.
78. As to identity of R. V. McPherson, 157.
79. As to Government conducting a scale of logs and mill cut *re* Doyle Rule, 163.
80. As to amounts received by officials in Attorney-General's Department, for Counsel fees in connection with O.T.A., etc., 167.
81. As to number of mothers applying for allowance, under Act, in Brantford, 168.
82. As to total number of Civil Service employees, 174.
83. As to appointment of James Higgins; salary, etc., 174.
84. As to time of payment of \$2,000, on account of services, paid to Commissioners Riddell and Latchford, etc., 178.
85. As to number of officials engaged by Board of License Commissioners, *re* O.T.A., who have been dismissed, 183.
86. As to moneys paid to W. J. Lannin, 184.
87. As to purchase of licenses in Algonquin Park, 185.
88. As to number of employees superannuated, etc., 185.

89. As to cost of Commission appointed to investigate Rural Credits, 187.
90. As to purchase of pamphlet entitled "Don Quixote in Finance," 202.
91. As to branch in Provincial Secretary's Department, devoted to repair of Public Buildings, 202.
92. As to payments to Arthur Hawkes, *re* Royal Radial Commission, 203.
93. As to persons added to each Department since Nov. 1919, 218.
94. As to cost of alterations of Knox College, 219.
95. As to number of petitions received *re* finding of Commission on Hydro rates, 220.
96. As to identity of G. Dupuis, 226.
97. As to applications made to Attorney-General for clemency under O.T.A., 222.
98. As to timber sold in Algonquin Park, 222.
99. As to identity of M. A. Mackenzie, 223.
100. As to annual revenue collected by Department of Mines, since 1907, 223.
101. As to official known as "Assistant to Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests," 229.
102. As to what settlement reached between Hydro-Electric Power Commission *re* purchase of property in township of Burton, 243.
103. As to encouragement of emigration to Province, 243.
104. As to leave of absence to Civil Servants for military training, 246.
105. As to judgment given by Justice Rose in action *vs.* Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Co., 256.
106. As to appointment of S. J. Martin, of Kemptville, 272.
107. As to proceeds of loans being placed to credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund, 272.
108. As to amount expended on Ottawa-Prescott Highway, 275.
109. As to indemnifying J. O. L. Spracklin of costs, 280.
110. As to private living rooms in Parliament Buildings, 280.
111. As to an opinion *re* Authority of Dominion Government to pass Act depriving Judges acting as Commissioners, of their remuneration, 281.
112. As to R. T. Harding being in employment of Attorney-General's Department, 281.
113. As to employment of N. W. Rowell, 281.
114. As to number of applications to Department of Attorney-General and others, for clemency, etc., under the O.T.A., 282.

115. As to employment of J. C. Elliott, 282.
116. As to number of cars at the disposal of Ministers, etc., 282.
117. As to purchase of motor cars, trucks, etc., 300.
118. As to estimate of timber on certain blocks, sold to E. W. Backus, 322.
119. As to reliable data *re* Employment of Children, 322.
120. As to date of original concession of pulpwood limits, held by Great Lakes Paper Co., 354.
121. As to work acquired by Government on purchase of Central Ontario Power System, 362.
122. As to negotiations made by Niagara Falls New York Power Co.: with Hydro-Commission, 367.

RACING ASSOCIATIONS:—

Question as to details of amount paid by each, 93.

RADIAL RAILWAYS:— See *Hydro-Electric, Toronto*.

RAILWAYS:—

Committee appointed, 28. *No report*.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES VOTING ACT:—

Bill (No. 65), introduced to amend, 26. Second reading and referred to Municipal Committee, 95. *No report*.

RAILWAY AND MUNICIPAL BOARD:—

1. Report presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 50.*) Printed.
2. Bills referred to, 34, 35, 109. Reported, 130, 137-172.

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION:—

Motion that Dominion Parliament be asked to amend Federal Railway Act so as to include Members of Legislature; withdrawn, 382.

REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS, TAXATION OF:—

Resolution introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 124. Bill (No. 134), introduced, 125. Second reading, 180. House goes into Committee on, 190. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 13.)

RECIPROCAL OR INTER-INSURANCE:—

Bill (No. 137), introduced respecting, 128. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 154. Reported, 260. House goes into Committee on and Bill defeated, 305.

REFORESTATION ACT:—

Bill (No. 74), introduced, 36. Second reading, 99. House goes into Committee on, 158. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 19.)

REGISTRY ACT:—

Bill (No. 180), introduced to amend, 183. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 209. Reported, 260. House goes into Committee on, 283. Third reading, 332. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 49.)

REGISTRY OFFICES:—

Report presented, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 7.*) Printed.

REST, ONE DAY IN SEVEN:—

Bill (No. 68), introduced for, 31. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 154. *No report.*

RIDDELL-LATCHFORD TIMBER ENQUIRY:—

1. Question as to cost of and amount paid to R. T. Harding, 90.
2. Question as to amounts, *per diem*, paid to Commissioners, 91.
3. Question as to time of payment of \$2,000 to Commissioners, etc., 178.

RIVER SIDE, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act to incorporate, 23. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 42), introduced and referred, 35. Reported, 181. Second reading, 189. Recommended, 209. Reported, 234. House goes into Committee on, 250, 325, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 121.)

ROLLIT, JOHN FULFORD:—

Petition for Act to authorize the Royal College of Dental Surgeons to admit to practise Dentistry in Ontario, 24. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 23), introduced and referred, 64. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 86.

ROWELL, NEWTON W.:—

Question as to employment office, Department of Attorney-General, 281.

RURAL CREDITS:—

1. Report presented, 67. (*Sessional Papers No. 58.*) Printed.

2. Question as to occupation of those who reported on, 102.
3. Question as to cost of Commission to investigate, 187.

S T. MARYS, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 31. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 31), introduced and referred, 109. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 287.

ST. THOMAS, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 33), introduced and referred, 35. Reported, 104. Second reading, 153. House goes into Committee on, 179. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242 (11 Geo. V. c. 122.)

SAULT STE MARIE, CITY OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 6), introduced and referred, 80. Reported, 287. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 120.)

SCHOOLS:—See *Education*.

SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR:—

Report presented, 331. (*Sessional Papers No. 19.*) Printed.

SHERIFFS:—

Report presented, respecting best mode of remunerating, 182. (*Sessional Papers No. 80.*) Printed. See *Coroners*.

SMITH AND HANNA:—

Return ordered, of correspondence, dealing with the suspension of; or resignation from the Provincial Police, 37. Presented, 153. (*Sessional Papers No. 74.*) Not printed.

SOLDIERS' AID COMMISSION:—

1. Reports presented, 139, 191. (*Sessional Papers No. 69.*) Printed.
2. Question as to what work now carried on, by, 147.
3. Question as to continuance of, 156.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS:—

Bill (No. 249), introduced respecting proof of death of, while on active service, 308. Second reading, 338. House goes into Committee on, 370.

Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 40.)

SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY:—

Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 17), introduced and referred, 81. Reported, 138. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 135.)

SPEAKER, MR. :—

1. Reads Messages from His Honour, 72, 270, 299.
2. Informs the House that Report had been received from Commissioners of Estate Bills, 166.
3. That Reports had been received from Railway and Municipal Board, 130, 137, 172.
4. House informed of illness of, and Speaker *pro tem*, elected, 192, 196.
5. Reserves ruling on point of order, 214.
6. Gives ruling against, 217.
7. Address His Honour, asking assent to Bills passed, 240, 383.

SPEECH:—See *Lieutenant-Governor*.

SPRACKLIN AND SPRACKLIN TRIAL:—

1. Question as to number of Counsel paid at trial, 129.
2. Question as to employment of, 141.
3. Question as to indemnifying him against costs of defence, 280.

SPRUCE FALLS PULP AND PAPER COY. :—

Return ordered, of correspondence relating to sale of Kapuskasing Soldiers and Sailors' Settlement Colony to, 116. Presented, 127. (*Sessional Papers No. 68.*) Not printed.

STALLION ENROLMENT BOARD:—

Report presented, 25. (*Sessional Papers No. 33.*) Printed.

STAMFORD, TOWNSHIP OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 79. Bill (No. 21), introduced and referred, 81. Reported, 138. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 124.)

STANDING ORDERS:—

1. Committee appointed, 27.
2. Report, 32, 63, 79, 80, 108, 139.
3. Recommend extension of time, 33, 79, 140.

STATIONARY AND HOISTING ENGINEERS ACT:—

Bill (No. 154), introduced to amend, 160. Second reading and referred to Labour Committee, 188. Reported, 276. House goes into Committee on, 305, 324. Third reading, 333. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 56.)

STATISTICS BRANCH:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 46.*) Printed.

STATUTE OF FRAUDS:—

Bill (No. 182), introduced to amend, 193. Second reading negatived, 212.

STATUTE LABOUR ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 161), introduced to amend, 26. Order for second reading discharged, 126.
2. Bill (No. 183), introduced to amend, 193. Second reading, 244. House goes into Committee on, 247, 309. Third reading, 321. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 69.)

STATUTES:—

Statement of distribution presented, 25. (*Sessional Papers No. 60.*) Not printed.

STEWART, JOSEPH :—

Question as to costs ordered to be paid by, 102.

SUBURBAN AREAS:—

Bill (No. 261), introduced respecting Public Improvements and Services in, 332. Second reading; House goes into Committee on; third reading, 379. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 66.)

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT:—

Resolutions introduced; Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified; passed through Committee and referred to Bill, 87. Bill (No. 81), introduced to amend, 87. Second reading, 126. House goes into Committee on, 158. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 10.)

SULPHUR FUMES:—

Bill (No. 242), introduced to provide compensation for damage caused by, 292. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 335. Third

reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 85.)

SUPPLY:—

1. Committee formed, 67.
2. Estimates presented and referred, 72, 270, 299. (*Sessional Papers No. 2.*) Printed.
3. Financial Statement delivered and Debate on adjourned, 73, 85, 89, 105, 119, 159, 165, 168, 170.
4. Amendment proposed and negatived, 170.
5. House goes into Committee on, 170, 195, 214, 225, 231, 239, 251, 258, 278, 285, 292, 312, 314, 330, 337.
6. Resolutions reported and concurred in, 261-70, 294-99, 340-50.
7. House goes into Committee of Ways and Means and Resolution concurred in, 350.
8. Bill of Supply (No. 263), introduced and read a first, second and third time, 351. R. A., 388. (11 Geo. V. c. 1.)

T ECUMSEH, TOWN OF:—

Petition for Act to incorporate, 24. Reported, 33. Bill (No. 45), introduced and referred, 35. Reported, 169. Second reading, 175. House goes into Committee on, 179. Third reading, 235. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 125.)

TEMISKAMING, DISTRICT OF:—

Bill (No. 235), introduced respecting the Administration of Justice in, 271. Second reading, 309. House goes into Committee on, 336. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 39.)

TEMISKAMING AND N. O. RAILWAY:—

1. Question as to construction work on, from Cochrane, North, 154.
2. Motion proposed and negatived, *re* extension, westerly, of, from North Bay to Parry Sound, 380.
3. Report of Commission presented, 170. (*Sessional Papers No. 48.*) Printed.

TIMBER COMMISSION:—

Interim Reports presented of, 119. (*Sessional Papers No. 67.*) Printed.

TIMBER AND TIMBER DUES:—

1. Question as to sums of money received for, up to December, 1920, 50.
2. Question as to use of Doyle Rule in measurement of logs and, 84.
3. Question as to identity of Mr. Campbell, 157.
4. Question as to estimate on Blocks 1 to 6, sold to E. W. Backus, 322.
5. Return ordered, showing how many limits offered for sale since December, 1910, 85. Presented, 85. (*Sessional Papers No. 64.*) Not printed. See *Riddell-Latchford.*

TIMBER SLIDE COMPANIES ACT:—

Bill (No. 240), introduced to amend, 280. Second reading, 328. House goes into Committee on, 336. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 59.)

TORONTO, CITY OF:—

1. Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 32. Bill (No. 8), introduced and referred, 34. Reported, 332. Second reading, 369. House goes into Committee on; third reading, 379. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 126.)
2. Bill (No. 219), introduced respecting the purchase by, of the assets of certain companies, 248. Second reading, 337. House goes into Committee on, 371. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 23.)
3. Bill (No. 258), introduced to authorize the purchase and operation, by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, on behalf of, 320. Second reading, 339. House goes into Committee on, 374. Third reading, 377. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 24.)

TORONTO AND HAMILTON HIGHWAY COMMISSION ACT:—

Bill (No. 115), introduced to amend, 90. Second reading, 155. House goes into Committee on, 164. 237. Third reading, 237. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 26.)

TORONTO UNIVERSITY:—

1. Report presented, 26. (*Sessional Papers No. 18.*) Printed.
2. Report of Commission presented, *re* Financial Obligations to and other Universities, 103. (*Sessional Papers No. 65.*) Printed.
3. Petition presented, of The Students Administrative Council, 97.

TOWN SITES:—See *Hearst.*

TOWNSHIP ROADS:—

Bill (No. 206), introduced to provide for construction of, by Special Assessment, 228. Order for second reading discharged, 329.

TRADES AND LABOUR BRANCH ACT:—

Bill (No. 173), introduced to amend, 177. Second reading, 195. House goes into Committee on, 212. Third reading, 353. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 77.)

TRAFALGAR AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY AND TOWN OF OAKVILLE:—

Petitions for Act respecting, 38, 63. Reported, 140. Bill (No. 49), introduced and referred, 140. Reported, 213. Second reading, 244. House goes into Committee on, 248. Third reading, 254. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 113.)

TREASURY BILLS:—

Question as to any issued since 13th November, 1919; what amounts, etc., 95.

TRUSTEE ACT:—

Bill (No. 63), introduced to amend, 26. Second reading and referred to the Legal Committee, 175. Reported, 188. House goes into Committee on, 335, 354. Third reading, 354. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 48.)

TWO PLATOON SYSTEM:—See *Fire Departments*.**U**NEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE:—

Resolution in favour of Conference with Dominion and Provincial Governments in the matter of, and Old Age Pensions, etc., 380-1.

UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION:—

Resolution endorsing representations made by Veteran Organizations regarding, carried and copy directed to be sent to Prime Minister at Ottawa, etc., 366-7.

UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITY ACT:—

1. Report presented, of Commission to report upon basis of finance obligation of Province, towards, Toronto, Queen's and Western Universities, 103. (*Sessional Papers No. 65.*) Printed.
2. Bill (No. 211), introduced to amend Act, 228. Second reading, 327. Order for House to go into Committee on discharged, 374.

UNMARRIED PARENTS:—See *Children*.**V**EGETABLE GROWERS:—

Report presented, 319. (*Sessional Paper No. 43.*) Printed.

VENEREAL DISEASES:—

Return ordered, of copy of Agreement between Provincial Board of Health

and Federal Health Department, relating to prevention of, 117. Presented, 153. (*Sessional Papers No. 73.*) Not printed.

VISGAR, CAPTAIN:—

Question as to Patrol Boat—so called—in Commission in 1919-20, 115.

VOTERS' LISTS IN CITIES:—

Bill (No. 67), introduced respecting the preparation of, 30. Second reading, 136. Referred to Select Committee, 141. Reported, 242. House goes into Committee on, 275, 321. Third reading, 322. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 2.)

WAR, THE:—

1. Report presented, of Select Committee appointed to consider how best to provide a permanent record of appreciation of distinguished services of all men of His Majesty's Forces, etc., 196.
2. Committee of Session of 1920, re-appointed to report *re* War Memorial for Ontario, 333. Member added, 351.

WAYS AND MEANS:—See *Supply*.

WESTON CLUB:—See *Etobicoke*.

WHITE DOG RAPIDS WATER POWER:—

Return ordered, of correspondence with E. W. Backus, relating to, and the Lake of the Woods Pulp Concession, 380. *Not brought down*.

WHITE, PETER, K.C. :—

Return ordered, of correspondence, relating to payment of Counsel Fee to and Debate on adjourned, 70, 142. Order discharged and Motion withdrawn, 365.

WILGESS, A. T. :—

Question *re* appointment of, as Librarian, 49.

WINDSOR, CITY OF:—

1. Petition for Act respecting, 24. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 24), introduced and referred, 109. Reported, 213. Second reading, 249. House goes into Committee on, 257. Third reading, 271. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 127.)
2. Petition for Act respecting the City and the Essex Border Utilities Commission, 24. Reported, 63. Bill (No. 25), introduced and referred, 65. Reported withdrawn; fees remitted, 145.
3. Petition for Act respecting and to validate sales of land, 24. Reported, 63.

Bill (No. 26), introduced and referred, 65. Reported, 120. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 172. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 128.)

WINDSOR AND WALKERVILLE:—

Petition for Act respecting the formation of a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for, 24. Reported, 108. Bill (No. 41), introduced and referred, 110. Reported, 120. Second reading, 154. House goes into Committee on, 173. Third reading, 194. R. A., 242. (11 Geo. V. c. 129.)

WINNIPEG PROVINCIAL ELECTION:—

Question as to special representative sent to report on, 69.

WOMEN:—

1. Bill (No. 69), introduced for the protection of, during confinement, 31. Second reading and referred to Labour Committee, 175. *No report.*
2. Bill (No. 223), introduced, concerning the employment of, during the night, 252. Order for second reading discharged, 367.
3. Bill (No. 239), introduced to extend the Franchise to, in Municipal Elections, 280. Order for second reading discharged, 367. See *Deserted Wives.*

WOMEN'S INSTITUTES:—

Report presented, 307. (*Sessional Papers No. 41.*) Printed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT:—

1. Bill (No. 169), introduced to amend, 173. Order for second reading discharged, 329.
2. Bill (No. 176), introduced to amend, 178. Order for second reading discharged, 374.
3. Report of Board presented, 331. (*Sessional Papers No. 55.*) Printed.

YORK, TOWNSHIP OF:—

Petition for Act respecting, 119. Reported, 140. Bill (No. 54), introduced and referred, 140. Reported, 287. Second reading, 327. House goes into Committee on, 368. Third reading, 376. R. A., 387. (11 Geo. V. c. 130.)

YOUNG PERSONS:—

Bill (No. 224), introduced in connection with night work of, employed in industry, 252. Order for second reading discharged, 368.

LIST OF SESSIONAL PAPERS

PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE DURING THE SESSION.

TITLE.	No.	REMARKS.
Accounts, Public, 1920.....	1	<i>Printed.</i>
Agricultural College, Report.....	30	"
Agricultural and Experimental Union, Report.....	32	"
Agricultural Societies, Report.....	42	"
Agriculture, Department of, Report.....	29	"
Archivist, Report, with Supplement.....	52	"
Auditor, Provincial, Report.....	5	"
Bee-Keepers' Association, Report.....	37	<i>Printed.</i>
Births, Marriages and Deaths, Report.....	20	"
Canada Copper Company, Correspondence.....	79	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Children, Neglected and Dependent, Report.....	27	<i>Printed.</i>
Civil Service Commissioner, Report.....	87	"
Coatsworth, Judge, Report on Criminal Justice, etc., in U. S.	56	"
Coroners, Report respecting.....	80	"
Criminal, Justice, Report on.....	56	"
Dairymen's Association, Report.....	38	<i>Printed.</i>
Division Courts, Report of Inspector.....	5	"
Education, Report of Department.....	17	<i>Printed.</i>
Education, Orders-in-Council.....	61	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Elections, Return from Records.....	51	<i>Printed.</i>
Entomological Society, Report.....	36	"
Estimates.....	2	"
Fish caught in Lakes Nipissing and Nipigon.....	83	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Friendly Societies, Report.....	11	<i>Printed.</i>
Fruit Growers, Report.....	44	"
Game and Fisheries, Report.....	14	<i>Printed.</i>
Hastings, David, Report of Commission, re charges.....	94	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Health, Board of, Report.....	21	<i>Printed.</i>
Horticultural Society, Report.....	43	"
Hospitals and Charitable Institutions, Report.....	25	"
Hospitals and Charitable Institutions, Orders-in-Council....	93	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Housing Commission, Report.....	40	<i>Printed.</i>
Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Report.....	49	"
Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Report as to distribution of Power.....	59	"
Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Report upon rate of Wages paid re Queenston-Chippawa development.....	77	"
Insane, Hospitals, Report.....	22	<i>Printed.</i>

CONTINUED


TITLE.	No.	REMARKS.
Insurance, Report.....	10	<i>Printed.</i>
Kapuskasing, Town site at.....	68	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Labour, Report of Department.....	16	<i>Printed.</i>
Lands and Forests, Report.....	3	"
Legal Offices, Report.....	6	"
Legislative Building, places in use outside.....	91	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Librarian, Report of.....	53	"
License Commissioners, convictions, O.T.A.....	84	"
Live Stock Branch, Report.....	39	<i>Printed.</i>
Loan Corporations, Report.....	12	"
Loan and Trust Corporations, Statements.....	12	"
Loans, "R.R." and "S.S." correspondence.....	92	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Luke, Lewis R., correspondence.....	75	"
Magistrates, correspondence <i>re</i> O.T.A.....	71	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Marriage Licenses, Report.....	62	<i>Printed.</i>
Marriage Licenses, Issuers of.....	70	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Mines, Report of Department.....	4	<i>Printed.</i>
Mining Tax Act, amounts credited to.....	82	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Mining Taxes, correspondence <i>re</i> increase.....	78	"
Mothers' Allowances, Report.....	88	<i>Printed.</i>
Municipal Affairs, Report.....	47	"
Municipal Auditor, Report.....	8	"
Ontario Athletic Commission, Report.....	76	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Ontario Public School Readers, tenders for.....	66	"
Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, Report.....	50	<i>Printed.</i>
Ontario Temperance Act, Report of Commissioners.....	28	"
Ontario Temperance Act, duties of Magistrates, etc.....	71	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Ontario Temperance Act, convictions under.....	84	"
Ottawa-Prescott Highway, miles included, etc.....	90	"
Parole, Ontario Board of, Report.....	57	<i>Printed.</i>
Prisons and Reformatories, Report.....	26	"
Proportional Representation, Report.....	81	"
Provincial Auditor, Report.....	54	"
Provincial Police, Report of Superintendent.....	72	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Public Accounts.....	1	<i>Printed.</i>
Public Highways, Report.....	15	"
Public Service Commission, Report.....	63	"
Public Works, Report of Department.....	13	"
Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, Report.....	9	<i>Printed.</i>
Queenston-Chippawa Development, Johnson's Report.....	85	"


CONTINUED

TITLE.	No.	REMARKS.
Queenston-Chippawa Development, Lea's Report.....	86	<i>Printed.</i>
Queenston-Chippawa Development, Cooper's Report.....	89	"
Registrar-General, Report.....	20	<i>Printed.</i>
Registry Offices, Report.....	7	"
Rural Credits, Report.....	58	"
Secretary and Registrar, Report.....	19	<i>Printed.</i>
Smith and Hanna, correspondence.....	74	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Soldiers' Aid Commission, Reports.....	69	<i>Printed.</i>
Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Co., correspondence.....	68	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Stallion Enrolment Board, Report.....	33	<i>Printed.</i>
Statistics Branch, Report.....	46	"
Statutes, Distribution of.....	60	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Temiskaming and N. O. Railway, Report.....	48	<i>Printed.</i>
Timber Commission, Reports.....	67	"
Timber Limits, offered for sale.....	64	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Toronto University, Report.....	18	<i>Printed.</i>
Toronto University, Report of Commission.....	65	"
Vegetable Growers' Association, Report.....	34	<i>Printed.</i>
Venereal Diseases, <i>re</i> prevention of.....	73	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Women's Institutes, Report.....	41	<i>Printed.</i>
Workmen's Compensation Board, Report.....	55	"

PAPERS ORDERED BUT NOT BROUGHT DOWN.

	<i>Page.</i>
1. Backus, E. W., correspondence <i>re</i> Lake of the Woods Pulp Concessions and White Dog Rapids Water Power	380
2. Game and Fisheries, fines and confiscations	135
3. Harding, R. T., correspondence regarding account rendered to James Hourigan & Co.	382
4. Hastings, David, correspondence <i>re</i> dismissal of	380
5. Highways Improvement, contribution of Federal Government under Canada Roads Act ,	381
6. Lumber Mills, Report of officer who conducted scale of logs and mill cut at Twenty-six mills	366
7. Municipal Loan Fund, operations of, amounts loaned, etc.	61
8. Ontario Temperance Act, correspondence, Attorney-General and Police Magistrates, Crown Attorneys	62
9. Ontario Temperance Act, correspondence <i>re</i> convictions	130
10. Ontario Temperance Act, applications for remission of fines in cases where Member for S.E. Toronto. Seat "A" was interested	204
White Dog Rapids:—See <i>above</i> 1.	





JOURNALS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

OF THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, January 25th, 1921.

PROCLAMATION.

Canada
Province of
Ontario. }

LIONEL HERBERT CLARKE.

GEORGE FIFTH, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, KING, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India, &c., &c., &c.

To Our Faithful, the Members elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of Our Province of Ontario and to every of you—GREETING.

WILLIAM EDGAR RANEY, } **W**HEREAS it is expedient for certain causes
Attorney General. } and considerations to convene the Legislative
Assembly of Our said Province, WE DO WILL that you and each of you, and
all others in this behalf interested, on TUESDAY, the TWENTY-FIFTH day of
the month of JANUARY now next, at OUR CITY OF TORONTO, personally
be and appear for the DESPATCH OF BUSINESS, to treat, act, do and conclude
upon these things which, in Our Legislature of the Province of Ontario by the
Common Council of Our said Province, may by the favour of God be ordained.

HEREIN FAIL NOT.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, we have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Our Province of Ontario to be hereunto affixed: WITNESS, His Honour LIONEL HERBERT CLARKE, LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR of Our Province of Ontario, at Our Government House, in the City of Toronto, in Our said Province, this EIGHTH day of DECEMBER, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty, and in the Eleventh year of Our Reign.

By Command,

ARTHUR H. SYDERE.

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Tuesday, the Twenty-fifth day of January, 1921, being the first day of the Second Meeting of the Fifteenth Legislature of the Province of Ontario for the Despatch of Business pursuant to a Proclamation of His Honour Lionel Herbert Clarke, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province.

PRAYERS.

3 O'clock P.M.

Mr. Speaker informed the House, that he had received notifications of vacancies which had occurred during and since the last Session of the House, and had issued his Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for new Writs for the Election of Members to serve in the present Legislature for the following Electoral Districts:—

Fort William, and
Toronto, N.E. seat "A."*

To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

WE, the undersigned Ernest Charles Drury, Member for the said Legislative Assembly for the Electoral Division of Halton, and Manning Doherty, Member for the said Legislative Assembly for the Electoral Division of East Kent, do hereby notify you that a vacancy has occurred in the representation in the said Legislative Assembly for the Electoral Division of Fort William, by reason of the acceptance of an office under the Crown, to WIT:

*For Mr. Cody's resignation, *vide* page 22 of Journal of 1920.

the office of Minister of Mines for the Province, by Henry Mills, Member elect for the said Electoral Division of Fort William. And we, the said Ernest Charles Drury and Manning Doherty, Members of the Assembly aforesaid, hereby require you to issue a new Writ for the Election of a Member to fill the said vacancy.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands and seals on this Twenty-sixth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty.

Signed and sealed in the presence of
J. LONSDALE CAPREOL.

E. C. DRURY. [L.S.]

MANNING DOHERTY. [L.S.]

Mr. Speaker also informed the House, That the Clerk had laid upon the Table the following Certificates:

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that in virtue of a Writ of Election, dated the second day of July, 1920, issued by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and addressed to Hugh H. Browne, Esquire, Returning Officer for the Electoral District of Fort William, for the election of a Member to represent the said Electoral District of Fort William in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the room of Henry Mills, Esquire, who had accepted an office of emolument under the Crown: TO WIT, the office of Minister of Mines, the Honourable Henry Mills has been returned as duly elected, as appears by the Return to the said Writ of Election, dated the nineteenth day of July, 1920, which is now lodged of record in my office.

ARTHUR H. SYDERE,

Clerk, L. A.

Ex officio Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Toronto, January 10th, 1921.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that in virtue of a Writ of Election, dated the twenty-third day of September, 1920, issued by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and addressed to Thomas Gibson, Esquire, Returning Officer for the Electoral District of North-East Toronto, Seat "A," for the election of a Member to represent the said Electoral District of North-East Toronto, Seat "A," in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the room of the Honourable Henry John Cody, who had resigned, Alexander Cameron Lewis, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected, as appears by the Return to the said Writ of Election, dated the seventeenth day of November, 1920, which is now lodged of record in my office.

ARTHUR H. SYDERE,

Clerk, L. A.

Ex officio Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Toronto, January 10th, 1921.

The Honourable Henry Mills, Member for the Electoral District of Fort William, having taken the Oaths and subscribed the Roll, took his seat.

Mr. Speaker also informed the House, That he had received from the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Controverted Elections Act of Ontario, Certificates and Reports, relating to the Elections for the Electoral Districts of:—

Grenville,

Dufferin,

Centre Simcoe, and

East Simcoe.

The several Certificates and Reports were then read by the Clerk at the Table as follows:—

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO.

THE CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Election for the Electoral District of the County of Dufferin, holden on the 20th day of October, 1920.

Between

John Johnson, William Braiden and George Moffat,
Petitioners,

and

Thomas Kerr Slack,
Respondent.

To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

WE, the Court constituted under The Controverted Elections Act for the trial of the Petition of the above-named Petitioners against the Return of the above-named Respondent as duly elected at the above-named election, have the honour to report as follows:—

1. The said Thomas Kerr Slack was duly elected and returned.
2. No corrupt practice has been proved to have been committed.
3. There is no reason to believe that corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the said election.
4. We are not of opinion that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the Petition, or that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices extensively prevailed is desirable.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

W. MULOCK,
Chief Justice of the Exchequer.

H. E. ROSE,
Justice.

Osgoode Hall,
October 29th, 1920.

To the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

(1) WE, the undersigned, James Magee and Robert Franklin Sutherland, the two Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Ontario duly assigned,

pursuant to The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, R.S.O., ch. 10, sec. 76 (1), for the trial of corrupt practices and of offences punishable under section 201 of The Ontario Elections Act, committed at or in connection with the Grenville Provincial election, held in October, 1919, beg to report, pursuant to section 51 of the said The Controverted Elections Act, that upon the evidence submitted to us in support of the petition of George Arthur Payne, the defeated candidate at the said election, and the cross-petition of George Howard Ferguson, the candidate who had by the Returning Officer been declared elected, we determined that the latter, George Howard Ferguson, was duly elected, and in consequence dismissed the petition in respect of which evidence was offered before us, on the trial of the said election petition on the 13th, 14th and 15th September, 1920, without costs, and dismissed the cross-petition, with respect to which no evidence was offered, also without costs, and we certify the same accordingly.

(2) We further report, pursuant to section 52 of the said The Controverted Elections Act (a) that no corrupt practice has been proved to have been committed by or with the actual knowledge or consent of any candidate.

(b) (1) "That one Sydney Lampkin, a moulder in a plow factory, solicited Alexander Matt, Lorne Burchill and Alexander Landrie, to vote for the respondent, telling Matt and Landrie each that there was something in it for them. Next day or so he put \$2.00 into the pocket of each of the first two named, and handed \$2.00 to Landrie, who gave it back to him with the remark that Lampkin needed it as much as he, and Lampkin thanked him." The said Lampkin was proved to have been thus guilty of a corrupt practice.

(2) That one John Boyd was proved to have made a corrupt offer to James Kelly, James E. McIntyre and William Fleming, through one Albert Roach, in sending him to them in connection with the election in question and telling him to say to each "there would be something in it for him" to vote for the respondent if he would do so, and to Fleming he named the sum of \$5.00.

(3) That one William Kidd made a corrupt offer to one William J. Greer in connection with the said election with respect to his vote by asking him to vote for the respondent, and if \$5.00 would not tempt him.

(4) That one Almon Cook admittedly made a payment of \$2.00 to a voter, Mrs. Kathleen Bellinger, and professedly for voting for the petitioner Payne, although his statement that he did so for voting for him may well be questioned, and we find that such payment was corrupt.

(5) That the evidence did not warrant a finding that there was reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed at the election.

(6) That we are not of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to this petition or cross-petition, or that further inquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable.

All of which we respectfully certify and report:

Dated this twenty-ninth day of December, 1920.

JAMES MAGEE, J. A.
R. F. SUTHERLAND, J.

To the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

(1) WE, the undersigned, James Magee and Robert Franklin Sutherland, the two Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Ontario duly assigned, pursuant to The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, R.S.O., ch. 10, sec. 76 (1), for the trial of corrupt practices and of offences punishable under section 201 of The Ontario Elections Act, committed at or in connection with the Centre Simcoe Provincial election, held in October, 1919, beg to report, pursuant to section 51 of the said The Controverted Elections Act, that the petition of John Thomas Simpson, the defeated candidate at the said election against Gilbert Hugh Murdock, the candidate who had by the Returning Officer been declared elected for the said Electoral District of East Simcoe, came before us for trial on Saturday, the twenty-third day of October, 1920, at the City of Toronto, to which place the place of trial had, with the consent of the parties, been changed, and Counsel for both parties being present, no evidence was offered in support of the said petition, and we determined that the said Gilbert Hugh Murdock was duly elected, and in consequence dismissed the said petition.

(2) We further report, pursuant to section 52 of the said The Controverted Elections Act (a) that no corrupt practice has been proved to have been committed by or with the actual knowledge or consent of any candidate.

(b) That no person was proved to have been guilty of any corrupt practice.

(c) That no evidence being offered we have no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed at the election.

(d) That we are not of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to this petition or cross-petition, or that further inquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable.

All of which we respectfully certify and report.

Dated this twenty-ninth day of December, 1920.

JAMES MAGEE (J. A.)
R. F. SUTHERLAND (J.)

THE ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

ELECTION *for the Electoral District of East Simcoe.*

BETWEEN

JAMES IRWIN HARTT,
Petitioner.

against

JOHN B. JOHNSTON,
Respondent.

Pursuant to the provisions of The Ontario Controverted Elections Act (R.S.O. 1914, Cap. 10, section 51), we, the undersigned, James Magee and Frank Egerton Hodgins, the two Judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, assigned to try the Petition of the above-named Petitioner against the above-named Respondent in relation to the Election held on the twentieth day of October, 1919, for the election of a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario for the Electoral District of East Simcoe, do hereby report:—

THAT the said Petition came before us for trial on Saturday, the twenty-third day of October, 1920, at the City of Toronto, to which date and place, the date and place of trial had, with the consent of the parties to the said Petition, been changed and Counsel for both parties being present, no evidence was offered in support of the said Petition, and we determined that the above-named Respondent was duly elected and returned as Member as aforesaid for the said Electoral District, and dismissed the said Petition, and no appeal having since been had against such our judgment we hereby make this our report.

AND pursuant to section 52 of the said The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, we further report:

(a) That no corrupt practice has been proved to have been committed by or with the actual knowledge or consent of any candidate.

(b) That no person has been proved to have been guilty of corrupt practice.

(c) That no person has upon his own evidence been found guilty of a corrupt practice.

(d) That no evidence having been offered, we have no reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed.

(e) That we are not of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, or that further inquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable.

All of which we respectfully certify and report.

Dated this twenty-ninth day of December, 1920.

JAMES MAGEE (J. A.)
FRANK E. HODGINS (J. A.)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Appellate Division.

(UNDER THE ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.)

Election holden for the Electoral District of the County of Grenville, the 20th day of October, A.D. 1920.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, TO WIT:

Hon. Mr. Justice Magee.	}	Tuesday, the 12th day of October, 1920.
Hon. Mr. Justice Sutherland.		

Between

George Howard Ferguson,
Cross Petitioner,

and

George Arthur Payne,
Respondent.

1. This action, coming on for trial on the 12th day of September, 1920, before this Court at sittings holden at Prescott for the trial of this Election Petition, in the presence of Counsel for both parties, upon hearing read the pleadings and the Cross Petition, this Court was pleased to direct this action to stand over for judgment, and the same coming on this day for judgment.

2. This Court doth order and adjudge that this action be and the same is hereby dismissed without costs.

3. This Court doth further order that upon payment to the Returning Officer and the Sheriff of their just charges under the 21st Section of The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, the money deposited in Court to the credit of the action be paid out to the petitioner.

(Sgd.) N. F. PATERSON,
Registrar.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Appellate Division.

(UNDER THE ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.)

Election for the Electoral District of the County of Dufferin, holden on the 20th day of October, 1919.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, TO WIT:

<p>The Honourable Mr. Justice Mulock, Chief Justice. The Honourable Mr. Justice Rose.</p>	}	<p>Tuesday, the 12th day of October, 1920.</p>
---	---	--

Between

John Johnston, William Braiden and George Moffatt,

Petitioners,

and

Thomas Kerr Slack,

Respondent.

1. This action, coming on for trial on the 27th day of September, 1920, before this Court at sittings holden at Orangeville, for the trial of this Election Petition, in the presence of Counsel for both parties, upon hearing read the pleadings and hearing the evidence adduced and what was alleged by Counsel aforesaid, this Court was pleased to direct this action to stand over for judgment and the same coming on this day for judgment.

2. This Court doth order and adjudge that this action be and the same is hereby dismissed.

3. This Court doth further order and adjudge that the petitioner pay to the respondent his costs of this action.

4. This Court doth further order and adjudge that out of the moneys deposited by the petitioner in Court to the credit of this action be paid to the Returning Officer and the Sheriff their just charges under the 21st section of The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, and to the respondent his taxed costs, and that the balance remaining, if any, be paid out to the petitioner.

(Sgd.) N. F. PATERSON,

Registrar.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO.

THE ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Election for the Electoral District of East Simcoe, holden the 20th day of October, 1919.

Before Hon. Mr. Justice Magee and } Saturday, the twenty-third day of
Hon. Mr. Justice Hodgins. } October, A.D. 1920.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, TO WIT:

Between

James Irwin Hartt,

[L.S.]

Petitioner,

and

John B. Johnston,

Respondent.

1. This action, having been set down for trial at Orillia on Tuesday, the 12th day of October, 1920, and this Court, by Order dated the 20th day of October, 1920, adjourned the said trial to Toronto, and the trial coming on this day at Toronto in the presence of Counsel for both parties, and hearing read the pleadings and Counsel for the petitioner refusing to deliver particulars of petition and offering no evidence.

2. This Court doth order and adjudge that the respondents' motion to dismiss the petition for the petitioners' failure to deliver particulars be dismissed without costs.

3. And this Court doth further order and adjudge that this action be and the same is hereby dismissed.

4. And this Court doth further order and adjudge that the petitioner pay to the respondent his costs of this action including the costs of the said order adjourning the trial to Toronto.

5. This Court doth further order and adjudge that out of the moneys deposited by the petitioner in Court to the credit of this action be paid to the Returning Officer and the Sheriff their just charges under the 21st section of The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, and to the respondent his taxed costs, and that the balance remaining, if any, be paid out to the petitioner.

(Sgd.) N. F. PATERSON,

Registrar.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO.

THE ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Election for the Electoral District of Centre Simcoe, holden the 20th day of October, 1919.

Before Hon. Mr. Justice Magee and } Saturday, the twenty-third day of
Hon. Mr. Justice Sutherland. } October, 1920.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, TO WIT:

Between

John Thomas Simpson,
Petitioner,

[L.S.]

and

Gilbert Hugh Murdock,
Respondent.

1. This action, having been set down for trial at Barrie on Tuesday, the 19th day of October, 1920, and this Court, by Order dated the 20th day of October, 1920, adjourned the said trial to Toronto, and the trial coming on this day at Toronto in the presence of Counsel for both parties, and hearing read the pleadings and Counsel for the petitioner refusing to deliver particulars of petition and offering no evidence.

2. This Court doth order and adjudge that the respondents' motion to dismiss the petition for the petitioners' failure to deliver particulars be dismissed without costs.

3. And this Court doth further order and adjudge that this action be and the same is hereby dismissed.

4. And this Court doth further order and adjudge that the petitioner pay to the respondent his costs of this action, including the costs of the said Order adjourning the trial to Toronto.

5. This Court doth further order and adjudge that out of the moneys deposited by the petitioner in Court to the credit of this action be paid to the Returning Officer and the Sheriff their just charges under the 21st section of The Ontario Controverted Elections Act, and to the respondent his taxed costs, and the balance remaining, if any, be paid out to the petitioner.

(Sgd.) N. F. PATERSON,

Registrar.

The House then adjourned during pleasure.

And after some time the House resumed.

His Honour Lionel Herbert Clarke, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, then entered the House, and being seated on the Chair on the Throne, was pleased to open the Session by the following gracious Speech to the House:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly—

In opening this Session I desire to give expression to the feeling of profound gratitude which our people owe to Almighty God for the manifold blessings that flow from the tranquillity of our Country, the stability of our institutions and the bountiful harvest of the past year.

At the present time the civilized world is passing through a period of readjustment to peace conditions, presenting serious problems to this Province. The situation calls for wise and generous counsels in order that industry may be maintained and labour afforded every possible opportunity for employment. My Government has found it advisable under the circumstances to extend financial assistance to provide relief for the unemployed, and will initiate legislation for public co-operation to the same end. I trust that before long a general revival of business activity will restore normal conditions in this Province.

The agricultural industry has suffered materially from the rapid deflation of the market prices of farm products, and the probable effect of this loss upon our rural districts is a matter of importance to the whole Province. A consideration of the situation looking towards a better understanding and a more general co-operation between our rural and urban population will, I trust, lead to beneficial results, and tend towards reducing the cost of distribution and bettering rural conditions in the Province.

One of the most practical ways of improving the conditions of rural life is by means of a judiciously designed good roads system. This matter has been kept prominently before my Ministers during the past year and much progress has been made in the direction of broadening the scope of the plans for highway improvement. It is felt that good roads are among the greatest material needs of the Province at the present time, by reason of the fact that they will not only help to solve the transportation problem and promote the economic welfare of the whole community, but will also contribute immeasurably to the convenience and happiness of the people.

Scarcely less important to the general welfare is the distribution of electrical energy in the rural districts, on terms more nearly approaching an equality with those on which the urban population is served. Special study has been devoted to this subject by a Committee of the Legislative Assembly, and this Committee has agreed upon findings which will be laid before you at an early date. It will be found that the report is not only a valuable contribution to the information available on this subject, but that it advances important suggestions for legislative action.

During the Recess the Minister of Agriculture visited Great Britain for the purpose of studying conditions in relation to immigration, the marketing of the products of the Province to better advantage, and the removal of the embargo on cattle.

The attention of the Government has been directed unceasingly during the past year to the important subject of education, with a view to increasing the efficiency of both rural and urban primary schools, as well as the secondary schools of the Province. The question of providing school organizations to meet the needs for fuller educational advantages in rural districts will be dealt with in a practical and comprehensive manner. A Committee is at present engaged in considering the High School courses of study, and their relation to general education and to vocational training. In due course a report will be laid before you giving the findings of the Commission of enquiry into the subject of university finances. Recognizing the need of better educational facilities for isolated settlements in the North Country, the Government has opened a special form of High School at Monteith, to which pupils may be sent from districts where advanced courses of instruction have hitherto been found impracticable. The success of the new school will have a direct relation to some of the educational problems of Northern Ontario. Measures to attain all these objects, and to make the educational system worthy of the Province and equal to the special needs of the time, will be presented for your consideration.

The welfare of industrial workers is a matter in which all classes are deeply concerned. Under the legislation of last Session, a Minimum Wage Board has been established and a plan for the payment of mothers' allowances has been put into operation. These measures have met with general acceptance and give promise of satisfactory results. A number of recommendations for legislation for the welfare of labour have been submitted to my Government, some of which have been endorsed by the International Labour Congress. In this connection, certain measures will be submitted to you, and in order to facilitate the consideration of such matters, you will be asked to appoint a standing Committee on Labour legislation which will afford the House the opportunity of hearing and weighing the views of all parties interested. The earnest desire of the Government, and the people of the Province, is that your legislation will promote harmony and progress in our industrial relations.

It is a matter of much satisfaction that the financial strength of Ontario is so well recognized by the investing public as to enable the Government to secure advantageous terms on the money market for the securities of this Province. This fact was demonstrated in a remarkable way by the success of the recent Provincial loan. While the expenditure of the Government under existing conditions of high cost and expanding undertakings has of necessity increased, the revenues are sufficiently buoyant to meet the public requirements.

Much progress was made during the past year in the construction of the Queenston-Chippawa Development, which, when complete, will greatly increase the quantity of electrical energy available in this Province. Arrangements

have been made for the purchase, by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, of the plant and transmission lines of the Electrical Development Company. The details of this important proposal will be submitted to you for your consideration and ratification. Projects for the construction and acquisition of certain radial railways have been made the subject of investigation, and the result of that investigation will be laid before you in due course.

The administration of the Ontario Temperance Act has been impaired by the traffic in intoxicating liquors both to and from this Province, but at an early date the question of the continuance of these conditions will be decided by a vote of the people. In the meantime, steps have been taken to deal with the situation as it exists, and legislation will be initiated to render such measures effective.

The work of simplification and codification of the statute law, in which progress was made last Session, will be resumed, and continued from time to time until this desirable object has been accomplished. Your attention will be directed to a consolidation of the Municipal and Assessment laws and to other consolidations for which preparations have been made.

Several Committees of the Legislature have been in Session during the Recess and have prepared reports upon matters referred to them. These reports deal with the subject of proportional representation, a memorial to the heroes of the war, the establishment of an Industrial Rehabilitation Board, the administration of the Ontario Temperance Act and the equalization of Hydro-Electric rates, and will be submitted to you at an early date.

You will be asked to consider legislation to provide a system of Rural Credits for the Province; to amend the Election Act; respecting Reforestation; regarding the Development of Northern Ontario; to amend the Corporation Tax Act; regarding the status of illegitimate children; to amend the Public Health Act; to amend the Mining Tax Act; regarding the employment of women in restaurants; respecting Loan and Trust Companies; to amend the Highways Act, to amend the Factories Act, and for other purposes.

The Public Accounts will be brought down at an early date, and in due course Supplementary Estimates for the current year and Estimates for the coming fiscal year, will be laid before you.

In welcoming you to the discharge of your duties, I desire to express the hope that under the guidance of Providence your deliberations may advance the prosperity of the Province, and the welfare and happiness of all our people.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire.

Mr. Speaker then reported. That, to prevent mistakes, he had obtained a copy of His Honour's Speech, which he read.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney, a Bill was introduced intituled "An Act respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office to persons appointed as Justices of the Peace," and the same was read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, to this House, be taken into consideration To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Resolved, That Select Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes:—1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Railways; 3. On Miscellaneous Private Bills; 4. On Standing Orders; 5. On Public Accounts; 6. On Printing; 7. On Municipal Law; 8. On Legal Bills; 9. On Agriculture and Colonization; 10. On Fish and Game; which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Speaker informed the House, That the Clerk had laid upon the Table:—

A Return from the Records of the By-Elections to the Legislative Assembly held on the 19th day of July and the 8th day of November, 1920, shewing:—

(1) The number of Votes Polled for each Candidate in each Electoral District in which there was a contest; (2) The majority whereby each successful Candidate was returned; (3) The total number of Votes Polled; (4) The number of Votes remaining unpolled; (5) The number of names on the Polling Lists; (6) The number of Ballot Papers sent out to each Polling Place; (7) The Used Ballot Papers; (8) The Unused Ballot Papers; (9) The Rejected Ballot Papers; (10) The Cancelled Ballot Papers; (11) The Declined Ballot Papers; (12) The Ballot Papers taken from Polling Places; (13) A General Summary of Votes cast in each Electoral District. (*Sessional Papers No. 51.*)

The House then adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

Wednesday, January 26th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House,

The Report of the Librarian on the state of the Library. (*Sessional Papers No. 53.*)

Alexander Cameron Lewis, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of North-East Toronto, Seat "A," having taken the Oaths and subscribed to the Roll, took his seat.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Ross (Kingston), two Petitions of the City Council of Kingston.

By Mr. Swayze, the Petition of the City Council of Niagara Falls; also, the Petition of the Township Council of Stamford.

By Mr. Dewart, the Petition of the Sons of England Benefit Society.

By Mr. Godfrey, the Petition of the Town Council of Mimico; also, the Petition of the Township Council of Etobicoke and Weston Golf and Country Club.

By Mr. Ireland, the Petition of the City Council of Belleville.

By Mr. Tooms, the Petition of the City Council of Peterborough.

By Mr. Warren, the Petition of the Town Council of Pembroke.

By Mr. Cunningham, the Petition of the City Council of Sault Ste. Marie.

By Mr. Thompson, the Petition of the City Council of Toronto.

By Mr. MacBride, the Petition of Alfred Hall of Toronto; also, the Petition of the City Council of Brantford.

By Mr. McCrea, the Petition of the City Gas Company of London.

By Mr. Cooper (Welland), the Petition of the Town Council of Port Colborne.

By Mr. Johnston (Simcoe), the Petition of the Town Council of Orillia.

By Mr. Evanturel, the Petition of the Town Council of Hawkesbury.

By Mr. Denyes, the Petition of James Petrie Platt of Montreal.

By Mr. Curry, the Petition of the Most Reverend George Thornloe and others.

By Mr. Murdock, the Petition of John Fulford Rollit of Barrie.

By Mr. Pinard, two Petitions of the City Council of Ottawa.

By Mr. Hill, the Petition of Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa; also, the Petition of the County Council of Carleton.

By Mr. MacVicar, the Petition of the City Council of St. Thomas.

By Mr. Brackin, the Petition of the City Council of Chatham.

By Mr. Tisdelle, the Petition of the City Council of Windsor; also, the Petition of M. S. Clapp and others of Sandwich East.

By Mr. Heenan, the Petition of the City Councils of the Cities of Fort William and Port Arthur.

By Mr. Gray, the Petition of the Town Council of Gananoque.

By Mr. Hogarth, the Petition of the City Council of Port Arthur.

By Mr. Tolmie, the Petition of the City Council of Windsor; also, the Petition of the City Council and the Water Commission of the City of Windsor; also, the Petition of the Essex Border Utilities Commission; also, the Petition of the Boards of Education and the Separate School Boards of Windsor and Walkerville; also, the Petition of the Town of Ford City and others; also, the Petition of R. W. Codes and others of the Township of Sandwich West.

By Mr. Mewhinney, the Petition of the Town Council of Kincardine.

By Mr. Lethbridge, the Petition of the Village Council of Acton.

By Mr. Price, the Petition of Lewis A. McElroy of Erie, U.S.A., and others.

The Order of the Day for the consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, having been read,

Mr. Johnson (Lanark) moved, seconded by Mr. Homuth,

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:—

To His Honour Lionel Herbert Clarke, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario:

WE, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank your Honour for the gracious Speech which your Honour has addressed to us.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the motion of Mr. Dewart,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That in addition to the Select Standing Committees already ordered by the House, there shall be, and is hereby constituted, a further Committee to be known as the Labour Legislation Committee, as outlined in the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to this House, said Committee to have the same powers as those already ordered.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, as to a more equitable system of distribution of Hydro-Electric power and a more uniform price. (*Sessional Papers, No. 59.*)

The House then adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

Thursday, January 27th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Johnston (Simcoe), the Petition of the Town Council of Midland.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith, it was

Resolved, That a special Committee of Fourteen Members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House as follows:—

Messieurs *Raney, Doherty, Grant, Biggs, Smith, Hicks, Rollo, Swayze, Marshall, Lang, Brackin, Thompson, Henry* and *McCrea*.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith, it was

Resolved, That a select Committee of Ten Members be appointed to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library to be composed as follows:—

Messieurs *Drury, Grant, Doherty, Mills, Bowman, Watson, Hall, Tolmie, Buckland* and *Kennedy*.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith, it was

Resolved, That a select Committee be appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum set apart by the Estimates for Art purposes, to be composed as follows:—

Messieurs *Drury, Smith, Nixon, Rollo, Grant, Dewart, Hay, Ross (Kingston)*, and *Lewis*.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. Drury,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Tuesday next.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney, it was

Ordered, That when this House adjourns To-day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the First day of February, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

Tuesday, February 1st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Buckland, the Petition of the City of Guelph.

By Mr. Calder, the Petition of the City Council of London.

By Mr. Watson, the Petition of McMaster University.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Village Council of Acton, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law.

Of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass reducing the number of Directors.

Of the City Council of Belleville, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 2286 authorizing the issue of Debentures.

Of the City Council of Brantford, praying that an Act may pass to enable the Corporation by By-law to provide for a Board of Control and Engineering Board, to pass certain By-laws and for other purposes.

Of the City Council of Chatham, praying that an Act may pass authorizing certain changes in government of the City, as approved by vote of the electors.

Of the County Council of Carleton, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of Debentures for a term of forty years and for other purposes.

Of the Essex Border Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass to amend Act making Debentures a joint liability and to extend the power of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board.

Of the Township Council of Etobicoke and Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law and Agreement.

Of the City Councils of the Cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporations to pass By-laws varying the fares on the Street Railway owned by them.

Of Lewis A. McElroy of Erie, U.S.A., and others, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate Fecunis, Limited, for the purpose of acquiring and operating Mining Lands.

Of the Town Council of Gananoque, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of Debentures.

Of the Town of Ford City and others, praying that an Act may pass annexing certain described lands to the Town.

Of Alfred Hall of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass declaring that he is in good standing as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Of the Town Council of Hawkesbury, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Town to separate from the United Counties of Prescott and Russell by its erection into a separate Town.

Of the City Council of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 42 and the contract with Thomas Watson thereunder.

Of the City Council of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 29 exempting certain buildings from taxation.

Of the Town Council of Kincardine, praying that an Act may pass to consolidate the floating debt and to authorize the borrowing of money.

Of the City Gas Company of London, praying that an Act may pass to amend Act respecting, towards increasing Capital Stock.

Of the Town Council of Midland, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm certain bylaws.

Of the Town Council of Mimico, praying that an Act may pass to amend 6 Geo. V, cap. 80, in relation to certain Public Works and for other purposes.

Of the City Council of Niagara Falls, praying that an Act may pass providing for the levy of an equal rate after 1st January, 1921, upon whole rateable property of Corporation to pay cost of construction of Sewers.

Of the Town Council of Orillia, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law providing for the issue of Debentures.

Of the Most Reverend George Thornloe and others, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England.

Of the City Council of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to appoint a Town Planning Commission for the City.

Of the City Council of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to provide by By-laws for borrowing upon Debentures certain sums of money for Public Utilities, without the assent of the electors.

Of the Town Council of Pembroke, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to assess and levy in any one year not more than three and one-half cents in the dollar on assessed value of the whole rateable property of the Town.

Of the City Council of Peterborough, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to vary and amend certain By-laws, to ratify and confirm certain Agreements and for other purposes.

Of James Petrie Pratt, of Montreal, praying that an Act may pass to authorize the Law Society of Upper Canada to admit him to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Of the Town Council of Port Colborne, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to acquire certain Cemetery Lands.

Of the City Council of Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass to amend 2 Geo. V, cap. 118, and to legalize and confirm Tax Sales prior to January 1st, 1920.

Of R. W. Codes and others of the Township of Sandwich East, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Town of River Side.

Of John Fulford Rollit, of Barrie, praying that an Act may pass authorizing him to practise Dentistry in Ontario.

Of the City Council of Sault Ste. Marie, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm certain By-laws and to confirm Sales of Land.

Of the Sons of England Benefit Society, praying that an Act may pass respecting reduction in value of Benefit Certificates.

Of the Township Council of Stamford, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the passing of a By-law and the issue of Debentures.

Of the City Council of St. Thomas, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 2430 authorizing the issue of Debentures.

Of M. S. Clapp and others of Sandwich East, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Of the City Council of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass respecting the duties of the Deputy City Auditor; the issue of Debentures and for other purposes.

Of the City Council of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass to validate and confirm all Sales of Land prior to the 31st December, 1920.

Of the City Council of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass permitting the City to withdraw from the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Of the City Council and the Water Commissioners of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass to amend Section 18 of Cap. 58, 51 Victoria.

Of the Boards of Education and the Separate School Boards of Windsor and Walkerville, praying that an Act may pass to create a joint Board of School Trustees with certain powers.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. MacBride,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Loan and Trust Corporation Statements, being Abstracts from Financial Statements made by Building Societies, Loan Companies, Loaning Land Companies and Trust Companies, for the year ended December 31st, 1919. (*Sessional Papers, No. 12.*)

Also—Report of the Stallion Enrolment Board of Ontario for 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 33.*)

Also—Statement of the distribution of the Revised and Sessional Statutes for the year 1920. (*Sessional papers, No. 60.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council passed since the last Session of the Legislature under the authority of the Department of Education Act, or of the Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Wednesday, February 2nd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Lewis, the Petition of the Town Council of St. Mary's.

By Mr. Curry, the Petition of J. Whittaker and others; also, the Petition of E. Charity and others; also, the Petition of W. Lucas and others; also, the Petition of F. Hunter and others, all of the Township of York.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 60), intituled "An Act respecting the Legitimation of Children by the subsequent intermarriage of their parents. *Mr. Raney.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 61), intituled "An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act."
Mr. Magladery.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 62), intituled "An Act to provide Free Text Books in Schools."
Mr. Brackin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 63), intituled "An Act to amend The Trustee Act." *Mr. Price.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 64), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act, 1913."
Mr. Stevenson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 65), intituled "An Act to amend The Railway Employees' Voting Act, 1918." *Mr. Stevenson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. Hall,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the University of Toronto Board of Governors, for the year ending 30th June, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 18.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council passed since January 22nd, 1921, under the authority of the Department of Education Act, or of the Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, February 3rd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Tooms, the Petition of the City Council of Peterborough.

By Mr. O'Neill, the Petition of the Trafalgar Agricultural Society of Oakville.

By Mr. Price, the Petition of the Village Council of Georgetown.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the City Council of Guelph, praying that an Act may pass to increase the Capital Stock of the Guelph Radial Railway Company and to ratify and confirm a certain By-law.

Of the City Council of London, praying that an Act may pass to authorize the passing of certain By-laws.

Of McMaster University, praying that an Act may pass to amend their Act of incorporation.

Mr. Smith, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed a list of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House, presented the following Lists as their Report:—

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Black, Bowman, Bragg, Buckland, Carmichael, Carty, Casselman, Cooke, Cooper (Toronto), Cridland, Crockett, Cunningham, Denyes, Doherty, Ecclestone, Evans, Evanturel, Fenton, Fowler, Govenlock, Grant, Gray, Greenlaw, Hill, Homuth, Johnston (Lanark), Joynt, Kennedy, Leeson, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, McNamara, MacVicar, Mageau, Marshall, Mewhinney, Murdoch, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sandy, Staples, Stevenson, Stringer, Swayze, Tooms, Widdifield—49.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Allan, Biggs, Black, Bowman, Brackin, Brown, Buckland, Calder, Cameron, Carmichael, Casselman, Clarke, Cooke, Cooper (Welland), Crawford, Crockett, Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Doherty, Ecclestone, Evanturel, Ferguson, Fox, Freeborn, Godfrey, Grant, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Hay, Heenan, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Hogarth, Homuth, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnston (Lanark), Lang, Leeson, Lennox, Lethbridge, Lewis, McArthur, McCrea, McNamara, MacBride, MacVicar, Mageau, Marshall, Mills, Montgomery, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Ramsden, Raney, Rankin, Rollo, Ross (Glengarry), Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Staples, Stevenson, Stringer, Swayze, Taylor, Thompson, Tisdelle, Tolmie, Walker, Warren, Watson, Webster—80.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Allan, Asmussen, Biggs, Black, Bowman, Bragg, Buckland, Carmichael, Carty, Cooke, Cooper (Welland), Crawford, Cridland, Crockett, Cunningham, Curry, Denyes, Dewart, Doherty, Ecclestone, Evans, Evanturel, Fenton, Fowler, Fox, Godfrey, Govenlock, Grant, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Heenan, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Homuth, Ireland, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnston (Lanark), Kennedy, Lang, Lewis, Leeson, McAlpine, McArthur, McCreary, McDonald, McLeod, MacBride, MacVicar, Mageau, Marceau, Marshall, Mills, Montgomery, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Raney, Rankin, Rennie, Rollo, Ross (Glengarry), Sandy, Slack, Smith, Staples, Stevenson, Stringer, Swayze, Taylor, Thompson, Watson—78.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Allan, Asmussen, Biggs, Bowman, Bragg, Brown, Cameron, Carty, Casselman, Clarke, Cooper (Toronto), Crawford, Cridland, Crockett, Cunningham, Denyes, Evans, Evanturel, Fenton, Fox, Godfrey, Gray, Halcrow, Hall, Heenan, Hicks, Hogarth, Homuth, Ireland, Joynt, Kennedy, Lang, Leeson, Lennox, McArthur, McCrea, McCreary, McDonald, McNamara, MacVicar, Mageau, Magladery, Marshall, Mathieu, Mills, Montgomery, Murdoch, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Ramsden, Raney, Rollo, Ross (Kingston), Ross (Glengarry), Sandy, Sewell, Slack, Stevenson, Stover, Stringer, Swayze, Thompson, Tisdelle, Tolmie, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield—71.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Black, Bowman, Bragg, Buckland, Calder, Cameron, Carty, Casselman, Cooke, Cridland, Doherty, Ecclestone, Evanturel, Fowler, Freeborn, Govenlock, Gray, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, Johnston (Lanark), Joynt, Kennedy, Lethbridge, McAlpine, McArthur, McCreary, McDonald, McLeod, MacVicar, Magladery, Marceau, Marshall, Mathieu, Mewhinney, Mills, Murdoch, Oke, Racine, Rankin, Rennie, Rollo, Ross (Glengarry), Sandy, Sewell, Smith, Stringer, Swayze, Tisdelle, Walker, Warren, Widdifield—55.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Carmichael, Clarke, Cooper (Toronto), Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Doherty, Ferguson, Freeborn, Godfrey, Grant, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Hogarth, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnston (Lanark), Lennox, McCrea, McLeod, MacBride, MacVicar, Mageau, Magladery, Mills, Nixon, Oke, Pinard, Price, Racine, Raney, Rollo, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield—53.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Bowman, Brackin, Calder, Clarke, Cridland, Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Doherty, Ferguson, Fox, Freeborn, Grant, Greenlaw, Hay, Heenan, Henry, Hicks, Hogarth, Johnston (Lanark South), Joynt, Lennox, Lethbridge, Lewis, McCrea, MacBride, Magladery, Mathieu, Oke, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Slack, Swayze, Taylor, Tolmie, Tooms, Webster, Widdifield—42.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME.

Messieurs Allan, Asmussen, Biggs, Black, Bowman, Cameron, Clarke, Cooper (Toronto), Cooper (Welland), Cridland, Cunningham, Denyes, Ecclestone, Fowler, Fox, Gray, Greenlaw, Heenan, Hicks, Ireland, Lang, Lethbridge, McAlpine, Mageau, Marceau, Magladery, Mills, Montgomery, Oke, Rankin, Slack, Stover, Stringer, Taylor, Tooms, Watson, Webster—37.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Allan, Biggs, Brackin, Carmichael, Curry, Dewart, Doherty, Ferguson, Grant, Hill, McCrea, Mills, Nixon, Price, Raney, Rollo, Sinclair, Smith—19.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Messieurs Biggs, Brown, Crawford, Crockett, Dewart, Gray, Hill, Mathieu, Nixon, Raney, Rennie, Smith, Stover, Swayze, Taylor—15.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR.

Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Allan, Biggs, Cameron, Casselman, Crockett, Dewart, Halcrow, Heenan, Hill, Homuth, Ireland, MacBride, MacVicar, McNamara, Magladery, Marceau, O'Neill, Rollo, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Webster—23.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of eleven members.

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the foregoing Report.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney, it was

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Denyes be added to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and the name of Mr. Stevenson to the Committee on Fish and Game.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 66), intituled "An Act respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 67), intituled "An Act respecting the preparation of Voters' Lists in Cities." Mr. Curry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 68), intituled "An Act for One Day of Rest in Seven." Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 69), intituled "An Act for Maternity Protection." Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 70), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." Mr. Homuth.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. Swayze,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Friday, February 4th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Brackin, the Petition of Joseph St. Pierre and others of the Township of Rochester.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Town Council of the Town of St. Mary's, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 417 fixing the rate to be levied against farm lands of twenty-five acres within the town.

Of J. Whittaker and others; also, of E. Charity and others; also, of W. Lucas and others; also, of F. Hunter and others, all of York, severally praying that an Act may pass to separate certain territory from the Township of York and to incorporate the same as the Township of North York.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the following Petitions and find the Notices as published in each case sufficient:

Of the Town Council of Mimico, praying that an Act may pass to amend 6 Geo. V, cap. 80, in relation to certain Public Works and for other purposes.

Of the City Council of Belleville, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 2286 authorizing the issue of Debentures.

Of the City Council of Peterborough, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to vary and amend certain By-laws, to ratify and confirm certain agreements and for other purposes.

Of the City Council of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass respecting the duties of the Deputy City Auditor; the issue of Debentures and for other purposes.

Of Alfred Hall of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass declaring that he is in good standing as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Of the City Gas Company of London, praying that an Act may pass to amend Act respecting, towards increasing Capital Stock.

Of the City Council of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 42 and the contract with Thomas Watson thereunder.

Of the City Council of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 29 exempting certain buildings from taxation.

Of Town Council of Port Colborne, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to acquire certain Cemetery lands.

Of the Town Council of Orillia, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law providing for the issue of Debentures.

Of the Essex Border Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass to amend Act making Debentures a joint liability and to extend the power of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board.

Of the Most Reverend George Thornloe and others, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England.

Of the City Council of St. Thomas, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 2430 authorizing the issue of Debentures for Water Works and other purposes.

Of the City Council of Chatham, praying that an Act may pass authorizing certain changes in the Government of the City as approved by vote of the electors.

Of the Town Council of Gananoque, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of Debentures to defray the floating debt of the Town.

Of R. W. Codes and others of the Township of Sandwich East, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Town of River Side.

Of the Town of Ford City and others, praying that an Act may pass annexing certain described land to the Town.

Of M. S. Clapp and others of Sandwich East, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Of the City Council of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to appoint a Town Planning Commission.

Your Committee recommend that Rule No. 51 of Your Honourable House be suspended in this, that the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the 15th day of February instant, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the 22nd day of February instant.

Ordered, That the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the fifteenth day of February instant, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the twenty-second day of February instant.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 2), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Mimico." Mr. Godfrey.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 3), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Belleville." Mr. Ireland.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 4), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough." Mr. Tooms.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 8), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Toronto." Mr. Thompson.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 10), intituled "An Act respecting the City Gas Company of London." Mr. McCrea.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 11), intituled "An Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 42 of the City of Kingston." Mr. Ross (Kingston.)

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 12), intituled "An Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 29 of 1920, of the City of Kingston." Mr. Ross (Kingston.)

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 13), intituled "An Act respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne." Mr. Cooper (Welland.)

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 14), intituled "An Act to confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia." Mr. Johnston (Simcoe.)

Referred to the Railway and Municipal Board.

Bill (No. 15), intituled "An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission." Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 18), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Chatham." Mr. Brackin.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 20), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings." Mr. Curry.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 32), intituled "An Act providing for the appointment of a Town Planning Commission for the City of Ottawa and defining the powers of such Commission." Mr. Pinard.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 33), intituled "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas." Mr. MacVicar.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 38), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Gananoque." Mr. Gray.

Referred to the Railway and Municipal Board.

Bill (No. 42), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Town of River Side." Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 43), intituled "An Act to annex certain land to the Town of Ford City." Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 45), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Town of Tecumseh." Mr. Tisdelle.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 71), intituled "An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act." Mr. Mageau.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 72), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Swayze.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 73), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Crawford.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 74), intituled "The Reforestation Act." Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 75), intituled "An Act to provide for Development Work in Northern and Northwestern Ontario." Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 76), intituled "An Act to amend The Motor Vehicles Act," Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 77), intituled "An Act to amend The Highway Travel Act." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 78), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 79), intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act." Mr. Mills.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Doherty,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Stover be added to the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and the name of Mr. Cooper (Welland) be added to the Standing Committees on Agriculture and Colonization and Labour.

On Motion of Mr. Sinclair, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence with and by the Government or any Department thereof leading up to and relating to the dismissal of Mr. Lewis R. Luke, as License Inspector for Ontario County.

Mr. MacBride moved, seconded by Mr. McNamara,

That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all letters of instruction or correspondence from the Attorney-General to Mr. J. W. Mallon, and copies of all letters between J. W. Mallon and any Members of the U.F.O. or Labour groups of the Legislative Assembly upon the subject of naming a committee of ten or twelve citizens in each constituency for the purpose of advising the Government in connection with the appointments of the Civil Service.

And a Debate having ensued,

The Motion was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

On motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Calder,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence passing between the Government of Ontario or any member, officer or official thereof, or of any department thereof and any member of the House or other person leading up to it, and dealing with the suspension and resignation of Messrs. Smith and Hanna from the Provincial Police.

The House then adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

Monday, February 7th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Marceau, the Petition of James Passmore and others of the Township of Ferris.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Village Council of Georgetown, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Village as a Town.

Of the City Council of Peterborough, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Trustees of the Peterborough Relief Association to pay over moneys held in trust for the alleviation of distress.

Of the Trafalgar Agricultural Society of Oakville, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of serial bonds.

Of Joseph St. Pierre and others of the Township of Rochester, praying that an Act may pass to validate and confirm in each of them the title to certain lands.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That beginning on Monday next and on each succeeding Monday for the remainder of the Session, Government Orders shall be placed upon the Order Paper.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Inspector of Division Courts, for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 5.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 8th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Select Committee appointed to make Report in respect of the administration of and amendments to The Ontario Temperance Act, presented their Report, together with a Minority Report, which were read as follows:—

Toronto, February 2nd, 1921.

Ontario Temperance Act.

Report of Special Committee appointed to make Report in respect to the administration of and amendments to The Ontario Temperance Act.

The Special Committee of the House appointed by the Legislature to meet during the Recess of the Legislature and to inquire as to the working and operation of The Ontario Temperance Act, and the administration thereof and as to what, if any, improvements, amendments or alterations should be made in the said Act, and to prepare such amendments to the Act as they may deem necessary and to report at the next Session of the Legislature met on the days following:—

- (1) 28th September, 1920.
- (2) 19th October, 1920.
- (3) 2nd November, 1920.
- (4) 3rd November, 1920.
- (5) *10th December, 1920.

and on the 10th day of December, 1920, appointed a Sub-Committee to draft a report for submission to the general committee, which was considered at a general meeting of the Committee on the 2nd day of February, 1921, when the following report was adopted by a majority of the said Committee:—

The Dominion Government having seen fit to postpone the taking of the referendum in the Province of Ontario until April of 1921, the work of the Committee very largely became that of taking and recording such evidence as was produced before it of the administration of the law and of minor amendments to the Act. The Committee at its first meeting concluded that it had power to take evidence under oath, and authorized the summoning of witnesses, but your Committee subsequently learned by the advice of Edward Bayly, K.C., Deputy Attorney-General, that the Committee had no power to enforce the attendance of such witnesses, nor to require that they should be sworn. The advice of the Deputy Attorney-General very much limited the scope of the investigation.

The Committee considered the advisability of recommending a system of Government control of the sale of liquor in the Province of Ontario, but upon due consideration, and having regard to the expressed will of the people in the referendum taken in October, 1919, the Committee concluded that they could not, without disregarding the will of the people so expressed recommend any such change. This further curtailed the scope and duties of the Committee.

Standard Hotels.

The Committee is of the opinion that Standard Hotels should not be given the exclusive right to sell malt products, and that there should not be any limitation to the hours within which Standard Hotels should be permitted to sell temperance beverages; and your Committee further reports that it has no information before it to justify the statement that the bars in Standard Hotels are conducted in a disreputable manner.

Percentage of Alcohol.

Your Committee having duly considered the arguments advanced: (1) In favour of raising the percentage of alcohol legally permissible in malt beverages; and (2) In favour of reducing the percentage of alcohol legally permissible in alcoholic beverages, is not, after careful inquiry, prepared to recommend that any change be made in the present provisions of the law in regard to the above matters.

The Committee is not prepared to advise that the sale of native wine under the provisions of The Ontario Temperance Act, be interfered with for the present.

Administration.

Your Committee reports that they have carefully considered such evidence as was submitted to them in regard to the lack of co-operation of officials charged with the administration of laws generally, and officials charged with the administration of The Ontario Temperance Act, for the purpose of determining what report should be made to the Legislature in respect to such lack of co-operation, and what means should be devised to ensure co-operation, and your Committee is pleased to report that partially as a result of the information obtained by reason of such inquiries, and in consideration of the evidence then given, the departments charged with the enforcement of laws generally and of The Ontario Temperance Act in particular, themselves applied the remedy by placing the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act in the Department of the Attorney-General. The Committee fully approves of the action of the Government in so consolidating the enforcement of such laws within one department.

During the inquiry your Committee recommended to the Attorney-General's Department that an investigation be held by a County Court Judge in respect to the developments in Essex County; your Committee reports that

for reasons that the Committee deemed sufficient such investigation was not held, and approves of the action taken by the Attorney-General's Department in not holding such investigation.

Appeals.

Your Committee carefully considered the question of giving a right of appeal to all parties convicted of any offence against The Ontario Temperance Act, and beg to report that it is of the opinion that the Act should be amended so as to provide for an appeal by the defendant on the record of the evidence as taken before the convicting Magistrate, such appeal to be to a Judge in Chambers of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and that provision be made that in the case of the defendant desiring to appeal, he shall deposit as security for costs the sum of \$100, which, in case of dismissal of the appeal, shall be forfeited to the Crown.

Your Committee finds upon inquiry, and begs to report that the amount of sales from dispensaries (including the central warehouse) during the past fiscal year amounted to \$3,628,191, that the same period there were 3,813 convictions, of which 27 were subsequently quashed; that the resultant fines, exclusive of those collected by municipal police, amounted to \$672,222, and remissions were subsequently granted to the amount of \$33,687; that clemency was granted to 181 individuals in respect to which imprisonment had been adjudged; that the amount of liquor confiscated amounted in value, as estimated, to \$227,459.

Your Committee presents herewith stenographic notes of the various meetings showing the evidence produced before your Committee, and has also attached herewith a copy of report of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Ontario Medical Association, Toronto, May 25-30, 1920, indicating the viewpoint of the said Association toward certain provisions of the O.T.A.

In conclusion your Committee begs to report that there was evidence of intention on the part of the Government of the Province of Ontario to administer The Ontario Temperance Act vigorously, firmly and with due consideration to the rights of all parties.

MINORITY REPORT.

Minority Report of the Committee to report in respect to the administration of an Amendment to The Ontario Temperance Act.

The undersigned, being a minority of the members of the said Committee, beg leave to report that they do not concur in the Report of the said Committee, but recommend that the following paragraph of the said Report be struck out:

“ Your Committee carefully considered the question of giving a Right of Appeal to all parties convicted of any offence against The Ontario Temperance Act and beg to report that it is of the opinion that the Act should be amended so as to provide for an appeal by the Crown or the defendant on the record of the evidence taken before the convicting Magistrate, such appeal to be to a Judge in Chambers of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and that provision be made that in the case of the defendant desiring to appeal, he shall deposit as security for costs the sum of \$100, which, in the case of dismissal of the appeal, shall be forfeited to the Crown,”

And that the following be substituted therefor:—

Your Committee carefully considered the question of giving the Right of Appeal to all parties convicted of any offence against The Ontario Temperance Act and beg to report that it is of the opinion that the said Act should be amended so as to provide that (in addition to the right of appeal allowed to the Crown under the Act in dismissed cases), the defendant may appeal to the Judge of the County or District in which conviction has been made, upon notice of appeal to the Crown or District Attorney within ten days after the date of such conviction and upon depositing the sum of \$100 as security of costs, when the Judge shall grant a summons calling upon the Crown Attorney or the complainant and the convicting Magistrate to appear, upon the return of which summons the case shall be tried in appeal, and the evidence of witnesses heard *viva voce*; and such order made as to dismissal or as to imprisonment or fine as is provided by the said Act; and as to costs, as to the Judge may seem right, such order to have the same effect and be enforceable in the same manner as the order of conviction or dismissal by a Magistrate under the Act.

F. C. TOLMIE.

C. F. SWAYZE.

PETER HEENAN.

H. H. DEWART.

GEO. S. HENRY.

F. W. HAY.

JOS. E. THOMPSON.

THOS. MARSHALL.

J. A. PINARD.

GEO. W. ECCLESTONE.

FORBES GODFREY.

Mr. Nixon then moved that the Report be adopted.

Mr. Tolmie moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Dewart,

That the said Report be not adopted, but that this House adopt, in lieu thereof, the amended Report suggested by the minority of the said Special Committee, as the same appears upon the record of the House.

And a Debate arising,

Mr. Raney moved

That the Debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

And the question having been put, was carried, and it was

Ordered. That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Mathieu be added to the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. McNamara,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Wednesday, February 9th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. O'Neill, the Petition of the Town Council of Oakville and the Trafalgar Agricultural Society.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of James Passmore and others of the Township of Ferris, praying that an Act may pass to divide the Township of Ferris.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Murdoch be added to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 9), intituled "An Act respecting Mr. Alfred Hall and the Solicitors' Roll of the Law Society of Upper Canada." Mr. McBride.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 80), intituled "An Act to amend the Limitations Act." Mr. Price.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 82), intituled "The Maximum Work Hour Day Act." Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 83), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." Mr. Curry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 84), intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act." Mr. Homuth.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 85), intituled "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 86), intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 87), intituled "An Act to amend the Assessment Act." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 88), intituled "An Act to regulate the Means of Egress from Public Buildings." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. O'Neil asked the following Question:—

1. What Commissions have been appointed by the Government since November 11th, 1919, by Order-in Council, and who are the Commissioners

in each case. 2. What Commissions were appointed by Order of the Legislature in 1920. 3. What of the above named Commissions have presented reports to the Government and in what cases have the reports been printed.

To which the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton; His Honour Colin George Snyder, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, London; His Honour Talbot Macbeth, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into administration, etc., etc., of The Victoria Industrial School; Dr. John Waugh, Dr. Helen MacMurchy and John J. Kelso, Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into the Natural Gas Situation; Eustace S. Estlin, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into and report on Soldiers' Settlement Colony at Kapuskasing; W. F. Nickle, Lieut.-Col. John I. McLaren and John Sharp, Esq., Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon all cutting by Timber licensees or other persons of timber upon Crown Lands, etc., etc.; Hon. W. R. Riddell, Hon. F. R. Latchford, Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late John McMartin, *re* payment of Succession Duties; Hon. W. E. Middleton, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late E. F. B. Johnston, *re* payment of Succession Duties; Hon. W. E. Middleton, Commissioner.

A Commission to enquire into the shooting of Ernest Bergeron by certain constables in the County of Essex; His Honour James Gamble Wallace, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the Wages paid to men employed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the construction of the Queenston Chippawa Development, etc., etc.; Messrs. Edgar Watson, William H. Casselman, Morrison M. McBride, James Craig Tolmie and Arthur Edward Ross, Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon seizure of car of whiskey at the City of Chatham, etc., etc.; His Honour Talbot MacBeth, Commissioner.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the best method of selecting, appointing and remunerating Sheriffs, County Court Officers, Clerks of the Peace, Crown Attorneys, etc., etc.; W. D. Gregory, Dr. H. L. Brittain, Norman Sommerville, Albert Hellyer and E. A. Pocock, Commissioners.

A Commission under the Athletic Commission Act, 1920, to assist, promote and encourage amateur sport; Francis Nelson, Donald Cameron, John F. McGarry, Edward B. Archibald and Patrick J. Mulqueen, Commissioners.

A Commission of Inquiry *re* Hydro-Radials; The Hon. Mr. Justice Sutherland, General Mitchell, Fred Bancroft, Esq., William Andrew Amos, Esq., Andrew Fullerton McCallum, Commissioners.

A Commission for Mothers' Allowances; Rev. Peter Bryce, Mrs. Elizabeth Shortt, Mr. Arthur James Reynolds, Mrs. Minnie Singer and Major Thomas J. Murphy, Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon a Basis for determining the financial obligations of the Province towards the University of Toronto; Queen's University, Kingston; and Western University, London; Ven. Archdeacon Cody, Colonel A. P. Deroche, Sir John Willison, Mr. T. A. Russell, Mr. C. R. Somerville and Mr. J. Alex. Wallace, Commissioners.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the truth or falsity of the charges made by one James M. Young, of Brockville, against F. B. Taber, License Inspector of Brockville, and C. R. Deacon, who was acting as the License Inspector's Solicitor and Counsel; His Honour John K. Dowsley, a Commissioner.

A Commission to investigate into the charges made against David Hastings, Police Magistrate at Dunnville; John A. Patterson, K.C., Commissioner.

2. The Commissions are appointed by Order-in-Council under the authority of Legislation.

3. A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton. Has reported. See Sessional papers, No. 87, Session of 1920. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, London. Has reported. See Sessional papers No. 88, Session of 1920. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into administration, etc., etc., of The Victoria Industrial School. Interim reports made. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into the Natural Gas Situation. Has reported. See 29th Annual Report of Bureau of Mines, Part V. Report printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report on Soldiers' Settlement Colony at Kapuskasing. Has reported. Sessional papers No. 61, Session of 1920. Report printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon all cutting by Timber licensees or other persons of timber upon Crown Lands. Interim reports made. Not printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late John McMartin, *re* payment of Succession Duty. Has reported. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into the shooting of Ernest Bergeron by certain Constables in the County of Essex. Has reported. Report in Attorney-General's Office. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon best method of selecting, appointing and remunerating Sheriffs, County Court Officers, Clerks of the Peace, Crown Attorneys, etc. Interim Report received *re* Police Magistrates and Issuers of Marriage Licenses. Not printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the truth or falsity of the charges made by one James M. Young, of Brockville, against F. B. Taber, License Inspector of Brockville, and C. R. Deacon, who was acting as the License Inspector's Solicitor and Counsel. Has reported. Report not printed.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the wages paid to men employed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the construction of the Queenston-Chippawa Development, etc. Has reported. Report not printed.

Mr. Sinclair asked the following Question:—

1. Was the pamphlet, "Canadian Nationality and the relation of Canada to the other Britannic Commonwealths," being the report of a speech of Hon. W. E. Raney, K.C., Attorney-General for Ontario, at the Canadian Bar Association at Ottawa on September 2nd, 1920, printed and published upon the

authority of the Government. 2. Was any contribution or payment of part or all of the funds for said publication made by the Government. 3. If any contribution payment was so made, on whose authority was it made. 4. If so made, how much was paid by the Government for said purpose. 5. To whom was such payment made. 6. How many copies of the same were published.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. No. 2. No. 3, 4 and 5. Answered by 1 and 2. 6. This is not a matter of public interest.

Mr. Sinclair asked the following Question:—

1. What was the total cost of the committee of the Legislature appointed last session to investigate the working of the O.T.A. 2. Who were members of the Committee. 3. How many days did the Committee sit. 4. What sums were paid or allowed to each member for (a) attendance at meetings; (b) mileage. 5. At what places were the meetings of the Committee held. 6. What was paid for witness' fees. 7. Was the evidence of witnesses taken on oath. 8. Will the evidence so taken be printed and distributed among the members of the Legislature. 9. Was the evidence so taken extended by the reporters and in the hands of the members of the Committee before they prepared their report.

And the Provincial Secretary replied as follows:—

1. Unknown, as several accounts have not yet been rendered. 2. Hon. E. C. Drury, Hon. W. E. Raney, Hon. H. C. Nixon, Messrs. Edgar Watson, H. McCreary, F. G. Sandy, J. G. Lethbridge, W. H. Casselman, Andrew Hicks, C. F. Swayze, Peter Heenan, H. H. Dewart, Thomas Marshall, J. W. Curry, J. C. Tolmie, F. W. Hay, Samuel Clarke, J. A. Pinard, Forbes Godfrey, Hon. A. E. Ross, Hon. G. S. Henry, G. W. Ecclestone, Capt. J. E. Thompson, R. M. Warren. 3. Five. 4. No payment has yet been made to members. 5. Parliament Buildings, Toronto. 6. No payment. 7. No. 8. No, but typed copies of stenographic notes and evidence were tabled with Committee's report. 9. The evidence was transcribed and placed in the hands of such members as availed themselves of the invitation to peruse same. It was also given to the sub-committee appointed to peruse same and draft report for consideration of the general committee.

Mr. Cooper (Toronto) asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Attorney-General been advised of the judgment of Hon. Mr. Justice Middleton in the action of Fleming vs. Spracklin, *et al*, tried at the

Sandwich Sessions in the Fall term of 1920. 2. Was this an ordinary civil action for damages. 3. Is it true, as reported in the press of January 5th, 1921, that the Attorney-General has ordered an appeal in this case. 4. If an appeal has been so ordered, is the Government furnishing funds to prosecute that appeal on behalf of the defendants.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. It was a Civil Action. 3. Yes. 4. Yes.

Mr. Lang asked the following Question:—

1. Who is Registrar of Deeds for Kent County. 2. When was he appointed. 3. Who was his immediate predecessor in said office. 4. When did the office become vacant. 5. What relation, if any, is the present Registrar to J. B. Clarke, who was elected as Member for East Kent as a U.F.O. candidate in October, 1919, and, subsequently resigning, to allow the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture to obtain a seat in the House. 6. What were the net emoluments of the office for the incumbent thereof in the year 1919. 7. Who was Deputy Registrar in said office at the decease of the former incumbent. 8. Did this Deputy carry on the work in the office satisfactorily from the decease of the former incumbent until the appointment of the present one.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. J. B. Clarke. 2. 25th November, 1920. 3. A. J. Dunn. 4. 30th April, 1920. 5. He is the same person. 6. \$4,446.87. 7. Miss Carrie J. Burton. 8. Yes.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question:—

1. Upon whose recommendation was Arthur T. Wilgress appointed to the office of Chief Librarian. 2. What salary or salaries will he draw in connection with the work of Chief Librarian. 3. What are the qualifications of Arthur T. Wilgress stated in the recommendation to the office of Chief Librarian. 4. What were the occupations of Arthur T. Wilgress before he entered the Government employment.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

1. The Provincial Treasurer. 2. \$3,100. 3. No qualifications were stated in the recommendation. 4. Banker, newspaper publisher and journalist.

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

1. What sums of money had been received by the Department of Lands and Forests up to December 3rd, A.D. 1920, in respect of timber dues owing to the Government from past transactions and arising out of the so-called timber probe. 2. What party or parties up to that date had paid any sum or sums to the said Department. 3. Had the said Department, up to that date, issued any information as to any such payments having been made. 4. Are the statements alleged to have been made by the Government Whip that large sums had been paid in, prior to that date, correct. 5. If said statements were not correct, what steps did the Minister of Lands and Forests or any other Minister take to inform the public of the incorrectness of the same.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words and figures following:—

1. \$12,600, \$13,030.74. 2. James Horrigan & Co., G. E. Farlinger. 3. No. 4. See Answer No. 1. 5. The Minister of Lands and Forests being interviewed by *Globe* reporter, December 8th, 1920, *re* statement said to have been made by Mr. Hicks. gave particulars as reported in *Globe*. December 9th, 1920.

Mr. Ramsden asked the following Question:—

1. Upon whose recommendation was the appointment of Clerk of the Executive Council made. 2. Was any committee appointed to deal with or report on this matter or to make recommendation with regard thereto. 3. Was the report of such committee, if any, accepted. 4. Were any representations made by any person or persons to such committee, if any, and by whom.

And the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. Upon the recommendation of the President of the Council. 2. There was no formal Committee or formal report but an informal exchange of views on the subject. 3. Answered by reply to No. 2. 4. Answered by reply to No. 2.

Mr. McLeod asked the following Question:—

1. What office did C. W. James hold before his appointment to the office of King's Printer. 2. What was his remuneration. 3. What was his occupation before he was employed by the Government. 4. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed to the office of King's Printer. 5. What were his qualifications for the office of King's Printer stated in the recommendation to that office. 6. What salary or salaries does he draw under the new appointment. 7. Are any part of the duties of purchasing agent to be undertaken by him in connection with the work of King's Printer.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Minister's Secretary and Departmental Secretary Department of Education, and Secretary to Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Board. 2. \$3,100. 3. Civil servant in employ of Dominion Government. 4. The Provincial Treasurer's. 5. No qualifications were stated in the recommendation. 6. \$4,000. 7. Yes.

Mr. Sinclair asked the following Question:—

1. How many copies of Public Service Bulletin, Vol. 4, No. 6, Ontario Legislature, 1920, were printed. 2. Who edited and prepared the same. 3. On whose authority was it printed. 4. Was distribution of the bulletin made at the expense of the Government. 5. What was the cost of (a) printing the same; (b) of editing the same; (c) of distributing the same. 6. Were the U.F.O. Clubs and Organizations in the Province used as a means of distributing the same. 7. How many copies of the bulletin were sent to the U.F.O. Clubs throughout the Province.

And the Premier replied as follows:—

1. 5,000. 2. The Law Clerks of the House. 3. On the authority of the Government. 4. Yes. 5. (a) \$270.30; (b) Nothing; (c) Postage on about 2,500 copies. 6. No. 7. The distribution was general, and there is no record of copies sent to any particular organization.

Mr. Pinard asked the following Question:—

1. Does the Government own a garage at Surrey Place, near Queen's Park, Toronto. 2. When was it built. 3. For what purpose was it built. 4. By whom was it built. 5. What was the total cost of the same with fixtures and equipment. 6. (a) By what authority was it built; (b) what alterations have been made under the authority of the present Government and at what cost. 7. How many automobiles will it house. 8. How many employees are engaged in it as mechanics, caretaker, or workmen, other than chauffeurs. 9. What is the total monthly wage-bill for the parties mentioned in answer to Question 8 for each month since it was occupied as a Government garage.

And the Minister of Public Works replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Yes. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6a. The garage was part of the property known as 15 Queen's Park, purchased by the Government from H. C. Cox, on 2nd January, 1917. 6b. An extension to the north and removal of partitions, \$14,998.38. 7. About 25. Highway Department trucks and automobiles. 8. Four. 9. \$468 per month.

Mr. Thompson asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Government received an interim report from the Commission on Hydro Radials. 2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to present it to the House. 3. Will the final report of the Commission on Hydro Radials be laid before the House this Session.

And the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. No interim report has been received. 2. Answered by reply to No. 1. 3. If received in time, the report will be laid before the House this Session.

Mr. Allan asked the following Question:—

1. How many Commissions and Special Committees have been appointed by this Government since November 13th, 1919. 2. What are the names of the various Commissions or Committees so appointed. 3. How many of the Commissions or Committees so appointed have presented their final reports to the Government.

To which the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. Eighteen Commissions, but no Special Committees, the latter being appointed by the Legislative Assembly.

2. A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton.

A Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, London.

A Commission to inquire into administration, etc., etc., of The Victoria Industrial School.

A Commission to inquire into the Natural Gas Situation.

A Commission to inquire into and report on Soldiers' Settlement Colony at Kapuskasing.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon all cutting by Timber Licensees or other persons of timber upon Crown Lands, etc., etc.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late John McMartin, *re* payment of Succession Duties.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late E. F. B. Johnston, *re* payment of Succession Duties.

A Commission to inquire into the shooting of Ernest Bergeron by certain constables in the County of Essex.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the wages paid to men employed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the construction of the Queenston-Chippawa Development, etc., etc.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon seizure of car of whiskey at the City of Chatham, etc., etc.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon best method of selecting, appointing and remunerating Sheriffs, County Court Officers, Clerks of the Peace, Crown Attorneys, etc., etc.

A Commission under The Athletic Commission Act, 1920, to assist, promote and encourage amateur sport.

A Commission of Inquiry *re* Hydro-Radials.

A Commission for Mothers' Allowances.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon a basis for determining the financial obligations of the Province towards the University of Toronto, Queen's University, Kingston, and Western University, London.

A Commission to investigate into the charges made against David Hastings, Police Magistrate at Dunnville.

A Commission to inquire into and report upon the truth or falsity of the charges made by one James M. Young of Brockville, against F. B. Taber, License Inspector of Brockville, and C. R. Deacon, who was acting as the License Inspector's Solicitor and Counsel.

3. The Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton. (See Sessional papers, No. 87, Session of 1920.)

The Commission to inquire into the administration, management, conduct, discipline, equipment and welfare of The Ontario Hospital, London. (See Sessional papers, No. 88, Session of 1920.)

The Commission to inquire into the Natural Gas Situation. (See 29th Annual Report of the Bureau of Mines, Part V.)

The Commission to inquire into and report on Soldiers' Settlement Colony at Kapuskasing. (See Sessional papers, No. 61, Session of 1920.)

The Commission to inquire into and report upon the fair market value of assets of estate of late John McMartin, *re* payment of Succession Duties.

The Commission to inquire into the shooting of Ernest Bergeron by certain constables in the County of Essex. (Report in Attorney-General's Office.)

The Commission to inquire into and report upon the truth or falsity of the charges made by one James M. Young of Brockville, against F. B. Taber, License Inspector of Brockville, and C. R. Deacon, who was acting as the License Inspector's Solicitor and Counsel.

The Commission to inquire into and report upon the wages paid to men employed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the construction of the Queenston-Chippawa Development, etc.

Mr. Magladery asked the following Question:

1. Has construction work been started on the extension of the T. & N. O. Railway from Cochrane north. 2. When did work begin. 3. How many men are employed. 4. Who is in charge of the work.

And the Premier replied as follows:

1. No. 2. Answered by reply to question No. 1. 3. Answered by reply to question No. 1. 4. Answered by reply to question No. 1.

Mr. Kennedy asked the following Question:

1. Was any seed oats sold to the farmers of the Province for the season of 1920. 2. How many bushels. 3. Through what department were they purchased and distributed. 4. From whom were they purchased. 5. What price was paid for them. 6. What price was charged for them.

To which the Minister of Lands and Forests replied:

1. Yes, to settlers in Northern and North-Western Ontario. 2. 14,337 bushels. 3. Through the Department of Lands and Forests, Northern Development Branch. 4. The Steele Briggs Seed Co., Ltd., Toronto; The United Farmers Co-operative Co., Ltd., Toronto; John Cormack, Oxdrift; Dugald Kennedy, Dryden; Harris McFayden Seed Co., Ltd., Winnipeg;

J. T. Brett Elevator Co., Ltd., Kenora; John Creerar, Oxdrift; Jas. A. Reid, Oxdrift; Syl. Hall, Oxdrift; W. H. Martin, Dryden; T. H. Lewis, Oxdrift; R. Skene, Sr., Oxdrift. 5. \$1.45 per bushel; \$1.49 per bushel; \$1.50 per bushel; \$1.66 per bushel; \$1.74 per bushel; \$1.75 per bushel. 6. \$1.55 per bushel; \$1.66 per bushel; \$1.70 per bushel.

Mr. Henry asked the following Question:

What was the total expenditure of the Department of Highways (1) For the fiscal year ending 31st October, 1920; (2) From 31st October, 1920, to the present date.

And the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:

1. \$4,491,895.81 less due from the Dominion Government. 2. \$2,738,-987.79 less due from the Dominion Government.

Mr. Hogarth asked the following Question:

How many officials in the Department of Game and Fisheries service have been discharged or asked to resign since November 13th, 1919.

And the Minister of Mines replied:

1.197.

Mr. Tolmie asked the following Question:

1. Is the position to which W. J. Lannin has been appointed a new one created by the Government. 2. (a) What are his duties; and (b) date of appointment. 3. To whom is he directly responsible. 4. What was his previous occupation. 5. Was his appointment recommended by the Superintendent of the Provincial Police; if not, by whom. 6. What salary does he receive. 7. What territorial districts does his work cover. 8. What is the amount of fines that have been collected for infringement of the O.T.A. since his appointment, and how does this compare with the same period of time immediately preceding his appointment. 9. How many officers are under him who are directly responsible to him. Who are they and when were they appointed. 10. What was his age at the time of his appointment. 11. Is his appointment in accord with the regulations which call for appointments being made under the age of 40 years.

To which the Attorney-General replied as follows:

1. Yes. 2. (a) Divisional Superintendent of Law Enforcement. (b) November 19th, 1920. 3. To the Board of License Commissioners for Ontario in so far as the enforcement of the Ontario Temperance Act is concerned and to the Superintendent of the Ontario Provincial Police Force in all other matters. 4. Chief of Police, Stratford. 5. No, the Attorney-General. 6. \$4,000 per annum. 7. Counties of Essex, Kent, Lambton, Elgin and Middlesex. 8. From Sept. 6 to Nov. 18, 1920. From Nov. 19, 1920, to Jan. 31, 1921, respectively.

Windsor	\$31,505 00	\$20,021 50
Essex	15,000 00	6,522 00
Kent	850 00	2,706 00
Lambton	470 00	1,840 00
Middlesex	2,420 00	1,335 00
Elgin	1,825 00	579 00
	\$53,070 00	\$33,003 50

9. Twenty-three License Inspectors: M. N. Mousseau, Windsor, appointed under O.T.A. Sept. 16, 1916; J. E. Keenleyside, London, appointed under O.T.A. Sept. 16, 1916; Walter Ross, St. Thomas, appointed under O.T.A. Sept. 16, 1916; J. E. Stone, Essex, appointed under O.T.A. Sept. 16, 1916; William Culbert, East Lambton, appointed under O.T.A. Jan. 4, 1918; Vacant, West Lambton; Matthew Side, Chatham, appointed Oct. 1, 1920. Provincial Police Constables: C. F. Airey, Sarnia, appointed 29th May, 1920; Findlay Low, Chatham, appointed 15th October, 1920; A. H. Palmer, London, appointed 13th October, 1920; Gordon E. Verral, Windsor, appointed 6th December, 1920; Wm. D. McConnell, Windsor, appointed 6th December, 1920. Special Officers (County Constables): Walter Churchill, Windsor, Aug., 1920; Fred Campeau, Windsor, Aug., 1920; Howard S. Brown, Windsor, Aug. 1920; William Allen, Windsor, Aug., 1920; John T. Hutchison, Windsor, Dec. 6, 1920; Hedley Padgett, Windsor, December 6, 1920; Roy Wilson, Windsor, December 6, 1920; Percy Clark, Chatham; John Hill, Chatham, January 25, 1921; Ernest Hopgood, Essex, August, 1920; Irwin Sadler, Essex, January 24, 1921. 10. Forty-four. 11. The provisions of Clause (c) Regulation 4, making an age limit of 40 years applies to the appointment of constables and not to the appointment of Divisional Inspectors.

Mr. Henry asked the following Question:—

1. How many municipalities have applied for assistance under The Community Halls Act. 2. How many municipalities have established Community Halls as provided for by the Act.

To which the Minister of Agriculture replied:—

1. 137 enquiries have been received in reference to assistance under The Community Halls Act. 2. Grants were paid during the past fiscal year on two halls completed, and ten halls are now in varying stages of progress.

Mr. Henry asked the following Question:—

1. How many Public School teachers have availed themselves of the agricultural training at Guelph and other places during the year 1920. 2. What is the total number of rural school teachers at present engaged in the Province of Ontario. 3. What is the number of rural school teachers needed at the present time.

And the Minister of Education replied as follows:—

1. 481. 2. 6,597. 3. 466.

Mr. Henry asked the following Question:—

1. How many milk and cream inspectors have been appointed under The Milk and Cream Act. 2. When was the Act proclaimed. 3. How many prosecutions have been made under the Act.

And the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. Four inspectors for varying periods in addition to the co-operation of the regular staff of dairy instructors of the Department. 2. Act came into effect when assented to. 3. Four.

Mr. Rankin asked the following Question:—

1. Have any motor cars been purchased by the Government for the use of District Nurses. 2. If so, how many. 3. Through what Department were they purchased. 4. Were tenders asked for. 5. From whom were they purchased. 6. What price was paid.

And the Minister of Labour replied in the words following:—

1. Yes. 2. 9 (nine). 3. Provincial Board of Health. 4. Yes. 5. M. & H. Jerome, Dundas, Ontario. 6. \$1,217.26 each.

Mr. Black asked the following Question:—

1. From whom are the automobile markers purchased. 2. Were tenders asked for. 3. How many tenders were received. 4. What is the price being paid.

And the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. J. L. Wright Co. 2. Yes. 3. Six. 4. Motor vehicle markers—twenty-eight and one-half cents per pair; motor cycle markers—twenty-six and one-half cents per pair.

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

1. What was the total cost of the Committee of the Legislature appointed last Session to investigate Proportional Representation. 2. Who were members of the Committee. 3. What was paid or allowed to each member for each day's sitting. 4. Was mileage paid or allowed to members also. 5. How many days did the Committee sit. 6. What sum is each member named in answer to Question 2 entitled to receive for (a) attendance at meetings; (b) mileage. 7. What amount was paid or allowed for reporters' services. 8. What was paid or allowed for witness' fees. 9. How many witnesses gave evidence. 10. Were witnesses called by the Committee to give evidence in opposition to the proportional representation scheme. 11. Were witnesses called by the Committee in support of the scheme. 12. Will the evidence so taken be printed and distributed among the members of the House. 13. What salaried positions have been created in connection with the Committee. 14. What are these positions. 15. Who have been appointed to them. 16. At what salary. 17. What is the term of the appointment in each case.

And the Premier replied as follows:—

1. \$982.35 up to date. 2. Messrs. Drury, Raney, Doherty, Smith, Tooms, Homuth, Mageau, Magladery, Marshall, O'Neill, Racine, Henry, Price, Hill. 3. Fifteen dollars for each day going to, attending at or returning from meetings. See Chap. 25, Geo. V. Statute Law Amendment Act, Clause 4, Section 74 (1). No payment made to any member of the Cabinet. 4. No. 5. 4 days. 6. Answered by No. 3. 7. Nil. 8. Nil. 9. Three, Messrs. Hooper, McNichol and Winchester. 10. Yes. 11. Yes. 12. The Evidence was not recorded. 13. None. 14. Answered by No. 13. 15. Answered by No. 13. 16. Answered by No. 13. 17. Answered by No. 13.

Mr. Hay asked the following Question: —

1. What loans have been placed by the Government since November 11th, 1919.
2. With whom were each of the loans placed.
3. What are the respective amounts of such loans, rates of interest, terms; commissions paid in each case, and to whom.
4. What were the net prices received by the Provincial Treasurer in each case.
5. What rate of interest did the bond yield the purchasers in each case.
6. Were these bonds sold by public tender, and if so, in what cases.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Loan from Dominion of Canada Housing Act. Dated January 31st, 1920, 5%—\$4,250,000.00.

Loan "GG." 2. Sold to Æmilius Jarvis & Company. 3. \$3,000,000
5½%, 10 years, none. 4. Price 97.76. 5. 5.794%. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "HH." 2. Sold to Æmilius Jarvis & Company. 3. \$3,000,000,
5½%, 10 years, none. 4. 90.41 New York Funds equal to 98 or 99 Canadian. 5
About 5.65. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "JJ." 2. Sold to Æmilius Jarvis & Company. 3. \$5,000,000.
5½%, 5 years, none. 4. 100.65. 5. 5.35. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "KK." 2. Sold to R. C. Matthews & Company, Hanson Brothers
and Financial Corporation. 3. \$2,000,000. 6%, 15 years, none. 4. 100.719. 5.
5.92. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "LL," Refunding Loan. 2. Sold to Wood, Gundy & Company, *et al.*
3. \$6,800,000, 6%, 5 years, none. 4. 91.633 New York Funds, equal to 100.85
Canadian Funds. 5. 5.80. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "MM." 2. Sold to Wood, Gundy & Company, *et al.* 3. \$8,000,000.
6%, 10 years, none. 4. Average 98.236. 5. 6.23. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "NN." 2. Sold to Æmilius Jarvis & Company, Halsey Stuart &
Company & First National Bank. 3. \$3,000,000, 6%, 3 years, none. 4. 103.40033
Net P. 5. 4.70. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "PP." 2. Sold to Wood, Gundy & Company, *et al.* 3. \$5,000,000.
6%, 7 years, none. 4. 104.533. 5. 5.21. 6. Yes.

1. Loan "RR." 2. Sold to Syndicate, Dominion Securities, *et al* (18
Brokers). 3. \$16,000,000. 6%.15 years, none. 4. 92.34. 5. 6.81 6. No.

1. Loan "SS." 2. Sold to Syndicate, Æmilius Jarvis, *et al* (24 Brokers).
3. \$10,000,000, 6%, 20 years, none. 4. Price 96.787. 5. 6.28. 6. No.

Mr Stover asked the following Question:

1. Has any regulation been passed increasing the license fee payable by net fishermen for fishing in Ontario waters from \$25; if so, to what amount; if not, is it the intention of the Government to pass such regulation. 2. Has any regulation been passed under which the licensed fishermen in Ontario waters are permitted to use over 3,000 yards of gill net; if so, what is the effect of such regulation. 3. Has any regulation been passed governing or restricting the use of motor boats in connection with gill fishing in Ontario waters. 4. If any such regulation or regulations as above referred to have been passed, do they extend to any waters or bays outside of the Great Lakes; if so, to what waters or bays. 5. If such regulations have not been passed, is it the intention of the Government or the Department in charge to pass any such regulation, and if so, what is to be the effect.

And the Minister of Mines replied in the words following:—

1. Yes, to \$30.00 and \$40.00, according to location and yardage. 2. Over 3,000 yards of gill nets have always been authorized by license. 3. Yes, governing, but not restricting former privileges. 4. Yes, to all Provincial waters open for commercial fishing. 5. Answered by question No. 4.

Mr. McCrea asked the following Question:—

Has the Attorney-General withdrawn the Order to supply copies of the evidence taken before the Crown Timber Commission of Investigation to Counsel or to any person on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative Opposition—if so, on what date.

And the Attorney-General replied in the negative.

Mr. Godfrey asked the following Question:—

What department of the Government has charge of the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act. 2. Are officers engaged in the enforcement of the O.T.A. authorized to carry firearms. 3. Are any firearms supplied or paid for by the Province.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words following:—

1. Attorney-General's Department. 2. No regulation has been made with regard to the carrying of firearms by officers enforcing the Ontario Temperance Act, but under the Criminal Code of Canada Peace Officers are allowed to carry firearms, and under section 119 of the Ontario Temperance Act every Inspector

and Provincial Officer is *ex-officio* a Constable. 3. Firearms are supplied and paid by the Province to each member of the Ontario Provincial Police Force. In a few special cases firearms have been supplied and paid for by the Board of License Commissioners to officers enforcing the Ontario Temperance Act after special consideration by the said Board.

On Motion of Mr. Mageau, seconded by Mr. Hall,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House showing:—1. What was the total quantity of fish caught in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon respectively and marketed in the following years, 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. 2. What were the varieties of fish caught and marketed in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon respectively and the quantity of each. 3. What was the price paid to fishermen for each variety; what was the price at which the Government sold each variety; to whom were such sales made. 4. To whom were licenses issued to take fish from Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon respectively in the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. 5. Is it the intention of the Government to continue this Fishery Department as a commercial enterprise. 6. What were the gross receipts from fish sales in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon in the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920; and what were the net profits of the Government in each of said years.

On Motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Buckland,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence, papers and documents since November 13th, 1919, relating to the conduct or duties of Magistrates, Justices of the Peace and other officers with reference to the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act.

On Motion of Mr. Widdifield, seconded by Mr. Montgomery,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing operations of the Municipal Loan Fund showing: 1. The amounts loaned to the Municipalities by the Province under this scheme. 2. The amounts paid by the Municipalities. 3. The proportion of the total indebtedness paid in each case by the Municipalities. 4. The Municipalities which made default in payment. 5. The losses resulting to each Municipality from the scheme. 6. The losses in detail resulting to the Province by reason of the guarantee or acquisition of debentures of the Municipalities by the Province. 7. What the special losses amount to with interest at the legal rate to the present date in each case. 8. What the position of the Province is in regard to payment of these moneys in respect of which Municipalities made default.

On Motion of Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all letters of instruction or other correspondence from the Attorney-General or any of the Members of the Government, or Officials, addressed to any Police Magistrates or Crown Attorneys in the Province of Ontario; and any communications or letters in reply thereto relating to the imposition of penalties, or the trial of cases, and their disposition under The Ontario Temperance Act and amendments thereto.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, February 10th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Asmussen, the Petition of the City Council of Kitchener.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time, it was, on the motion of Mr. Ross (Kingston),

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6 p.m.

Friday, February 11th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Town Council of Oakville and the Trafalgar Agricultural Society, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of Serial Bonds to the amount of \$20,000 to be guaranteed by the Town of Oakville.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Second Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the following Petitions and find the Notices as published in each case sufficient:

Of the City Council of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass permitting the City to withdraw from the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Of the City Council of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass to validate and confirm all sales of land prior to the 31st December, 1920.

Of McMaster University, praying that an Act may pass to amend their Act of incorporation.

Of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass reducing the number of Directors.

Of James Petrie Pratt of Montreal, praying that an Act may pass to authorize the Law Society of Upper Canada to admit him to practice as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Of J. Whittaker and others of York, praying that an Act may pass to separate certain territory from the Township of York and to incorporate the same as the Township of North York.

Of John Fulford Rollit of Barrie, praying that an Act may pass authorizing him to practice Dentistry in Ontario.

Of the City Council of Brantford, praying that an Act may pass to enable the Corporation by By-law to provide for a Board of Control and Engineering Board, to pass certain By-laws, and for other purposes.

Of the Town Council of Midland, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm certain By-laws.

Of the City Councils of the Cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporations to pass By-laws varying the fares on the Street Railway owned by them.

Of the City Council of Niagara Falls, praying that an Act may pass providing for the levy of an equal rate, after 1st January, 1921, upon the whole rateable property of the Corporation to pay costs of construction of sewers.

Of the City Council of Guelph, praying that an Act may pass to increase the Capital Stock of Guelph Radial Railway Company and to ratify and confirm a certain By-law, and for other purposes.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 1), intituled “An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.”
Mr. Swayze.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 7), intituled “An Act respecting the City of Brantford.” Mr. MacBride.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 19), intituled “An Act to authorize the Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practice as a Barrister and Solicitor.”
Mr. Denyes.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 22), intituled “An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.” Mr. Hill.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 23), intituled “An Act to authorize John Fulford Rollit to practice Dentistry in Ontario.” Mr. Murdoch.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 25), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Windsor and the Essex Border Utilities Commission." Mr. Tisdelle.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 26), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Windsor." Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 35), intituled "An Act respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William." Mr. Cameron.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 46), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Midland." Mr. Johnston (Simcoe.)

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 47), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Guelph." Mr. Buckland.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 48), intituled "An Act respecting McMaster University." Mr. Watson.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 89), intituled "An Act respecting the Two-platoon System for the Employees of Permanent Fire Departments in Ontario." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 90), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Parks Act." Mr. Asmussen.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 91), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Thompson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 92), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." Mr. Denyes.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 93), intituled "An Act respecting Provincial Auctioneers." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 94), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Freeborn.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Johnston (Simcoe) be added to the Standing Committee on Fish and Game.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed, and after some time,

The Motion, having been again submitted, was carried, and it was

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, as follows:—

To His Honour Lionel Herbert Clarke, Lieutenant-Governor of Our Province of Ontario.

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

The Address, having been read the second time, was agreed to.

Ordered, That the Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by those Members of this House who are Members of the Executive Council.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Resolved, That this House will on Tuesday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Resolved, That this House will on Tuesday next, resolve itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

The Provincial Treasurer presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

The Public Accounts of the Province for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 1.*)

Ordered, That the Public Accounts of the Province for the year 1920 be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The Minister of Agriculture presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Committee on Rural Credits. (*Sessional Papers, No. 58.*)

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Provincial Board of Health for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 21.*)

Also—Report of Bureau of Municipal Affairs. (*Sessional Papers, No. 47.*)

Also—Interim Report of Public Service Commission *re* Issuers of Marriage Licenses. (*Sessional Papers, No. 62.*)

Also—Interim Report of Public Service Commission *re* Police Magistrates. (*Sessional Papers, No. 63.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Monday, February 14th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the City Council of Kitchener, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 1606 and for other purposes.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 95), intituled "An Act to amend the Dairy Standards Act." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 96), intituled "An Act respecting Farm Loans in Ontario." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 97), intituled "An Act for the promotion of Agricultural Development." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 98), intituled "An Act to finance Agricultural Development." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 99), intituled "An Act to amend The Agricultural Associations Act." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 100), intituled "An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act." Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 101), intituled "An Act to amend The Marriage Act." Mr. Godfrey.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Hill asked the following Question:—

1. How many concerns, corporations, partnerships or individuals carried on lumber operations in this province during the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. 2. How many licensed cullers made returns to the Department of Lands and Forests during each of the said years. 3. Approximately how many affidavits were furnished to the said Department during each of the said years (a) by officers or officials of the concerns mentioned in Question 1; (b) by cullers and Crown timber agents. 4. Has the Government instituted criminal proceedings against any culler or official of the Department since November 13th, 1919, and if so, what are their names.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the figures following:—

1. 1917-18, 441; 1918-19, 459; 1919-20, 506. 2. 1917-18, 217; 1918-19, 229; 1919-20, 269. 3. (a) 1917-18, 2,500; 1918-19, 2,500; 1919-20, 3,000; (b) 1917-18, 2,000; 1918-19, 2,000; 1919-20, 2,300. 4. No.

Mr. Black asked the following Question:—

1. How many investigators have been appointed under The Mothers' Allowances Act. 2. What are the names and addresses of such investigators appointed. 3. What remuneration do they receive.

And the Minister of Labour replied as follows:—

1. 23. 2. Miss E. W. Rogers, Toronto; Miss D. Farncomb, Toronto; Miss E. King, Ottawa; Mrs. G. M. Graham, London; Mr. Wm. Stephenson, Toronto; Mrs. O'Connor, Toronto; Miss E. Storms, Hamilton; Miss M. Abernethy, Kingston; Mr. A. Bruce, Lindsay; Miss H. Bapty, London; Miss A. Lawrence, Creemore; Miss J. Strange, Guelph; Miss E. McMullen, Toronto; Miss E. Willison, Peterboro; Miss L. Steward, Brantford; Mme. G. Preston, Ottawa; Mrs. Fraser, Toronto; Mme. Brodeur, Ottawa; Mrs. Van Dine, Toronto; Rev. A. E. Smith, Toronto; Mrs. E. P. Macpherson, Kingston; Mr. Hartill, North Bay; Mrs. Gerrard, Pembroke. 3. Sixteen investigators receive a salary at the rate of \$125 *per* month; seven receive at the rate of \$100 *per* month. Note.—Five investigators, who are included in the above statement, were appointed for a period of two months to help during the organization period—these appointments expired in January.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. Was any special representative sent by the Premier of Ontario to Winnipeg to report on the recent Provincial election there. 2. If so, who was

so appointed and what was his address and previous occupation. 3. What sum was paid or charged for any such report and for expenses. 4. Is the report to be printed for the information of the House.

To which the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. Yes. 2. A. S. Winchester, Barrister, Toronto, Law Clerk, Attorney-General's Department. 3. For travelling expenses, \$121.56; no charge for report. 4. No decision,—report presented to Committee on Proportional Representation.

Mr. Dewart moved, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

That it is the duty of the Government to institute proceedings under The Mining Tax Act to recover from the Canadian Copper Company (or the International Nickel Company) the arrears of taxes properly payable by it, and that the necessary ancillary legislation be passed, conformable to "The Mining Tax Act, 1917"; to include the years in question from the 31st day of December, 1915, back to the commencement of the period covered by the illegal agreement, and authorizing the recovery by the Government of the Province of the taxes to which it is entitled and which have not been paid. And this House further requests that the necessary legislation be forthwith introduced so that proceedings may be taken at the earliest possible time for the recovery of the moneys to which the Province is justly entitled.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on motion of Mr. Mills,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

Mr. McCrea moved, seconded by Mr. Crawford,

That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence relating to the payment of counsel fee to Mr. Peter White, K.C., to represent the Liberal-Conservative Opposition before the Crown Timber Commission of Investigation: 1. Between the Attorney-General and the Hon. Geo. S. Henry. 2. Between the Attorney-General and either of the Commissioners or the Counsel for the Crown. 3. Between the Attorney-General and Mr. Peter White, K.C. 4. Between the Attorney-General and the Hon. G. H. Ferguson.

And a Debate having arisen, it was, on the motion of Mr. Ferguson,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Sinclair, seconded by Mr. Calder,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return showing dates when tenders called for, the tenders received and the names of tenderers for the production of: (a) Ontario Public School Readers, each respectively; (b) Ontario Public School Histories, each respectively; (c) Ontario High School History; (d) Ontario Composition and Grammar.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 64), To amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Mr. Stevenson moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the question, having been put, was carried on a division, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Board of License Commissioners on the operation of The Ontario Temperance Act for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 28.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council made since January 31st, 1921, of the Department of Education or of the Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Hill, the Petition of the Ontario Association of Osteopaths; also, the Petition of the City Council of Ottawa.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting the City of Belleville.

Bill (No. 20), An Act to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 12), An Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 29, of 1920, of the City of Kingston.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes, be remitted on Bill (No. 20), "An Act to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings," on the ground that it is one relating to a Religious Institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes, be remitted on Bill (No. 20), To incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Doherty,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. McCreary and Mr. Ross (Glengarry), be added to the Standing Committee on Fish and Game.

Mr. Drury delivered to Mr. Speaker a Message from the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by himself; and the said Message was read by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:—

L. H. CLARKE,

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the year ending 31st October, 1921, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Toronto, February 15th, 1921.

(*Sessional Papers, No. 2.*)

Ordered, That the Message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the Estimates accompanying same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of Supply having been read,

Mr. Smith moved,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Detailed Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 10.*)

Also—Report of the Registrar of Loan Corporations for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 12.*)

Also—Report of the Minister of Public Works for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 13.*)

Also—Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 11.*)

Also—Report of the Provincial Municipal Auditor for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 8.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Wednesday, February 16th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Hill, from the Special Committee to which was referred Bills (Nos. 68 and 69) of the Session of 1920 to report upon the system of Proportional Representation, presented their Reports, which were read as follows:—

Your Committee to which was referred Bills Nos. 68 and 69 met during the Recess and heard arguments for and against the adoption of the system of electing members to the Legislative Assembly as set forth in the said Bills. Your Committee regrets that after hearing these arguments and after consider-

able discussion it was impossible to arrive at a unanimous conclusion of recommendation. Your Committee therefore presents for your consideration the Report of the majority of the members of the Committee, the Report of the minority of the members of the said Committee, the arguments advanced by the advocates and opponents of the said system and an outline of Parliamentary action in the United Kingdom, Tasmania and Canada, as furnished to the Committee, and a statement showing the interest in the question in the Province of Ontario.

All of which is most respectfully submitted.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE.

Your Committee have been impressed with the arguments in favour of the adoption of proportional representation in Ontario, and are of opinion, in view of the fact that its adoption is a plank in the platform of three of the political parties and the expression of desire on the part of the G.W.V.A. and other bodies and the expressions of opinion in England, and the satisfaction with which the system has worked out in other countries, that steps should be taken towards its gradual adoption in this Province. The Committee feel that it would be unwise to adopt it immediately for the whole Province of Ontario because of the difficulties in securing experienced officers to administer the Act, and also because of the lack of familiarity of the public generally with the objects to be attained and the method of count. The Committee appreciates that so far as the voter himself is concerned the duty which he is called on to perform at the polling booth is not more difficult than under the present system, but are apprehensive that its adoption on a wide scale without previous education might tend to confusion and misunderstanding to such an extent as to make the system unpopular at the start. There is also this difficulty to be contended with: With the exception of the City of Toronto, there is no city having a greater representation than two members. As proportional representation requires large constituencies returning three or more members, it would be necessary, should the membership of the House remain as it is at present, that urban and rural sections of the country would have to be placed together as one constituency, which would not be regarded with favour by either those dwelling in the cities or in the country districts, the probability being that both these bodies would feel that the other would obtain an undue advantage under such a system. Northern or New Ontario, by reason of its sparsely settled nature, also renders it problematical whether elections could be held under such a system in that portion of Ontario, owing to the distances that would necessarily have to be covered. Your Committee are, however, of the opinion that the system should be tried out in certain constituencies at the next election. In order to make such experiment a success, it should be tried out in places where no one party would reap an advantage at the expense of another. Your Committee have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the system should be tried out in both urban and rural con-

stituencies. The urban constituencies which are most adaptable for such an experiment would be the cities of Hamilton and Ottawa, or in the alternative it could be tried out in the City of Toronto. Your Committee feel that it would be advisable that a group of constituencies be formed in Eastern Ontario and a group in Western Ontario. After considering the various constituencies as they are at present, your Committee would recommend for this purpose that the present constituencies of Carleton, North and South Lanark, Leeds, Grenville and Brockville be united into one district, returning six members. In Western Ontario your Committee recommends that the present constituencies of North and South Brant, North and South Waterloo, and North and South Oxford should be united and that they elect six members. The number of names on the voters' list in the Eastern group, according to the return from the records of the general election to the Legislative Assembly in 1919, is as follows:—

Carleton	12,815
Lanark, North	8,941
Lanark, South	10,849
Leeds	10,690
Grenville	10,396
Brockville	10,932
	<hr/>
Total	64,623

The number of voters in the Western constituencies were as follows:—

Brant, North	10,746
Brant, South	17,145
Oxford, North	14,820
Oxford, South	13,720
Waterloo, North	21,623
Waterloo, South	19,182
	<hr/>
Total	97,236

Your Committee have had before them and have considered the question of adopting some method whereby, in the event of more than two candidates running in a single-member constituency, some method could be adopted whereby the candidate to be elected should necessarily obtain more than 50 per cent. of the vote cast. There are instances at present in the House of Assembly where Members have been elected from constituencies where several candidates have run in which the candidate elected has obtained less than one-third of the total vote cast. In such cases he has been elected a member, although two-thirds of the voters voted against him. It would appear to your Committee that if the single transferable vote system was adopted in single member constituencies, then in such an event the member elected would be the

choice of over 50 per cent. of the voters. This would be a step towards the ultimate adoption of the single transferable vote with group constituencies all over the Province, and your Committee recommends that its adoption for single-member constituencies be enacted by the Legislature.

Your Committee have also considered the question of permitting Municipalities, should they so desire, to elect their Municipal bodies by means of Proportional Representation, and it recommends that The Municipal Act be amended to permit Municipalities to so elect their Councils.

The recommendations of your Committee may be summarized thusly:—

1. That the Cities of Ottawa and Hamilton be each allowed two members to be elected by these Cities as a whole under the Single Transferable Vote System of Proportional Representation, or in the alternative that the members from the City of Toronto be elected by this system.
2. That the present constituencies of Carleton, North and South Lanark, Leeds, Grenville and Brockville, together elect six members under the Single Transferable Vote System of Proportional Representation.
3. That the constituencies of North and South Brant, North and South Waterloo, and North and South Oxford together elect six members under the Single Transferable Vote System of Proportional Representation.
4. That the rest of the Province select their members in what is known as single member constituencies, but that the Transferable Vote be used in the election of such members.
5. That municipalities be permitted to elect their councils by means of the Single Transferable Vote System of Proportional Representation.
6. That legislation be forthwith enacted carrying into effect the above recommendations.

Your Committee desires to express its appreciation of the invaluable assistance which it has received from Mr. Ronald Hooper of Ottawa, the Honorary Secretary of the Proportional Representation Society of Canada, who furnished the Committee with much information on Proportional Representation.

Your Committee also desires to thank the Honourable the Minister of Labour in the Dominion Government for his kindness in extending Mr. Hooper leave of absence from the Department to attend the sittings of the Committee. Your Committee also expresses its appreciation to Mr. John R. McNichol of Toronto, the President of the British Representation League, for his presentation of the arguments against the adoption of the System in this Province.

Your Committee also thanks Mr. A. S. Winchester of Toronto for his valuable services as Secretary of the Committee.

Dated this 16th day of February, 1921.

MINORITY REPORT.

The undersigned members of the Parliamentary Committee on Proportional Representation will not repeat the many arguments put forth by the Proportional Representation League or by the British Representation League, which are fairly well covered in the material attached to the dual report of your Committee, but will content themselves with making certain defined conclusions, *viz*:—

1. No steps should be taken to consider the question of Electoral Representation of the people in the Legislature of Ontario until after the census is completed in 1922.

2. A safe principle to be borne in mind is that of Representation by Population, which is very different from Proportional Representation. We believe that many people are confused by the similarity of the names and are not informed on the principles involved.

3. In a new country like Canada where so many people of different races and languages make a new home, efforts should be made to assimilate and merge them into Canadians rather than segregate them into separate communities with special representation.

4. Proportional Representation would bring many candidates into the field dividing up the vote on non-essentials and electing representatives of minorities who have not behind them popular approval for their fads and fancies.

5. Proportional Representation means that a minority may often, by using the balance of power, dictate terms to the majority in the Legislature of Ontario.

6. In a sparsely populated country like most of Ontario the 5 to 8 member constituency would be too large; all members trying to represent the whole and none representing any particular part. Most members have enough to do now to represent one single constituency and travel about it.

7. Proportional Representation makes for weak groups; weak groups or minority groups means log rolling and compromise; log rolling means frequent changes of Government with change of policy without going to the people for approval.

8. Instability of Government in a new country which depends on Government policy for development would wreck untold harm in a Province like Ontario. The present system generally means majority Government for 4 years with an opportunity for the opposition to reverse the Government, if the people are not satisfied with its policy. There is always safety in majority rule.

9. The Gerrymander in its worst form could be utilized in framing large constituencies; farmers could be hived so that townfolk could reduce the farmer representation in the House and *vice versa*.

10. Present rural constituencies situated around cities of less than 50,000 population under Proportional Representation would be dominated entirely by the city vote; small towns and villages in a well-populated rural constituency would often fail to get representation; when 13 per cent. in Winnipeg gets no representative that may occur in many places in Ontario.

11. In the proposals of other members of this Committee placed before the House, The Eastern Proportional Representation Riding, comprising the old constituencies of Lanark, Grenville, Carleton, Leeds and Brockville, population 64,623, would have six members, unit of population 10,770; The Western Proportional Representation Riding, comprising 2 Brants, 2 Oxfords and 2 Waterloos, population 97,236, would have six members, unit of population 16,206. There is not much proportion about this to begin with.

11a. One realizes that it is impossible to get exact representation, but when some ridings have a population of sixty thousand and others nine thousand, it is time to apply a little more fairly the "one man one vote" principle which should bring Representation by Population.

12. Cost of elections to the Candidate over a large constituency eliminates everyone but the rich man, who can travel the riding and spend plenty of money.

13. An independent candidate running in a single riding can be often elected on a good general policy under the present system. Under Proportional Representation unless there were several candidates running in the large constituency on the same policy, there would be no chance for this man being elected. He would draw votes from no other source.

14. The British system works well because majorities, consistent with the stability of the country, treat minorities well. Greater progress is made in British communities than in foreign countries practising many forms of Proportional Representation supposed to safeguard minorities, but actually resulting in keeping the country in a turmoil and never giving it the solid progress that we enjoy in Canada.

15. Your members thus reporting think that the Legislature should consider very carefully before making changes in these trying times; changes that are advocated by a society of individuals rather than by the solid thinking citizens with property rights throughout the Provinces. It will be time to act when Boards of Trade, Farmers' Associations and Ratepayers' Associations memorialize the Government that a change from the present tried and satisfactory system of Proportional Representation is desired.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM H. PRICE,
For Minority of Committee.

Referred to the Printing Committee.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Third Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the following Petitions and find the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of Joseph St. Pierre and others, of the Township of Rochester, praying that an Act may pass to validate and confirm in each of them, the title to certain lands.

Of the Village Council of Georgetown, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Village as a Town.

Of the Township Council of Stamford, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the passing of a By-law and the issue of debentures.

Of Sons of England, praying that an Act may pass respecting reduction in value of Benefit Certificates.

Of the City Council of Sault Ste. Marie, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm certain By-laws and to confirm sales of land.

Of the County Council of Carleton, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of debentures for a term of forty years.

Of Lewis A. McElroy of Erie, U.S.A., and others, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate Fecunis, Limited, for the purpose of acquiring and operating mining lands.

Your Committee recommends that Rule No. 51 of Your Honourable House be further suspended in this, that the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the twenty-second day of February instant, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the 1st day of March next.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Fourth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the Petition of the City Council of London, praying that an Act may pass to authorize the passing of certain By-laws, to authorize certain changes in the Civic Government of the City, and for other purposes, and find that two distinct notices have been published in connection therewith, the first notice relating to the passing of a certain By-law authorizing the issue of debentures for the construction of storm sewers has been published for the full period of six weeks in both the *Ontario Gazette* and in the *London Advertiser*, and agrees with the Petition. The second notice relating to changes in the Civic Government, and other matters has also been published in the *Ontario Gazette* and in the *London Free Press* for a period of six weeks as required by the Rules of Your Honourable House. This Notice, however, does not agree with the Petition in various particulars, principally as to the number of commissioners to compose the Council of the Corporation of the City for the year 1922, and thereafter; the Notice says the Council shall be composed of the Mayor and twenty Commissioners, whilst the Petition says the Mayor and eight Commissioners; the Notice further says that the Mayor shall be elected annually, whilst the Petition says that the Mayor shall be elected for a period of two years; the date of the nomination and election of Commissioners also differ.

Your Committee are of the opinion that an amended Notice, agreeing with the Petition in so far as the contemplated changes in the form of Civic Government are concerned, should be published daily for a period of two weeks in *The London Advertiser* and the *London Free Press*, and that evidence of such publication be furnished to the satisfaction of the Private Bills Committee.

Your Committee consider that advertising as aforesaid having been made, the public will have had sufficient opportunity of becoming aware of the proposed legislation and would therefore recommend the suspension of the Rule in this case.

Ordered, That the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Tuesday the twenty-second day of February instant, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be further extended until Tuesday the first day of March next.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 6), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie."
Mr. Cunningham.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 17), intituled "An Act respecting the Sons of England Benefit Society." Mr. Dewart.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 21), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Stamford." Mr. Swayze.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 28), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Town of Georgetown." Mr. Price.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 30), intituled "An Act respecting Fecunis Limited." Mr. Price.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 37), intituled "An Act respecting the City of London." Mr. Calder.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 44), intituled "An Act respecting the County of Carleton." Mr. Hill.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 103), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." Mr. Stevenson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 104), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Health Act." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 105), intituled "An Act allowing Municipalities to adopt Proportional Representation in Municipal Elections." Mr. Magladery.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 106), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Gray.

Ordered; That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 107), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Insurance Act." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 108), intituled "An Act to amend The Bureau of Municipal Affairs Act." Mr. Stevenson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. O'Neill and Mr. McAlpine be added to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Ferguson asked the following Question:—

What fees have been paid to Mr. R. T. Harding since November 13th, 1919 (a) for legal services by the Treasury Department; (b) by the Attorney-General's Department for professional services other than fees received as counsel for the Timber Enquiry; (c) by any other departments of the Government.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

(a) None. (b) None. (c) None.

Mr. Calder asked the following Question:—

1. Has Edward D. L. Hammond been appointed to a new position under the Government. 2. If so, in what capacity. 3. Do his duties include work in connection with the administration of criminal investigations as well as work under the administrations of the O.T.A. 4. What was his previous occupation. 5. What was the date of his appointment. 6. What is his remuneration. 7. What territorial districts does his work cover. 8. What officers are under his direction, giving names and dates of appointment. 9. Who is his superior officer to whom he reports. 10. What was his age at the time of his appointment. 11. Is his appointment in accord with the regulations which call for appointments being made under the age of 40 years. 12. Who recommended his appointment. 13. What were the terms of the recommendation.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words following:—

1. Yes. 2. Provincial Officer under The Ontario Temperance Act. 3. No. 4. Assistant Superintendent, Pinkerton Detective Agency. 5. 15th December, 1920. 6. \$291.66 *per* month. 7. City of Toronto, Counties of Simcoe, Peel, York, Ontario, Northumberland and Durham, Peterborough, Victoria and the Provisional County of Haliburton, and the Territorial Districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound. 8. Jno. Charlton, appointed Nov. 8, 1920, Provincial Officer; Samuel Smith, appointed Nov. 8th, 1920, Provincial Officer; Geo. F. Grimshaw, appointed Jan. 11, 1921, Provincial Officer; Jas. G. Jeffrey, appointed Feb. 8th, 1921, Provincial Officer, and the License Inspectors in the Counties and Districts above named. 9. Chief Inspector J. A. Ayearst. 10. 36. 11. There is no such regulation as mentioned with regard to appointments under The Ontario Temperance Act. 12. The Attorney-General. 13. Copy of recommendation attached.

To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in Council:

The Civil Service Commissioner for Ontario having given the necessary certificate under The Ontario Public Service Act, 1918, the undersigned has the honour to recommend that pursuant to section 119 of The Ontario Temperance Act, Mr. Edward D. L. Hammond be appointed a Provincial Officer having supervision over and authority with regard to the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act in the City of Toronto, the Counties of Simcoe, Peel, York, Ontario, Durham, Northumberland, Peterborough, the Provisional County of Haliburton and the Territorial Districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound for a period of six months with a salary at the rate of two hundred and ninety-one dollars and sixty-six cents (\$291.66) a month, such salary to be paid out of Vote 96, Item 3, of the current Estimates.

Mr. Lewis asked the following Question:—

1. Who is A. H. Pepall, who, according to Public Accounts, 1920, page 538, received \$4,000 for services and travelling expenses. 2. Does he hold a position in the Government service, and if so, in what Department and what is his official position.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

1. General Sales Manager, Toronto Plate Glass Company, residence 30 High Park Avenue, Toronto. 2. No.

Mr. Gray asked the following Question:—

1. Who is R. H. Boal, who, according to Public Accounts, 1920, page 538,

received \$6.45 for cleaning and pressing his clothes. 2. Is he in the Government employ, and if so, in what department.

To which the Provincial Treasurer replied:—

1. He is an Amusement Tax Inspector. 2. Yes, Provincial Treasurer's Department, Amusements Tax Branch.

Mr. McCrea asked the following Question:—

1. Is the Doyle Rule adopted and in use by the Crown in the Province of Ontario for the measurement of logs and timber sold by the Crown. 2. When and by what authority was such rule authorized. 3. What is the Doyle Rule of measurement. 4. Are Government scalers instructed by the Department to allow for defects before applying the Doyle Rule of measurement. 5. By what authority are scalers authorized to make such deductions for defects. 6. By what method are such defects measured or estimated. 7. Upon what authority is such method based. 8. Are scalers examined as to their fitness to determine log defects before they are granted Government licenses to act as scalers. 9. Is any person other than a licensed Government scaler authorized to determine what part of any log should be deducted for defects.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words following:—

1. Yes. 2. The 18th day of October, 1879, by authority of Order-in-Council. 3. The Doyle Rule is constructed by the following formula: Deduct 4 inches from the diameter of the log as an allowance for slab; square $\frac{1}{4}$ of the remainder and multiply the result by the length of the log in feet. 4. Yes. 5. By Cullers' License obtained under The Ontario Cullers' Act. 6. Different methods are adopted by different licensed scalers, deductions for defects being left to the judgment of the licensed scalers. 7. By Cullers' License obtained under The Ontario Cullers' Act. 8. Yes. 9. No.

Mr. Kennedy asked the following Question:—

What quantity of oats was purchased from the United Farmers' Co-operative Company, Ltd., for seed for the farmers of Ontario for the season of 1920.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied:—

10,008 bushels.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Hay,

Ordered, That there be laid before the House a Return showing 1. How many Timber Limits have been offered for sale since 1st December, 1919, and where situated. 2. Were they all sold by tender. 3. The date of sale, area, and price paid. 4. Were any withdrawn after being advertised, and if so, why. 5. How many tenders were received in each case. 6. The name of the successful tenderer. 7. The amount of bond given in each case by the successful tenderer.

On Motion of Mr. McAlpine, seconded by Mr. McLeod,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing what are the amounts paid by each Company respectively which make up the total credited to The Mining Tax Act in the Public Accounts for 1920 at page a31 under the heading: (a) Acreage tax, \$71,223.26; (b) Profits tax, \$713,291.46.

The following Bill was read the second time;—

Bill (No. 62), To provide Free Text Books in Schools.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion. That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed.

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Brown,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Minister of Lands and Forests presented to the House.

Return to an Order of the House showing 1. How many Timber Limits have been offered for sale since 1st December, 1919, and where situated. 2. Were they all sold by tender. 3. The date of sale, area, and price paid. 4. Were any withdrawn after being advertised, and if so, why. 5. How many tenders were received in each case. 6. The name of the successful tenderer. 7. The amount of bond given in each case by the successful tenderer. (*Sessional Papers, No. 64.*)

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Agricultural Societies of the Province and of the Convention of the Ontario Association of Fairs and Exhibitions, for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 42.*)

The House then adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Thursday, February 17th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Ontario Association of Osteopaths, praying that an Act may pass creating a Board of Osteopathy for Ontario.

Of the City Council of Ottawa, praying for certain amendments to The Municipal and Public Health Acts.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Second Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting the Town of Port Colborne.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 19), An Act to authorize The Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, the Bill be remitted on Bill (No. 9), "An Act respecting Mr. Alfred Hall and the Solicitors' Roll of The Law Society of Upper Canada"; and also that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 23), "An Act to authorize John Fulford Rollit to practise Dentistry in Ontario," the same having been withdrawn by the promoter thereof.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 9), Respecting Alfred Hall and on Bill (No. 23), John Falford Rollit.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting Succession Duties.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Succession Duty Act be amended so as to provide that the additional duty payable under subsection 2 of section 8 be imposed in the cases where the whole amount passing to one person, mentioned in subsection 1, exceeds \$50,000.

That the Succession Duty Act be amended so as to provide that the duty payable under subsection 3 of section 8 be imposed in cases where the aggregate value exceeds \$10,000.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. Watson reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, That the Succession Duty Act be amended so as to provide that the additional duty payable under subsection 2 of section 8 be imposed in the cases where the whole amount passing to one person, mentioned in subsection 1, exceeds \$50,000.

That the Succession Duty Act be amended so as to provide that the duty payable under subsection 3 of section 8 be imposed in cases where the aggregate value exceeds \$10,000.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 81), To amend The Succession Duties Act.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 81), intituled “An Act to amend The Succession Duties Act.”
Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 102), intituled “An Act respecting The Ontario Provincial Police Force.” Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 109), intituled “An Act for the Protection of Children of Un-married Parents.” Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 110), intituled “An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.” Mr. Henry.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 50), intituled “An Act respecting the Title to certain lands devised under the Will of Pierre Charron, deceased.” Mr. Brackin.

Referred to the Commissioners of Estate Bills.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. Calder and Mr. Mewhinney be added to the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and the names of Mr. Hall and Mr. Pinard be added to the Standing Committee on Fish and Game.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 93), Respecting Provincial Auctioneers.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 95), To amend The Dairy Standards Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 99), To amend The Agricultural Associations Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 100), To amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed.

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Marshall,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 10.00 p.m.

Friday, February 18th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Henry, the Petition of the Students' Administrative Council of the University of Toronto.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 27), intituled "An Act to incorporate a part of the Township of York as the Township of North York." Mr. Curry.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 111), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 112), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Health Act." Mr. Tooms.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 113), intituled "An Act respecting the Delivery of Bread." Mr. McLeod.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 114), intituled "An Act respecting Liens of Mechanics and Wage-Earners, Supply Men and others." Mr. Sinclair.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 115), intituled "An Act to amend The Toronto and Hamilton Highway Commission Act." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 116), intituled "An Act to amend The Provincial Highway Act." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Ferguson asked the following Question:—

1. What is the cost to date to the Province of the Riddell-Latchford Timber Enquiry. 2. What is the total amount paid to Mr. R. T. Harding: (a) For fees as Counsel; (b) For payment of assistance; (c) For travelling expenses.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. Accounts have been received to date amounting to \$69,519.32. These accounts are in process of being audited and the exact amount at which they will be allowed cannot at present be stated. 2. (a) \$2,000, on account of fees as Counsel; (b) and (c) Accounts have been received but have not been audited. Mr. Harding's expenses are included in the general expenses of the Commission and cannot be separated.

Mr. Buckland asked the following Question:—

1. What is the amount *per diem* paid to Mr. Justice Riddell and Mr. Justice Latchford for their services as commissioners in connection with the Crown Timber Commission of Investigation. 2. What amount has been paid to each to date. 3. By whom was the arrangement made.

To which the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. No arrangement has been made fixing a *per diem* rate for the Commissioners. 2. There has been paid to each of the Commissioners \$2,000 on account of their services. 3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Calder asked the following Question:—

1. What is the total cost of the Ontario Public Service Commission to the present date. 2. Who compose the Commission. 3. What remuneration has been paid or allowed to each member. 4. What expenses account has been paid or allowed to each member. 5. What was paid or allowed for (a) Expenses of reporting; (b) Witness fees. 6. How many days did the Commission sit. 7. At what places did the Commission sit. 8. Was evidence taken under oath. 9. Is it the intention of the Government to publish the evidence for the information of the members of the Legislature. 10. What salaried positions have been created in connection with the Public Service Commission. 11. What are these positions. 12. Who have been appointed to them. 13. At what salary. 14. What is the term of the appointment in each case.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. \$15,037.33. 2. W. D. Gregory, Norman Sommerville, Dr. H. L. Brittain, Albert Hellyer and E. A. Pocock. 3. W. D. Gregory, \$2,240; N. Sommerville, \$2,000; Dr. H. L. Brittain, \$820; Albert Hellyer, \$1,000; E. A. Pocock, \$1,180. 4. W. D. Gregory, \$605.42; N. Sommerville, \$373.28; Dr. H. L. Brittain, \$338.15; A. Hellyer, \$457.25; E. A. Pocock, \$720.77. 5. (a) \$2,231.50; (b) Nil. 6. 55 days. 7. Toronto, Haileybury, North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur, Fort Frances, Winnipeg, Kenora, Ottawa, Cornwall, Brockville, Kingston, Belleville, Picton, Cobourg, Windsor, Detroit, Chatham, London, Kitchener, Guelph, Brampton, Owen Sound, St. Catharines, Brantford and Hamilton. 8. No. 9. The reports will be published, but the evidence will not be published unless so ordered by the Legislature. 10. None. 11, 12, 13 and 14. Answered by 10.

Mr. Marceau asked the following Question:—

1. What was the cost to the Government of each marker (a) For motor vehicles generally; (b) For motor cycles in use for the year 1920. 2. (a) Were

tenders called for; (b) From whom were markers purchased; (c) Was marker the subject of patent. 3. What was the cost to the Government of each marker (a) For motor vehicles generally; (b) For motor cycles in use for the year 1921. 4. (a) From whom were the markers purchased; (b) Were tenders called for; (c) Was marker the subject of patent.

And the Minister of Public Works replied:—

1. (a) Fourteen cents; (b) Fourteen cents. 2. (a) No; (b) St. Thomas Metal Signs, Limited; (c) No. 3. (a) Fourteen and one-quarter cents. (b) Thirteen and one-quarter cents. 4. (a) The J. L. Wright Company; (b) Yes; (c) No.

Mr. Mewhinney asked the following Question:—

What are the details that make up the item of \$903,422.41 credited to the capital receipts of the Lands and Forests Department as part of the total receipts of \$2,911,047.13 as stated in the Public Accounts for 1920 on pages (a24 and a30.)

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:—

The item \$903,422.41 credited to the capital receipts of the Lands and Forests Department is arrived at as follows:—The total revenue for the Lands and Forests Department for the year 1920 was \$2,911,047.13. The expenditure for the year, as shown in the Public Accounts, was \$1,104,202.31. This being deducted, half of the net revenue has been treated as the proportion recovered from Capital realization from Woods and Forests collections, *viz.*, Bonus, Timber Dues, etc.

Mr. Marshall asked the following Question:—

1. Were tenders called for work done for each item which appears in the Public Accounts on page 458 as follows:—Thomas V. Gearing, alterations and additions to garage, \$6,647.95. 2. If so, who were the respective tenderers and what was the amount of each tender. 3. Was order dated, what contract was entered into, was order given for work.

And the Minister of Public Works replied:—

1. Yes. 2. Thos. V. Gearing; cost of materials and wages plus ten *per cent.* 3. The tender dated August 20th, 1920, was accepted the same day and placed on file as official contract.

Mr. Govenlock asked the following Question:—

What are the details of the amounts paid by each Racing Association for the Spring and Fall meetings respectively, included in the item of receipts for Race Track meeting licenses stated at \$770,410 on page a79 of the Public Accounts for 1920.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:

The details are as follows:—

Ontario Jockey Club	\$105,000 00
Collingwood Driving Club	10 00
Kingston Gentlemen's Driving Club	10 00
Thorncliffe Park Racing and Breeding Association	105,000 00
Kitchener Driving Association	10 00
Metropolitan Racing Association	35,000 00
Woodstock Trotting Club	20 00
Napanee Driving Club	10 00
Lucan Turf Club	10 00
Dominion Day Celebration Committee, Port Elgin	10 00
Hamilton Jockey Club	105,000 00
Western Racing Association, Devonshire Park	105,000 00
Niagara Racing Association, Fort Erie	105,000 00
Simcoe Driving Club	20 00
Windsor Jockey Club	105,000 00
Preston Driving Club	20 00
Arthur Agricultural Society	10 00
Collingwood Driving Club	20 00
Kingston Gentlemen's Driving Club	10 00
Kitchener Driving Club	40 00
Welland Driving Association	20 00
Kenilworth Jockey Club	105,000 00
Simcoe Driving Club	20 00
Orangeville Turf Association	20 00
Brussels Trotting Club	10 00
Wingham Athletic Grounds	20 00
Ridgetown Old Boys' and Girls' Re-Union	30 00
Dunnville Racing Club	10 00
Brampton Driving Club	10 00
Woodstock Trotting Club	10 00
Kingston Gentlemen's Driving Club	10 00
Kitchener Driving Club	10 00
Toronto Driving Club	20 00
Woodbridge Driving Club	10 00
Dufferin Park Driving Club	10 00

\$770,410 00

Mr. Buckland asked the following Question:—

1. Is A. M. Latchford, who, according to Public Accounts, 1920, page 532, was paid the sum of \$1,260 for legal services, a son of Mr. Justice Latchford, one of the Timber Commissioners.

And the Attorney-General replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Hay asked the following question:—

1. (a) Was the loan "N.N." of \$3,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in three years, for which the net price of 103.40033 was realized according to the Provincial Treasurer's statement, publicly advertised, and if so, on what date; (b) What date of issue do the bonds bear; (c) Are the principal and interest upon the bonds repayable at option of the purchaser in gold in New York. 2. (a) Was the loan "P.P." for \$5,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in seven years, for which the price of 104.533 was realized according to the Provincial Treasurer's statement, publicly advertised, and if so, what was the date of the first advertisement; (b) What date of issue do these bonds bear; (c) Are the principal and interest upon the bonds repayable at the option of the purchaser in gold in New York. 3. (a) What date of issue do the bonds bear covered by the loan "R.R." for \$16,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in fifteen years, for which, according to the statement of the Provincial Treasurer, the price of 92.34 was obtained without public tender; (b) What method was adopted by the Provincial Treasurer to obtain offers for such bond issue and what offers, if any, were received other than that of Dominion Securities Syndicate; (c) Are the principal and interest under such bonds payable in gold at par in United States or only stipulated to be paid in Canada. 4. (a) What was the date of issue of bonds covered by loan "S.S." for \$10,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in twenty years and according to the Provincial Treasurer's statement sold to the syndicate of Aemilius Jarvis and others at the price of 96.787; (b) What method was adopted by the Provincial Treasurer to obtain offers for such bond issue, and what offers, if any, were received other than that of Aemilius Jarvis Syndicate; (c) Are the principal and interest under such bonds payable in gold at par in the United States or only stipulated to be paid in Canada.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:

1. (a) Yes, 30th September, 1st and 4th October, 1920; (b) 1st October, 1920; (c) Yes. 2. (a) Yes, November 4th, 1920. (b) 15th November, 1920; (c) Yes. 3. (a) 1st December, 1920; (b) Negotiations were made with syndicate comprised of all leading brokers in Toronto; none; (c) Payable in Canada only. 4. (a) 1st February, 1921; (b) Negotiations were made with syndicate comprised of all leading brokers in Toronto; none; (c) Payable in Canada only.

Mr. Sinclair asked the following Question:—

1. Have any Treasury Bills been issued by the Government since 13th November, 1919, if so (a) For what amounts respectively; (b) Upon what dates; (c) For what periods respectively; (d) At what prices respectively; (e) To whom were these issued in each case; (f) Was there any public advertisement; (g) Were tenders called for; (h) If not, what method was adopted by the Provincial Treasurer in placing the said Treasury Bills and realizing upon said Treasury Bills, and what offers were received, and what was accepted in each case.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:

1. Yes; (a) \$3,000,000, Series "H.H."; \$5,000,000, Series "J.J."; \$6,000,000, Series "K.K."; \$1,000,000, Series "L.L."; (b) May 15th, 1920; June 15th, 1920; Oct., 15th, 1920; Nov. 15th, 1920; (c) May 15th, 1920-Nov. 15th, 1920; June 15th, 1920-Dec. 15th, 1920; Oct. 15th, 1920-Apr. 15th, 1921; Nov. 15th, 1920-May 15th, 1921; (d) 99.50, 99.50, 99.50, 99.50; (e) Home Bank of Canada; Home Bank of Canada and Aemilius Jarvis & Co.; Home Bank of Canada and Aemilius Jarvis & Co.; Canadian Debentures Corporation, Ltd.; (f) No; (g) No; (h) Offers were made by the Bank and Brokers mentioned in answer to Question (e), and after due consideration, they were accepted.

Mr. Thompson asked the following Question:—

1. Is A. R. McVicar in the employ of the Government. 2. If so, what position does he occupy. 3. What are his qualifications for that position. 4. How long has he been employed. 5. Where did he reside. 6. Is he a brother of the Honourable the Member for East Elgin.

And the Minister of Public Works replied:—

1. Yes. 2. Foreman. 3. Late County Road Superintendent for Brant County, also experience on road and railway contract work. 4. Since June 24th, 1919. 5. Brantford. 6. No.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 65), To amend The Railway Employees' Voting Act, 1918.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 70), To amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 72), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 73), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 84), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 86), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 88), To amend the Act to regulate the means of Egress from Public Buildings.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 87), To amend The Assessment Act, having been read,

Mr. Crockett moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House then adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

Monday, February 21st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Students' Administrative Council of the University of Toronto, praying for improved accommodation.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 117), intituled "An Act to amend The Police Magistrates Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 118), intituled "An Act to provide for the appointment of Police Magistrates with extended jurisdiction." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 119), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 120), intituled "An Act respecting the Adoption of Children." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 3), Respecting the City of Belleville.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 20), To incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 2), Respecting the Town of Mimico.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 4), Respecting the City of Peterborough.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 12), To legalize and confirm By-law No. 29, of 1920, of the City of Kingston.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 13), Respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 19), To authorize ~~The~~ Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 90), To amend The Public Parks Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 91), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 92), To amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 106), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 60), Respecting the Legitimation of Children by the subsequent intermarriage of their Parents.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 66), Respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 74), The Reforestation Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 95), To amend The Dairy Standards Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 99), To amend The Agricultural Associations Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 100), To amend The Agricultural Societies Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question:—

What were the legal services rendered in connection with each item and charged in the Public Accounts for 1920 on page 64 as follows:—(a) J. S. Lundy, legal services *re* alleged combine, \$743.25; (b) W. Nesbitt, legal services *re* Grocers' combine, \$500; (c) A. W. Roebuck, legal services *re* alleged

combine in the Wholesale Grocers' trade, \$2,250.70; (d) A. M. Stewart, legal services *re* Grocers' combine, \$250. 2. At what rate *per diem* were services charged for in each case.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. (a) Mr. J. S. Lundy was engaged by the former Government to represent it before the Dominion Board of Commerce in a number of investigations; (b) Mr. Wallace Nesbitt's services were conferences and an opinion *re* Grocers' Combine; (c) Mr. A. W. Roebuck's services were as Counsel for the Government on the enquiry before the Dominion Board of Commerce on charges of alleged combinations by wholesale grocers in restraint of trade; (d) Mr. A. M. Stewart's services were conferences and an opinion *re* Grocers' Combine. 2. The basis of the engagement in these cases was not a *per diem* one.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. What lands or mining rights in the nickel belt in the District of Sudbury have been leased, patented or otherwise disposed of under The Mining Act by the Government since 13th November, 1919, to the Canada Copper Company (International Nickel Company), George E. Buchanan, solicitor to the Canada Copper Company, or any other corporation or individual; and upon what dates and at what price or rental *per acre*. 2. In case any such leases or patents have been granted, do such leases or patents contain any reservation under 7 George V, cap. 11 (1917), as to the treatment and refining within the Dominion of Canada of ores or minerals raised or removed from the properties in question. 3. What restrictions or precautions have been taken to ensure the reservation of ores or minerals raised or removed from any such lands so as to ensure their treatment and refining in Canada.

And the Minister of Mines replied in the words and figures following:—

1. The following lands were patented:—

Township of Blezard.

S.E. quarter of S. half of lot 7, con. 1, $39\frac{1}{4}$ acres, Martin Hassett, Dec. 24, 1919.

Township of Capreol.

W.R. 12, 40 acres, Gilbert Bennett, Nov. 24, 1920.

Township of Creighton.

- N.W. quarter of N. half of lot 3, con. 2, $38\frac{7}{8}$ acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S.W. quarter of N. half of lot 3, con. 2, $38\frac{7}{8}$ acres, George E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S. E. quarter of N. half of lot 3, con. 2, $38\frac{7}{8}$ acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- N.E. quarter of N. half of lot 3, con. 2, $38\frac{7}{8}$ acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- N.W. quarter of S. half of lot 1, con. 3, $41\frac{1}{4}$ acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 17th Nov., 1920.
- N.E. quarter of S. half of lot 2, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- N.W. quarter of S. half of lot 2, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S.E. quarter of S. half of lot 2, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S.W. quarter of S. half of lot 2, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- N.E. quarter of S. half of lot 3, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S.W. quarter of S. half of lot 3, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- N.W. quarter of S. half of lot 3, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.
- S.E. quarter of S. half of lot 3, con. 3, 40 acres, Geo. E. Buchanan, 19th Oct., 1920.

Township of Denison.

- S.W. quarter of S. half of lot 12, con. 5, $58\frac{3}{4}$ acres, C. A. Durkee, 7th May, 1920.
- S.E. quarter of S. half of lot 12, con. 5, $58\frac{3}{4}$ acres, C. A. Durkee, 7th May, 1920.

Township of Levack.

- N.W. quarter of N. half of lot 4, con. 3, 40 acres, Robt. J. Clark, 26th August, 1920.

Township of Trill.

- N.W. quarter of N. half of lot 7, con. 1, 40 acres, Louis Laforest, 8th Oct., 1920.
- N.E. quarter of N. half of lot 7, con. 1, 40 acres, Emma Laforest, 8th Oct., 1920.
- Price, the Statutory price of \$3.00 *per* acre.

2. All of the said lands were patented subject to condition contained in 7 George V, chapter 11 (1917), as to treatment and refining within the Dominion of Canada of ores or minerals raised or removed therefrom. 3. None of the said lands have yet been worked for ores or minerals.

Mr. Ferguson asked the following Question:—

1. What are the respective places of residence and occupations of W. T. Jackson, Thos. McMillan and M. H. Staples, who made the report on Rural Credits. 2. What special qualification had each of them to advise with respect to a system of rural credits.

And the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. W. T. Jackson, Toronto, Assistant Professor, University of Toronto; Thos. McMillan, Farmer, R.R. 2. Seaforth; M. H. Staples, Secretary and Lecturer, Toronto. 2. Prof. W. T. Jackson, several years studying and teaching finance and transportation in universities in Canada and United States, with special reference to agricultural finance; Thos. McMillan, many years of experience as farmer and stock man in association with agricultural business affairs; M. H. Staples, graduate Toronto University and experience as farmer.

Mr. Allan asked the following Question:—

1. When was Alexander Montgomery appointed Superintendent of the Nipissing Central Railway. 2. Is he the same Alexander Montgomery who was U.F.O.-Labour candidate at the last Provincial election. 3. On whose recommendation was he appointed.

And the Premier replied as follows:—

1. Appointed Acting Superintendent of Transportation, March 16th, 1920. 2. Yes. 3. Recommended for promotion by a Conference of Executive Officials on account of being senior employee of the Nipissing Central Railway.

Mr. Sinclair asked the following Question:—

Were the costs of License Inspector Joseph Stewart of Peterboro ordered to be paid by him on the quashing of a conviction by the Honourable Mr. Justice Middleton against Bert Haydon for a violation of The Ontario Temperance Act, paid to Joseph Stewart out of the funds of the Ontario License

Board, or was he paid or reimbursed out of any funds by any department of the Government, and if so, out of what funds.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

The bill of Messrs. Gordon & O'Brien, who appeared on behalf of the defendant on the motion to quash the conviction against Bert Haydon for a violation of The Ontario Temperance Act, which was rendered at \$119.90 and taxed at \$84.90, was paid by the Board of License Commissioners for Ontario to Messrs. Gordon & O'Brien out of the Peterborough Ontario Temperance Act license fund account.

On Motion of Mr. Hay, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return of copies of all papers and correspondence between the Government or any member thereof or any official on behalf of the Government and any other Corporation or person relating to: (a) Loan "R.R." sold to syndicate composed of the Dominion Securities and others; (b) Loan for \$16,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in fifteen years for which the price of 92.34 was realized; (c) The loan "S.S." sold to the syndicate composed of Aemilius Jarvis and others; (d) The loan for \$10,000,000 at 6 per cent., repayable in twenty years for which the price of 96.787 was realized.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Commission to enquire into and report upon a basis for determining the financial obligations of the Province toward the University of Toronto, and the financial aid which the Province may give to Queen's University of Kingston and the Western University of London, etc., etc. (*Sessional Papers*, No. 65.)

Also—Report of the Ontario Board of Parole for the year ending October 31st, 1920. (*Sessional Papers*, No. 57.)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of the 14th day of February instant for a Return showing dates when tenders called for, the tenders received and the names of tenderers for the production of (a) Ontario Public School Readers, each respectively; (b) Ontario Public School Histories, each respectively; (c) Ontario High School History; (d) Ontario Composition and Grammar. (*Sessional Papers*, No. 66.)

The House then adjourned at 6 p.m.

Tuesday, February 22nd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Henry, the Petition of the Township Council of York.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Third Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the City of Chatham.

Bill (No. 33), An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Town of Midland.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting McMaster University.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill (No. 28), An Act to incorporate the Town of Georgetown.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes be remitted on Bill (No. 48), "An Act respecting McMaster University" on the ground that it is one relating to a Religious Institution, and less fines imposed under the Rules of the House.

Your Committee recommend that notwithstanding Rule 51 of Your Honourable House the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended to and inclusive of Thursday, the 10th day of March next.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes, and less fines imposed by Rules of House, be remitted on Bill (No. 48), McMaster University.

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports of Committee on Private Bills, be extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the 10th day of March next.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 121), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Lewis.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 122), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Homuth.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 123), intituled “An Act respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.” Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 124), intituled “An Act to amend the Fire Department Hours of Labour.” Mr. Hay.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. MacBride,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting Agricultural Development.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the sum of \$500,000 be set apart out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purchase of bonds to be issued by the Agricultural Development Board to provide capital for the promotion of agricultural development by means of loans on first mortgages on farm property subject to the terms and provisions of "The Agricultural Development Act" and "The Farm Loans Act."

That subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to borrow money by receiving deposits to any amounts and from any persons or corporations, and to open offices for this purpose at such points in Ontario as he may deem necessary, and to fix such conditions as to the payment of interest not exceeding four *per cent. per annum* and the repayment of such deposits, and to apply money received by way of deposit to loans to members of associations under "The Ontario Farm Loans Act," the purchase of bonds or debentures issued under "The Agricultural Development Act," or the purchase of bonds or debentures issued or guaranteed by the Province of Ontario, the Dominion of Canada or any Province of Canada or any municipality in Ontario.

That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to guarantee the repayment of any bonds or debentures issued by the Agricultural Development Board for the purpose of making loans on farm property to be secured by first mortgage to the extent of sixty-five *per cent.* of the value of such property.

That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to subscribe for shares to an amount equal to one-half the total amount subscribed for by individuals in the capital stock of any association formed under "The Ontario Farm Loans Act, 1921," and that the sums required for the purchase of such shares shall be a charge upon and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund or may be payable in bonds issued by or guaranteed by the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions,

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. Watson reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, That the sum of \$500,000 be set apart out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purchase of bonds to be issued by the Agricultural Development Board to provide capital for the promotion of agricultural development by means of loans on first mortgages on farm property subject to the terms

and provisions of "The Agricultural Development Act" and "The Farm Loans Act."

That subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to borrow money by receiving deposits to any amounts and from any persons or corporations, and to open offices for this purpose at such points in Ontario as he may deem necessary, and to fix such conditions as to the payment of interest not exceeding four *per cent. per annum* and the repayment of such deposits, and to apply money received by way of deposits to loans to members of associations under "The Ontario Farm Loans Act," the purchase of bonds or debentures issued under "The Agricultural Development Act," or the purchase of bonds or debentures issued or guaranteed by the Province of Ontario, the Dominion of Canada or any Province of Canada or any municipality in Ontario.

That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to guarantee the repayment of any bonds or debentures issued by the Agricultural Development Board for the purpose of making loans on farm property to be secured by first mortgage to the extent of sixty-five *per cent.* of the value of such property.

That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to subscribe for shares to an amount equal to one-half the total amount subscribed for by individuals in the capital stock of any association formed under "The Ontario Farm Loans Act, 1921," and that the sums required for the purchase of such shares shall be a charge upon and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund or may be payable in bonds issued by or guaranteed by the Province of Ontario.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 97) respecting the Promotion of Agricultural Development.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 76), To amend The Motor Vehicles Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 96), Respecting Farm Loans in Ontario.

Referred to a Select Committee to be hereafter named.

Bill (No. 97), For the promotion of Agricultural Development.

Referred to a Select Committee to be hereafter named.

Bill (No. 98), To finance Agricultural Development.

Referred to a Select Committee to be hereafter named.

The House then adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Wednesday, February 23rd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O.CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Fifth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the following Petitions and find the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the City Council of Kitchener, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law 1606 and for other purposes.

Of the Town Council of St. Mary's, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm By-law No. 417 repealing By-law No. 10, A.D. 1895, of the Corporation, fixing the rate on all lands situate in the Town used for farm lands and in blocks of not less than twenty-five acres.

Of the Village Council of Acton, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law.

Of the City Council and the Water Commissioners of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass to amend section 18 of cap. 58, 61 Victoria so as to enable them to raise certain moneys for Water Works purposes.

Of the Town Council of Pembroke, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to assess and levy in any one year not more than three and one-half cents on the dollar on assessed value of the whole rateable value of the Town.

Of the Township Council of Etobicoke and Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain By-law and Agreement.

Of the Boards of Education and the Separate School Boards of Windsor and Walkerville, praying that an Act may pass to create a Joint Board of School Trustees with certain powers.

Of the Town Council of Kincardine, praying that an Act may pass to consolidate the floating debt and to authorize the borrowing of money.

Of the City Council of Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass to amend 2 George V, cap. 118, and to legalize and confirm tax sales prior to January 1st, 1920.

Of the Town Council of Hawkesbury, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Town to separate from the United Counties of Prescott and Russell by its erection into a separate Town.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 5), intituled “An Act respecting the Town of Pembroke.”
Mr. Warren.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 16), intituled “An Act to enable the Town of Hawkesbury to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell.” Mr. Evanturel.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 24), intituled “An Act respecting the City of Windsor.” Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 29), intituled “An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke and the Western Golf and Country Club, Limited.” Mr. Godfrey.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 31), intituled “An Act respecting the Town of St. Mary’s.”
Mr. Lewis.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 34), intituled “An Act respecting the Village of Acton.”
Mr. Lethbridge.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 39), intituled “An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.”
Mr. Hogarth.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 40), intituled “An Act respecting the Town of Kincairdine.”
Mr. Mewhinney.

Referred to the Railway and Municipal Board.

Bill (No. 41), intituled "An Act to establish a joint industrial and technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville." Mr. Tolmie.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 52), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Kitchener." Mr. Asmussen.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 125), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act." Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 126), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act." Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 127), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 128), intituled "An Act to amend The Motor Vehicles Act." Mr. Tooms.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 129), intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Act of Ontario." Mr. Mills.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 130), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Doherty,

Ordered, That the following members be constituted a Special Committee of the House, to consider and report on Bills Nos. 96, 97 and 98:—Messrs. Doherty, Smith, Sandy, MacVicar, Ross (Glengarry), Swayze, Heenan, Clarke, Marshall, Sinclair, Henry, Hill and McCrea.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Widdifield be added to the Standing Committee on Fish and Game, and the name of Mr. Webster be added to the Standing Committee on Municipal Law.

Mr. Henry asked the following Question:

1. Has the Government submitted the necessary plans and maps as provided for by regulations under The Canada Highways Act of 1919. 2. What is the total mileage on which Federal aid has been arranged for. 3. What is the mileage of Federal-aided roads located in each of the various counties within the Province. 4. What amount was spent upon these Federal-aided roads by the Province during the year ending October 31st, 1920. 5. What amount, if any, has the Federal Government agreed to pay the Province on 1920 expenditures and what amount has been already received.

And the Minister of Public Works replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Yes. 2. 1,752.80 miles. 3. See Schedule "A." 4. See Schedule "B." 5. (a) Forty per cent. of No. 4, or \$1,091,524.80; (b) Nothing, as statement not yet submitted.

SCHEDULE "A."

<i>County</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Mileage</i>	<i>Total</i>
Brant	9	7.78	
	10	18.49	26.27
	19	38.14	38.14
	6	30.50	
Carleton	33	7.38	
	34	40.58	
	32	12.00	90.46
	26	25.82	25.82
Dufferin	5A	61.89	61.89
Dundas, Stormont & Glengarry..	13	31.12	
Elgin	16	27.27	58.39
	13	35.48	
	15	24.23	59.71
Essex	3	7.72	
	4	13.51	
	32	20.15	41.38
	18	32.96	
Grey	26	37.90	70.86
	16	38.35	
Haldimand	17	15.55	53.90

<i>County</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Mileage</i>	<i>Total</i>
Halton	21	15.00	
	25	15.50	30.50
Hastings	2	9.49	
	3	17.92	27.41
	24	25.29	25.29
Huron	24	25.29	25.29
Kent	13	49.91	..
	15	39.14	89.05
Lambton	20	40.48	40.48
Lanark	32	32.62	32.62
Leeds & Grenville.....	4	33.23	
	5	10.40	
	5A	7.20	
	6	27.60	
	32	35.21	113.64
Lennox & Addington.....	3	20.71	20.71
Lincoln	8	27.03	
	35	.85	27.88
Middlesex	12	8.94	
	14	10.74	
	15	36.36	
	20	24.92	
	23	19.52	100.48
Norfolk	16	30.27	30.27
Northumberland & Durham.....	2	61.76	
		18.92	80.68
Ontario	1	11.63	
	2	4.68	
	30	25.15	41.46
Oxford	16	.84	
	10	17.65	
	11	7.16	
	12	6.86	32.51
Peel	25	9.50	
	26	39.20	48.70
Perth	21	11.40	
	23	15.10	
	24	17.31	43.81
	31	8.05	8.05
Prescott & Russell.....	33	61.71	61.71
Renfrew	34	53.00	53.00
Simcoe	28	52.44	52.44
Victoria	30	16.00	16.00
Waterloo	21	19.20	
	22	10.85	30.05

<i>County</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Mileage</i>	<i>Total</i>
Welland	16	27.41	
	35	3.50	30.91
Wellington	18	48.33	
	19	23.45	
	21	19.34	91.12
	7	4.00	
Wentworth	8	5.17	
	9	12.14	
	17	8.50	
	22	16.36	
	18	11.45	
	36	2.78	
	25	3.67	64.09
	29	4.20	33.31
York	25	1.9	
	27	27.21	
	29	4.20	

SCHEDULE "B."

List of Projects under agreement with the Dominion Government with total amounts expended during year 1919-1920.

Project No. 2	\$ 389,743 43
" No. 3	498,561 53
" No. 4	316,137 16
" No. 5	58,787 54
" No. 6	853,776 85
" No. 7	34,149 55
" No. 8	286,056 78
" No. 9	97,320 36
" No. 10	74,818 63
" No. 11	5,603 65
" No. 12	35,425 00
" No. 17	1,211 29
" No. 23	Nil
" No. 25	415 05
" No. 27	2,651 50
" No. 33	74,153 69

Total.....\$2,728,812 01

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

1. What was the net income to the Government under the operation of The Ontario Temperance Act respectively for the years 1919 and 1920. 2. What is the revenue estimated for the year 1921. 3. For what reason has the amount been so fixed.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. 1919, \$85,711.08; 1920, \$469,773.29. 2. Estimated gross revenue, \$500,000. 3. Provided the Referendum results in prohibiting the importation of liquor, it is anticipated that the amount that will be collected for penalties for infractions of the Ontario Temperance Act will be considerably less than in 1920, the gross revenue for 1920 being \$785,788.99.

Mr. Allan asked the following Question:—

1. Was S. K. Burdin, Chief Clerk, Record Branch, Department of Lands and Forests, suspended or given leave of absence in or about the month of April, 1920. 2. For what reason was the suspension made or leave of absence given. 3. On whose recommendation was such order or orders made. 4. How long did the suspension or leave of absence exist. 5. Under what section of The Public Service Act was such suspension made or leave of absence given. 6. Has he been reinstated.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words following:—

1. Mr. Burdin was granted leave of absence for three months, from March 8th, 1920. 2. As a Royal Commission had been appointed to investigate the timber administration of the Province, it was deemed advisable that the files of the Department be placed in charge of one of the other members of the staff for the time being. This arrangement was agreed to by Mr. Burdin. 3. On the recommendation of the Minister of Lands and Forests. 4. On June 8th, 1920, Mr. Burdin was granted a further leave of absence for three months. 5. Subsection 2, section 17, Public Service Act. 6. As Mr. Burdin had been granted leave of absence no reinstatement was necessary. On the expiration of the leave of absence granted on June 8th, 1920, he resumed his duties.

Mr. Rankin asked the following Question:—

1. Is there an official known as Chief Clerk of Lands, in the Department of Lands and Forests, if so, what is his name. 2. What remuneration is he receiving for his services. 3. What are his qualifications for the position. 4. What was the date of appointment. 5. By whom was he recommended.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied:—

1. Selby Draper. 2. \$1,900 *per annum*. 3. Satisfactory services for about 22 years in the Department, four years of which he has been Clerk in charge of Free Grant Lands, from which position he was promoted to Chief Clerk. 4. December 22nd, 1920. 5. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Kennedy asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Government rented the building formerly known as "The Old Knox College" and more recently as the "Spadina Military Hospital." 2. For what purpose has the building been rented. 3. What are the terms of rental and for what period of time.

And the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. Departmental offices. 3. Ten years, \$5,000 *per quarter* for the first five years and \$6,250 *per quarter* for the last five years and to pay taxes.

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

Was the boat, *Capt. Visger*, a fish patrol boat in commission during the year 1919-1920. Who was the captain in charge.

And the Minister of Mines replied as follows:—

The Str. *Capt. Visger* was in commission as a patrol boat for 1919 with Capt. Wm. Lasha in charge, and in 1920 the Str. *Grey Bird*, formerly *Capt. Visger*, was in commission with Capt. Ed. Wray in charge until the 7th of September, and from September 18th, Capt. Jas. Hough was in charge.

Mr. O'Neill asked the following Question:—

1. What is the date of the appointment of A. A. Cole "as Commissioner on the Peat Committee," for which the sum of \$3,600 is charged for twelve months' salary (Public Accounts, page 657). 2. Who was the "Commissioner" appointed. 3. (a) Who constitutes the "Peat Committee"; (b) Has the "Commissioner" or "Peat Committee" made any report; (c) If so, on what date; (d) Is it the intention to bring down such report and to have it printed.

And the Minister of Mines replied as follows;—

1. 9th April, 1918. 2. A. A. Cole and R. C. Harris, appointed by the Government of Ontario. R. A. Ross and B. F. Haanel, appointed by the Dominion Government. 3. (a) Answered by Number 2. (b) The Committee has made three Reports. (c) Report for 1918, dated December 31st, 1918, Report for 1919, dated December 31st, 1919. Preliminary Report for 1920, dated 3rd February, 1921. (d) The Reports for 1918 and 1919 have been printed, the first in the Twenty-eighth and the second in the Twenty-ninth Annual Reports of the Department of Mines. The full Report for 1920 has not yet been received, but will be printed in the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Department.

On Motion of Mr. Godfrey, seconded by Mr. Thompson,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return showing the number of convictions made under The Ontario Temperance Act for breaches of the said Act for years 1919-1920: 1. At the instance of officers of the Board of License Commissioners. 2. At the instance of officers of the Ontario Provincial Police. 3. At the instance of Municipal Police officers. 4. The number of cases in which fines or sentences have been remitted, reduced, or commuted: (1) Upon the recommendation of the Board of License Commissioners; (2) Without the recommendation of the Board of License Commissioners.

On Motion of Mr. Magladery, seconded by Mr. Thompson:—

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Prime Minister, or any Minister of the Government and any official, representative or solicitor on behalf of the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Co., together with all estimates, reports, conditions of sale, maps, documents and papers of every kind and nature, relating to (1) The sale of the Kapuskasing Soldiers' and Sailors' Settlement Colony; (2) The additional area acquired by the Company to add to the concession known as the Kapuskasing Pulp concession; (3) Relating to the establishment of the Government Town Site at Kapuskasing.

On Motion of Mr. Godfrey, seconded by Mr. Thompson:—

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Provincial Police to the Attorney-General for the years 1918, 1919 and 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Clarke:—

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence between the Government or any Member, or any Minister or Official and the Canada Copper Company (International Nickel Company) and George E. Buchanan relating to leases or grants of nickel-bearing or other mineral lands in the Township of Creighton, District of Sudbury, since 13th November, 1919.

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Thompson,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return showing copy of Agreement between Provincial Board of Health and Federal Health Department relating to prevention of Venereal Diseases. 2. What amount has already been received by the Province to date.

On Motion of Mr. Ross (Kingston), seconded by Mr. Crawford,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return showing the number of Issuers of Marriage Licenses in the Province of Ontario, with their names and addresses, and the date of their appointment.

On Motion of Mr. Bragg, seconded by Mr. McLeod,

Resolved, That whereas it is clearly established that the export of fruit to the overseas markets is carried on with serious disadvantages to Canadian growers; And whereas it is stated on reliable authority that there is an extraordinary difference in the prices that are received by farmers for their apples, and the cost of this fruit to consumers overseas; And whereas the difference represents an enormous loss to the Canadian producers, and apparently a corresponding profit to overseas jobbers, dealers or traders, in which, under present conditions, Canadian producers are debarred from participating; and whereas it is desirable that these conditions should be remedied, so that the Canadian producers should receive the share in those profits to which they are entitled. Therefore be it resolved that a special committee of this House be appointed forthwith, with instructions to enquire and report upon the condition of the fruit and apple interests and business in the Province of Ontario, and all matters relating to the production, packing, storage, transportation, shipping, marketing and export of Ontario fruit and apples, and with power to send for and examine all necessary persons and papers in or concerning the premises. And that the said Committee be empowered to sit for such purposes during any adjournment of this House.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 18), Respecting the City of Chatham.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 46), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 48), Respecting McMaster University.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 1), Respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 28), Respecting the Town of Georgetown.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 47), Respecting the City of Guelph.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 85), To amend the Public School Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 89), Respecting the Two-platoon System for Employees of Permanent Fire Departments in Ontario.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 94), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 110), To amend the Cemeteries Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 104), to amend The Public Health Act, having been read,

Mr. Hill moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

And the motion, having been put, was lost on a division.

And so it was declared in the negative.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Mageau,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Interim Reports (First, Second and Third) of the Commission to investigate and report upon the accuracy or otherwise of all returns made pursuant to The Crown Timber Act, sec. 14, by any holder of a Timber License, etc., etc., etc. (*Sessional Paper No. 67.*)

The House then adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Thursday, February 24th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Township Council of York, praying that an Act may pass to Validate Sales of Land and for other purposes.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fourth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 41), An Act to establish a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 131), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Hall.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 132), intituled “An Act respecting the collection of Income Tax by Municipalities.” Mr. Lang.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 133), intituled “An Act to amend The Audit Act.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, 1. That the clause lettered (a) in subsection 2 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1920) be amended by adding thereto the words: “And one-tenth of one *per cent.* on the reserve fund and undivided profits thereof.”

2. That subsection 7 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1914) be amended by striking out the figures “\$25” where they occur in the eighth line thereof and substituting therefor the figures “\$40.”

3. That subsection 11 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by striking out the words "one-quarter of one *per cent.*" and substituting therefor the words "one-half of one *per cent.*"

4. That subsection 14 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1914) be amended by inserting after the word "by" in the second line thereof the word "operating," and by striking out the words "sleeping, parlour, dining" where they occur in the second line thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following clause:—

(a) Every company transacting business in Ontario by leasing, hiring or operating sleeping, parlour or dining cars run upon or used by any railway within Ontario shall pay a tax of \$10,000 *per annum.*

5. That section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:—

18. Every navigation company and every company transacting business in Ontario by operating, leasing or hiring steamboats shall pay a tax of one-tenth of one *per centum* on the paid-up capital thereof.

6. That section 7 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 3 of 6 George V, chapter 8, be amended by striking out all the words after the words "the first day of" in the third line and substituting therefor the words:

"July and in default of payment on the first day of July as aforesaid a penalty of five *per centum* of the amount of such tax shall be added thereto and thereafter a further penalty of one *per centum per month* shall be added for each additional month or portion thereof during which the said tax and penalty shall remain unpaid."

7. That section 16 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by adding the following subsection:—

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make arrangements with any person for the exclusive sale of stamps to him in any locality, and for such time as he may think fit at a discount not exceeding 5 *per cent.*

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That the clause lettered (a) in subsection 2 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1920) be amended by adding thereto the words: "And one-tenth of one *per cent.* on the reserve fund and undivided profits thereof."

2. That subsection 7 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1914) be amended by striking out the figures "\$25" where they occur in the eighth line thereof and substituting therefor the figures "\$40."

3. That subsection 11 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by striking out the words "one-quarter of one *per cent.*" and substituting therefor the words "one-half of one *per cent.*"

4. That subsection 14 of section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Corporations Tax Act (1914) be amended by inserting after the word "by" in the second line thereof the word "operating," and by striking out the words "sleeping, parlour, dining" where they occur in the second line thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following clause:—

(a) Every company transacting business in Ontario by leasing, hiring or operating sleeping, parlour or dining cars run upon or used by any railway within Ontario shall pay a tax of \$10,000 *per annum.*

5. That section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:—

18. Every navigation company and every company transacting business in Ontario by operating, leasing or hiring steamboats shall pay a tax of one-tenth of one *per centum* on the paid-up capital thereof.

6. That section 7 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by section 3 of 6 George V, chapter 8, be amended by striking out all the words after the words "the first day of" in the third line and substituting therefor the words:

"July and in default of payment on the first day of July as aforesaid a penalty of five *per centum* of the amount of such tax shall be added thereto and thereafter a further penalty of one *per centum per month* shall be added for each additional month or portion thereof during which the said tax and penalty shall remain unpaid."

7. That section 16 of The Corporations Tax Act be amended by adding the following subsection:—

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make arrangements with any person for the exclusive sale of stamps to him in any locality, and for such time as he may think fit at a discount not exceeding 5 *per cent.*

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 136), To amend The Corporations Tax Act.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting the tax upon the registration of Transfers of Land.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, 1. That a tax of one-fifth of one *per centum* upon the amount of the purchase money shall be paid by the party registering same upon every transfer, conveyance, deed, instrument or writing whereby any land, tenements or other realty sold shall be granted, assigned, transferred or otherwise conveyed to or vested in the purchaser or purchasers or in any other person or persons by his, her or their direction.

2. That such tax shall be collected by the Registrar or Master of Titles, as the case may be, before he registers such transfer, conveyance, deed or other instrument and any Registrar or Master of Titles not paid by salary shall be entitled to retain to his own use two *per centum* of the moneys collected by him under section 2 hereof.

That provided that where any such instrument or instruments may be registered or entered in more than one Registry Office or Land Titles Office or in a Registry and Land Titles Office, the tax imposed shall be payable once only in respect of any one transfer or conveyance and shall be payable upon the delivery to the Registrar or lodging in the Land Titles Office the first instrument registered or lodged in such transaction.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That a tax of one-fifth of one *per centum* upon the amount of the purchase money shall be paid by the party registering same upon every transfer, conveyance, deed, instrument or writing whereby any land, tenements or other realty sold shall be granted, assigned, transferred or otherwise conveyed to or vested in the purchaser or purchasers or in any other person or persons by his, her or their direction.

2. That such tax shall be collected by the Registrar or Master of Titles, as the case may be, before he registers such transfer, conveyance, deed or other instrument and any Registrar or Master of Titles not paid by salary shall be entitled to retain to his own use two *per centum* of the moneys collected by him under section 2 hereof.

That provided that where any such instrument or instruments may be registered or entered in more than one Registry Office or Land Titles Office or in a Registry and Land Titles Office, the tax imposed shall be payable once only in respect of any one transfer or conveyance and shall be payable upon the delivery to the Registrar or lodging in the Land Titles Office the first instrument registered or lodged in such transaction.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 134), Respecting the taxation of Real Estate Transfers.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting the Highway Improvement Fund Account.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolved, That the sum of \$7,000,000 be placed to the credit of The Highway Improvement Fund Account, the said sum to be chargeable to and payable

out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and to be in addition to any appropriation heretofore made to the said Highway Improvement Fund.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolution as follows:—

Resolved, That the sum of \$7,000,000 be placed to the credit of The Highway Improvement Fund Account, the said sum to be chargeable to and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and to be in addition to any appropriation heretofore made to the said Highway Improvement Fund.

The Resolution having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 135), The Highway Improvement Act, 1921.

The following Bills were then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 134), intituled “ An Act respecting the Taxation of Real Estate Transfers.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 135), intituled “ The Highway Improvement Act, 1921.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 136), intituled “ An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 78), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 116), To amend The Provincial Highway Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 81), To amend The Succession Duties Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 109), For the protection of Children of Unmarried Parents.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 112), To amend The Public Health Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 61), To amend The Statute Labour Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 93), Respecting Provincial Auctioneers, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 76); To amend The Motor Vehicles Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Raney,

Ordered, That the following Members do compose the Select Committee proposed under the Resolution passed by the House yesterday, in the matter of the Export of Fruit:—Messieurs Doherty, Montgomery, Sewell, Leeson, Swayze, Cook, Black, Bragg and Marshall.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House,

Return to an Order of the House of the 23rd February, 1921 for a Return of copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Prime Minister, or any Minister of the Government and any official, representative or solicitor on behalf of the Spruce Falls Pulp & Paper Co., together with all estimates, reports, conditions of sale, maps, documents and papers of every kind and nature, relating to (1) The sale of the Kapuskasing Soldiers' and Sailors' Settlement Colony; (2) The additional area acquired by the Company to add to the concession known as the Kapuskasing Pulp Concession; (3) Relating to the establishment of the Government Town Site at Kapuskasing. (*Sessional Papers, No. 68.*)

The House then adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Friday, February 25th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. MacVicar, from the Select Committee, to which was referred Bill (No. 96), Respecting Farm Loans in Ontario; Bill (No. 97), For the Promotion of Agricultural Development; and Bill (No. 98), To Finance Agricultural Development, presented their Report, which was read as follows:—

Your Committee has carefully considered

Bill (No. 96), and beg to submit the same with amendments.

Bill (No. 97), and beg to submit the same with amendments.

Bill (No. 98), and beg to submit the same with amendments.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 137), intituled "An Act respecting Reciprocal or Inter-Insurance." Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 138), intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act." Mr. Swayze.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Ferguson asked the following Question:—

1. Has R. T. Harding, K.C., been employed since November 13th, 1919, by the Government or any department thereof, except as Counsel before the Timber Commission. 2. If so, by what departments. 3. Are any moneys owing to him, or accounts outstanding for such services.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. Yes. 2. Treasury Department, Provincial Secretary's Department, and Attorney-General's Department (associated with Counsel). 3. Yes.

Mr. Evanturel asked the following Question:—

1. From what date did the superannuation of Joseph Lemieux as License Inspector for the County of Prescott take effect. 2. What was the date of the appointment to said position of J. H. Dehaitre. 3. What was the place of residence of Mr. Dehaitre prior to his appointment, and what is his present place of residence. 4. What were the stated qualifications of Mr. Dehaitre and by whom was he recommended. 5. What was his former occupation. 6. What is his age. 7. Were other recommendations made for the said position. 8. Were recommendations from the County of Prescott for the position made to the Government or any Minister or official.

To which the Attorney-General replied:—

1. 31st December, 1920. 2. December 6th, 1920, to take effect on 1st January, 1921. 3. Rockland, Rockland. Will reside in Hawkesbury so soon as he can obtain a suitable residence. 4. Provincial Officer under The Ontario Temperance Act; Board of License Commissioners for Ontario. 5. Provincial Officer under The Ontario Temperance Act. 6. 42. 7. Yes. 8. Yes.

Mr. Ireland asked the following Question:—

1. How many Counsel are being paid by the Government in connection with the Spracklin trial. 2. What are the names of each counsel.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. Mr. A. Monro Grier, K.C., was assigned to take the Crown work at the recent Sandwich Assizes and will be paid by the Government in the ordinary way. The Government has not undertaken to pay any other Counsel in connection with the Spracklin trial. 2. Answered by No. 1.

On Motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Buckland,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing:—1. How many miles are included in the Ottawa-Prescott Highway. 2. How many miles of this Highway were completely graded at the end of the year 1920. 3. How much grading still remains to be done. 4. What was the average cost *per mile* of the grading completed. 5. What amount was spent during the year 1920 on equipment for the Ottawa-Prescott Highway. 6. How many men were employed in each of the months of 1920. 7. Has the Government purchased any gravel pits or stone quarries along or in the vicinity of the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and if so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid for each; and (c) What was the area of each. 8. Has the Government rented any gravel pits or stone quarries along or in the vicinity of the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and if so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid for each; and (c) What was the area of each. 9. Did the Government purchase any gravel or stone for the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and is so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid *per cubic yard*; and (c) What was the total amount paid each man. 10. How many culverts were built during the year 1920. 11. How many still remain to be completed. 12. How many culverts were built (a) By day labour; (b) By contract. 13. If any were built by the latter (a) Who were the contractors; (b) What were the unit prices paid; (c) What lump sums were paid to each contractor. 14. What was the cost *per cubic yard* of the said culverts in place built by day labour. 15. What was the cost *per cubic yard* of the said culverts in place built by contract. 16. What was the total amount spent on the Ottawa-Prescott Highway to 31st December, 1920. 17. Have the plans of the said Highway been filed in the Federal Department of Railways pursuant to the Canada Highways Act, and if so, when. 18. Has a subsidy agreement been signed with the Dominion Government pursuant to the Canada Highways Act. 19. If so, what is the date of the agreement. 20. Has the Government received any payments on account of Dominion Government subsidy, and if so, the dates and amounts of the payments. 21. What wages were paid during

1920, on the Ottawa-Prescott Highway (a) For unskilled labour; (b) For teams with driver. 22. How many hours a day did the men employed on the road during 1920 work. 23. Who was the engineer in charge of the road during 1920, and what was his salary. 24. Has the Government settled with all the parties from whom the right-of-way was acquired. 25. If the answer to 24 is in the negative, what parties still remain to be settled with.

On Motion of Mr. Lennox, seconded by Mr. Crawford,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence with or by the Government, or any Department thereof, including the Ontario License Board, relating to all convictions made under the O.T.A. since November 15th, 1919, in which applications have been made for remission of fines and reduction of terms of imprisonment imposed by the convicting Magistrates or Justices of the Peace.

The House then adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

Monday, February 28th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Speaker informed the House:

That the Clerk had received from the Railway and Municipal Board, their Report in the following case:—

Bill (No. 38), Respecting the Town of Gananoque.

The Report was then read by the Clerk at the Table, as follows:—

To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Upon the reference, under Rule 61 (a) of Your Honourable House to The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, of Bill (No. 38), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Gananoque," the Board begs leave respectfully to report that in the judgment of the Board it is reasonable that such Bill should be passed by your Honourable House, provided that it is amended by striking out the word "thirty" in the second line of section 2 and inserting instead thereof the word "five."

The indebtedness of \$15,000.00 referred to in the Bill is largely for expenditures which should have been paid out of the taxes and for this reason

the Board recommends that the period for which the debentures be issued be reduced from thirty years to five years.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. M. McINTYRE,
Chairman.

A. B. INGRAM,
Vice-Chairman.

J. A. ELLIS,
Commissioner.

Dated at Toronto,

this twenty-eighth day of February, 1921.

Ordered, That Bill (No. 38), Respecting the Town of Gananoque, be referred to the Committee on Private Bills with instructions to consider the same with reference to the suggestions of the Railway and Municipal Board thereon.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 139), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Halerow.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 140), intituled “An Act to amend The Assessment Act.” Mr. Halerow.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 141), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Curry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 142), intituled “An Act to amend The School Sites Act.” Mr. Ramsden.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 143), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Halerow.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 144), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 3), Respecting the City of Belleville.

Bill (No. 20), To incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings.

Bill (No. 2), Respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill (No. 4), Respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 12), To legalize and confirm By-law No. 29, of 1920, of the City of Kingston.

Bill (No. 13), Respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne.

Bill (No. 19), To authorize The Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Bill (No. 18), Respecting the City of Chatham.

Bill (No. 46), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Bill (No. 48), Respecting McMaster University.

Bill (No. 1), Respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill (No. 28), Respecting the Town of Georgetown.

Bill (No. 47), Respecting the City of Guelph.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendment.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. Has any portion of the Bond Building, at the corner of Sheppard and Temperance Streets, Toronto, been leased by the Government or any Government Board. 2. If so, how many floors, and what floor space. 3. For what purpose has the building been leased, if so taken. 4. At what rental and for what term of years.

And the Minister of Public Works replied in the words and figures following:—

1. A portion of what is known as the Bond Building, 66-68 Temperance Street, has been leased by the Workmen's Compensation Board. 2. The lease covers two floors, the fourth and fifth, comprising 20,000 square feet of floor space. 3. The building is leased for the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board, including office, vault, filing and storage accommodation, and space for medical examination and X-ray work. 4. The rental is \$20,000 a year, including heating and water, and the term of the lease is five years from December 1st, 1920.

Mr. Ireland asked the following Question:—

1. How many lots have been disposed of by the Crown since November 13th, 1919, in the Townsites of (a) Hearst; (b) Lowbush; and (c) Fauquier. 2. To whom were they conveyed. 3. What prices were received.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words and figures following:—

1. (a) 54; (b) None; (c) There is no townsite of Fauquier. Alexandra Townsite is at Fauquier Station; 28 lots sold. 2. See lists attached. 3. Answered by Number 2.

Hearst Townsite.

Lot.	Name.	Price.
344.	Porter H. MacEachern	\$150 00
345.	Mrs. Mary D. Vandoskie	100 00
348.	Ida Reid	100 00
349.	Susannah Reid	100 00
392 to 395 (inclusive)	Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada	
420 to 423 (inclusive)	Church and Manse Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.....	50 00

Lot.	Name.	Price.
397.	Mrs. A. Brisbois	\$100 00
398.	Isaac Brisbois	100 00
400.	Eugene Cloutier	150 00
402.	Mrs. E. Martin	100 00
403.	John Loreto	100 00
404.	Maria Loreto	100 00
405.	James Muir	100 00
407.	Basil C. Roney	150 00
412.	Herbert Trombley	100 00
413.	Mrs. J. Moss	100 00
414.	Herbert J. Moss	100 00
415.	Adrian Sicotte	150 00
456 to 459, 484 to 487 (inclusive)	Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation	50 00
460 to 463, 480 to 483 (inclusive)	Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation	200 00
464.	Alphonse Halley	150 00
465.	Leonidas Samson	100 00
466.	Leonce Fortin	100 00
467.	Albert Jacque	100 00
472.	J. Adelard St. Laurent	150 00
475.	Ludger Grondin	100 00
476.	Philippe Grondin	100 00
477.	Jos. Lambert	100 00
478.	Adelard Dorion	100 00
479.	Adelard Blais	150 00
494.	Eldrid O. Allen	150 00
495.	Harry E. Powell	150 00
504.	Agnes B. Powell	150 00
505.	Mrs. Mary E. Allen	150 00

Alexandra Townsite.

94.	Joseph Gillemette	\$80 00
154, 155.	Mrs. Annie Trembley	175 00
133, 134.	J. R. Tremblay	175 00
M.	George Pelletier	75 00
E.	Emile Beauvais	75 00
P.	Adelard Imbeau	75 00
N.	George Tremblay	75 00
O.	Liguori Tremblay	75 00
H. & I.	Emile Laberge	150 00
F.	S. Beauvais	75 00
156 & C.	J. A. Tremblay	150 00
135.	J. M. Tremblay	100 00

Lot.	Name.	Price.
136.	J. M. Tremblay	\$75 00
149.	H. E. Tremblay	75 00
153.	J. B. Pouliotte	75 00
109.	Hermidas Lafontaine	60 00
132.	H. E. Tremblay	75 00
130, 131.	Mrs. Eva P. Daigle	100 00
129.	Hermidas Lafontaine	75 00
119.	Arthur Lyons	60 00
115.	F. X. Lamontagne	100 00
116.	F. X. Lamontagne	75 00
114.	S. F. Laferriere	75 00

On Motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return of copies of all letters, reports and communications of every kind received by the Minister of Mines or any Member of the Government with respect to the proposed increase in mining taxes.

On Motion of Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Govenlock,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing:—

1. All fines and confiscations of property under The Game and Fisheries Act for each of the years 1916-17-18-19-20, imposed by game wardens, overseers or other representatives of the Department.
2. The number of such cases brought before a Magistrate of which there is any record for each year as above and the numbers of recorded convictions.
3. The amounts for each year received by the Government and the amounts paid each year to informers.
4. Copies of instructions issued to game wardens, overseers or other representatives from time to time during the period 1912-20, dealing with the method of levying fines and directing seizure of property.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 122). To amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Mr. Homuth moved,

That the Bill be read the second time,

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs :

Asmussen	Greenlaw	Homuth	Rancy
Curry	Halcrow	Mills	Rollo
Drury	Heenan	Nixon	Staples
			Tooms—13.

NAYS.

Messieurs :

Biggs	Godfrey	Leeson	Sinclair
Black	Govenlock	McCrea	Smith
Calder	Gray	MacVicar	Swayze
Clarke	Hall	Mathieu	Thompson
Crawford	Hay	O'Neill	Tolmie
Cridland	Henry	Ramsden	Watson
Denyes	Hicks	Rankin	Webster
Ferguson	Ireland	Sewell	Widdifield—34.
Fowler	Joynt		

PAIRS.

None.

And so it was declared in the negative.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 67), Respecting the preparation of Voters' Lists in Cities.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 83), To amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 124), To amend the Fire Departments Hours of Labour.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Tuesday, March 1st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Speaker informed the House :

That the Clerk had received from the Railway and Municipal Board, their Report in the following case:—

Bill (No. 14), Respecting the Town of Orillia.

The Report was then read by the Clerk at the Table, as follows:—

To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Upon the reference, under Rule 61 (a) of Your Honourable House to The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, of Bill (No. 14), intituled "An Act to confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia," the Board begs leave respectfully to report that in the judgment of the Board it is reasonable that such Bill should be passed by your Honourable House.

The indebtedness of \$24,000, referred to in the Bill, as well as the expenditures under By-laws Nos. 577, 588, 702 and 598, are largely for expenditures for permanent works, and for this reason the Board considers that debentures might properly be issued in this case, payable in twenty years.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. M. McINTYRE,
Chairman.

A. B. INGRAM,
Vice-Chairman.

J. A. ELLIS,
Commissioner.

Dated at Toronto,
this first day of March, 1921.

Ordered. That Bill (No. 14), Respecting the Town of Orillia, be referred to the Committee on Private Bills with instructions to consider the same with reference to the suggestions of the Railway and Municipal Board thereon.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fifth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting Sons of England Benefit Society.

Bill (No. 21), An Act respecting the Township of Stamford.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 145), intituled “An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.” Mr. Swayze.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 146), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act. Mr. Price.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 147), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Ross (Kingston.)

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 148), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Curry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion and Amendment for the adoption of the Special Report *in re* the administration of The Ontario Temperance Act, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. MacBride,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Registrar-General relating to the registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths in the Province of Ontario during the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 20.*)

Also—Annual Report of the Soldiers' Aid Commission of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1919. (*Sessional Papers, No. 69.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 23rd February, 1921, that there be laid before the House, a Return showing the number of Issuers of Marriage Licenses in the Province of Ontario, with their names and addresses and the date of their appointment. (*Sessional Papers, No. 70.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 23rd February, 1921, that there be laid before the House a Return of copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Provincial Police to the Attorney-General for the years 1918, 1919 and 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 72.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 9th February, 1921, that there be laid before the House a Return of copies of all correspondence, papers and documents since November 13th, 1919, relating to conduct or duties of Magistrates, Justices of the Peace and other officers with reference to enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act. (*Sessional Papers, No. 71.*)

The House then adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Wednesday, March 2nd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Carmichael, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Sixth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully examined the following Petitions and find the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the City Council of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to provide by By-laws for borrowing upon debentures certain sums of money for Public Utilities without the assent of the electors.

Of James Passmore and others of the Township of Ferris, praying that an Act may pass to divide the Township of Ferris.

Of the Town Council of Oakville, and the Trafalgar Agricultural Society praying that an Act may pass authorizing the issue of Serial Bonds to the amount of \$20,000, to be guaranteed by the Town of Oakville.

Of the Township Council of York, praying that an Act may pass to validate sales of land and for other purposes.

Your Committee recommend that Rule No. 51 of Your Honourable House be further suspended in this that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Friday, the fourth day of March instant.

Ordered, That the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Friday, the fourth day of March, instant.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 36), intituled “An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.” Mr. Pinard.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 49), intituled “An Act respecting The Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Corporation of the Town of Oakville.” Mr. O’Neill.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 51), intituled “An Act respecting the division of the Township of Ferris in the District of Nipissing.” Mr. Marceau.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 54), intituled “An Act respecting the Township of York.” Mr. Henry.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 58), intituled “An Act respecting the construction of certain Works on Lakes and Streams in Ontario.” Mr. Mills.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 59), intituled “An Act respecting the Lake of the Woods Control Board.” Mr. Drury.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 149), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."
Mr. Pinard.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Resolved, That the reference to the Municipal Committee of Bill (No. 67), An Act respecting Voters' Lists in Cities, be withdrawn, and that the Bill be referred to a Special Committee consisting of:—Messieurs Drury, Raney, Smith, Warren, Casselman, Walker, MacVicar, Crockett, Cunningham, Henry, McCrea, Hill, Dewart, Sinclair, McLeod and Lang, with instructions to consider the same together with any other suggestions as to amendments to The Voters' Lists Act or the Election Laws as may be laid before them.

Mr. Rennie asked the following Question:—

1. What was the date of the first employment of Rev. J. O. L. Spracklin by the Government or the Board of License Commissioners. 2. Is he now retained in the service of the Board of License Commissioners or of the Government. 3. If not, when did his employment cease. 4. Is he still in receipt of pay from the License Department or otherwise. 5. What was the amount of his salary or remuneration. 6. When was his salary last paid. What was the sum of the last payment made to him.

To which the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. July 27th, 1920. 2. Yes. 3. Answered by No. 2. 4. Yes. 5. \$175 per month. 6. November 18th, 1920, \$350.

Mr. Calder asked the following Question:—

1. What is the total number of mothers who have applied for allowance under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the County of Oxford up to the 31st of January, 1921. 2. What is the total number of mothers who have received allowances under The Mothers' Allowance Act up to the 31st of January, 1921.

And the Minister of Labour replied in the words following:—

1. Nineteen applications. 2. One. *Note*—Of the nineteen applications, thirteen were received in January.

Mr. Mewhinney asked the following Question:—

1. What is the total number of mothers who have applied for allowances under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the County of Bruce up to the 31st January, 1921. 2. What is the total number of mothers who have received allowances under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the County of Bruce up to the 31st of January, 1921.

And the Minister of Labour replied as follows:—

1. Twenty-five applications. 2. None. *Note*—Of the twenty-five applications seventeen were received in January.

Mr. Lewis asked the following Question:—

1. Is the book, "Flag and Fleet," on the list of Auxiliary Readers authorized for Public Schools in Ontario. 2. Is it the intention of the Department of Education to remove it from such list. 3. If so, for what reason.

And the Minister of Education replied:—

1. No. 2. No. 3. Answered by 1 and 2.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for a Return of correspondence *in re* the payment of Counsel fee to Peter White, K.C., having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Watson,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Thursday, March 3rd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Smith, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented their First Report, which was read as follows:—

Your Committee recommend that the following Documents be printed:—

Five thousand (5,000) copies Report on Proportional Representation.

Five thousand (5,000) copies Report prepared for Prime Minister by A. S. Winchester on Proportional Representation, as applied in electoral district of Winnipeg, in connection with Manitoba Provincial Election.

Your Committee recommend that the following publications be purchased for distribution to the Members:—

One hundred and fifteen copies (115) "Canada's Sons and Great Britain in the World War," by Col. C. G. Nasmith, C.M.G., at four dollars (\$4) per copy.

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the foregoing Report.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 55), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Inquiries Act." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 56), intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 57), intituled "An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion and Amendment for the adoption of the Special Report *in re* the administration of The Ontario Temperance Act, having been read.

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time,

Mr. Sinclair moved, in amendment to the Amendment, seconded by Mr. Mewhinney,

That all the words after the word "appear" in the sixth line from the last of the Minority Report and beginning with the words "upon the return of which summons" be expunged and the following substituted therefor: "upon the return of the summons the Judge, upon hearing the parties may either affirm or quash the order, or if he thinks fit may hear the evidence of such other witnesses as may be produced before him, or the further evidence of any witnesses already examined and may make an order affirming the order of conviction, or may reverse such order and dismiss the defendant and in case the conviction is affirmed may impose such fine and costs or other penalty as is provided by this Act and the order so made shall have the same effect and shall be enforced in the same manner as is provided in the case of a conviction before a Magistrate under this Act."

And the practice and procedure upon such appeals and all the proceedings thereon, shall thenceforth be governed by "The Ontario Summary Convictions Act," so far as the same is not inconsistent with "The Ontario Temperance Act." So as to provide that the provisions of subsections (8) and (9) of section 92 of The Ontario Temperance Act shall, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to an appeal from an order of conviction and to the right to reverse such order and dismiss the defendant as in the case of an appeal from an order of dismissal at the direction of the Attorney-General of Ontario, under subsection (6) of the said section 92 of the said "Ontario Temperance Act" and the said amended report suggested by the Minority of the said Special Committee, as hereby amended, be and the same is hereby adopted.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Lewis,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Friday, March 4th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Sixth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William.

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 11), "An Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 42 of the City of Kingston," and on Bill (No. 25), "An Act respecting the City of Windsor and the Essex Border Utilities Commission," the same having been withdrawn by the promoters thereof.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 11), City of Kingston, and on Bill (No. 25), Windsor and the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 150), intituled "An Act to regulate the practice of Chiropody." Mr. Curry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 151), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." Mr. Henry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 3), Respecting the City of Belleville.

Bill (No. 20), To incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England in Canada and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings.

Bill (No. 2), Respecting the Town of Mimico.

Bill (No. 4), Respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 12), To legalize and confirm By-law No. 29, of 1920, of the City of Kingston.

Bill (No. 19), To authorize The Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

Bill (No. 18), Respecting the City of Chatham.

Bill (No. 46), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Bill (No. 48), Respecting McMaster University.

Bill (No. 1), Respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill (No. 28), Respecting the Town of Georgetown.

Bill (No. 47), Respecting the City of Guelph.

On Motion of Mr. Cooper (Welland), it was

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 13), Respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne be discharged and the Bill be recommitted to the Standing Committee on Private Bills for further consideration and report.

Mr. Ecclestone asked the following Question:—

1. Who appeared for the Province before the Dominion Railway Commission on the hearing of the Freight Rates case. 2. By whom was he retained and instructed. 3. Were such retainer or instructions in writing. 4. What dates did he appear. 5. What amount was he paid for remuneration.

And the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. W. A. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways. 2. Instructed to appear by the Minister of Public Works and Highways. 3. No. 4. August 20, 1921. 5. No remuneration in addition to salary as Deputy Minister.

Mr. Price asked the following Question:—

1. What work is now being carried on by the Soldiers' Aid Commission. 2. What amount of money was spent on behalf of soldiers during the last fiscal year. 3. What was the expense of the Commission for the last fiscal year. 4. Are loans now made to soldiers, and if so, on what security. 5. How many soldiers received assistance by way of loans during the last fiscal year. 6. Who are the present members of the Soldiers' Aid Commission. 7. How many are employed by the Commission; what are the names and positions of those employed and what salaries do they receive. 8. Has the Commission representatives in different parts of the Province.

And Mr. Carmichael, Minister without Portfolio, replied in the words following:—

1. (a) *Adult Welfare.*

1. Visits to homes of ex-soldiers and dependents reported in distress.

2. Financial relief.

(b) *Loans against reasonable security.*

(c) *Burial of deceased ex-soldiers who die destitute.*

(d) *Child Welfare.*

1. Administration of pensions.

2. Temporary care of children in hostels and private homes.

3. Permanent adoption and supervision of foster-homes.

(e) *General.*

1. Presenting claims for pension.

2. Adjusting war service gratuity, separation allowance and assigned pay.

3. Claims for refund of transportation expenses.

4. Adjustment of domestic difficulties.

5. Swearing affidavits.

6. Tracing missing relatives and friends.
7. Obtaining medals.
8. Presenting claims for working pay.
9. Settlement of troubles between landlord and tenant.
10. Legal advice.
11. Tracing lost baggage.
12. Payment of transportation on behalf of men who have obtained employment at outside points.
13. Securing birth and marriage certificates.

In fact it may be said that the Soldiers' Aid Commission is ready to assist any ex-soldier or his dependents in need of advice or assistance to the fullest extent within its power, and at the present time is doing a work not attempted by any other Government Department or organization.

2. \$19,122.81. 3. \$130,849.33. 4. Yes. Pending the receipt of pensions, war service gratuity, pay and allowances or against any other form of reasonable security. 5. 4,339. 6. Lieutenant-Colonel The Honourable Dougall Carmichael, D.S.O., M.C., M.P.P. (chairman), Collingwood; W. L. Best, Esq., Ottawa; Robert J. Christie, Esq., Toronto; Lieutenant-Colonel H. S. Cooper, O.B.E., M.C., M.P.P., Toronto; Honourable George Gordon, Senator, North Bay; John B. Laidlaw, Esq., Toronto; Honourable George Lynch-Staunton, Senator, K.C., Hamilton; Kenneth McKay, Esq., St. Thomas. 7. 60.

1. *Head Office.*

(a) *Secretarial.*

	Yearly.
Mr. J. Warwick, secretary	\$3,600 00
Mr. H. L. Robertson, assistant secretary and inspector of branches	2,100 00
Mr. H. Buckle, correspondence	1,800 00
Miss J. Quinlan, stenographer	1,092 00
Miss F. Travers, stenographer	1,040 00
Mrs. E. Hodgkinson, switchboard operator	988 00
Mr. J. A. Coad, messenger	1,040 00

(b) Accountant's Department.

	Yearly.
Major R. G. Mainer, chief accountant.....	\$2,500 00
Mr. W. J. Wallace, assistant accountant (leaves service of Commission Feb. 28th)	1,500 00
Mr. A. J. McKean, clerk	1,352 00
Mr. A. E. Odlum, clerk	1,300 00
Miss M. Gadway, stenographer	988 00
Miss B. Atkinson, stenographer (leaves service of Commission March 5th)	988 00
Mr. M. A. Searle, bookkeeper	1,300 00

(c) Child Welfare.

Mr. G. R. Stephenson, superintendent	2,000 00
Mr. R. J. Buchanan, investigator	1,300 00
Mr. R. V. Sparks, investigator	1,248 00
Mrs. A. Lawson, investigator	1,020 00
Miss G. Heaslip, investigator	1,000 00
Miss E. McLean, stenographer	1,092 00
Miss G. Jose, stenographer	1,092 00

(d) Branches, Administration of Pensions and Adult Welfare.

Miss J. McKinnon, general assistant	1,560 00
Miss I. Leamen, stenographer (leaves service of Commission March 12th)	936 00

(e) Central Registry.

Mr. G. C. Evans, clerk	1,144 00
Mr. G. A. Pollard, clerk	1,040 00

2. Children's Hostels.

Miss K. E. Kindersley, superintendent.....	1,100 00
--	----------

Pembroke Street Hostel.

Miss E. Boswell, matron	900 00
Miss F. Lovell, assistant matron	600 00
Miss I. Hardy, welfare worker	936 00
Mrs. E. Dick, cook	540 00
Miss C. Martin, assistant cook	420 00
Mrs. A. Gains, laundress	780 00
Mrs. H. Pritchard, nursemaid	480 00
Miss M. Dewar, nursemaid	420 00
Mrs. M. Stonard, nursemaid	420 00
Mrs. H. Allard, night nurse	564 00
Mr. P. Dick, janitor.....	720 00

Jarvis Street Hostel.

	Yearly.
Miss M. Porteous, matron	\$900 00
Miss L. Dempsey, assistant matron.....	480 00
Miss A. Bell, cook	480 00
Miss C. Smith, assistant cook	420 00
Miss F. DeFriez, welfare worker	936 00
Mrs. E. Murch, nursemaid	420 00
Miss McManus, nursemaid	420 00
Miss J. McCombe, nursemaid	360 00
Mr. W. Murch, janitor	780 00
Mrs. L. Lynd, night nurse	624 00
Mrs. J. Middleton, laundress	715 00

Avenue Road Hostel.

Miss A. E. Ogden, matron	1,000 00
Miss Baker, nurse	900 00
Miss M. McKenzie, assistant matron	720 00
Mrs. J. Bain, cook	540 00
Miss A. Elder, assistant cook	420 00
Miss E. Wakefield, night nurse	600 00
Miss A. Dunbar, nursemaid	420 00
Mr. J. Scriven, janitor	1,186 25

3. Branch Secretaries.

Mr. J. B. Seggie, secretary, Ottawa	2,000 00
Mr. H. B. Mains, general assistant, Ottawa.....	960 00
Mr. F. H. Dobbin, secretary, Peterboro	300 00
Mr. L. E. Lowman, secretary, Woodstock.....	1,200 00
Mr. W. J. Douglass, secretary, Windsor.....	2,700 00

S. Yes.

Mr. Evanturel asked the following Question:—

1. When was J. N. Belanger, the Assistant Provincial Archivist, superannuated. 2. What was his salary before he retired. 3. Who succeeded him and what is the salary of his successor.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. 1st November, 1920. 2. \$1,300. 3. A successor has not been appointed.

Mr. Evanturel asked the following Question:—

1. Is G. H. Dehaitre, who was recently appointed License Inspector for the County of Prescott, still acting as Provincial officer. 2. If not, when did

his service as Provincial officer terminate. 3. If still acting in the dual capacity, what is his present salary. 4. What other persons were recommended for the position of License Inspector for the County of Prescott, and by whom were the recommendations made.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. No. 2. 1st January, 1921. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. Thomas Farrell, recommended by the honourable member for Prescott.

Mr. Evanturel asked the following Question:—

1. What is the total number of mothers who have applied for allowance under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the County of Prescott up to the 1st February, 1921. 2. What is the total number of mothers who have received allowances under The Mothers' Allowance Act up to 1st February, 1921, in the County of Prescott.

And the Minister of Labour replied:—

1. Eleven. 2. Four.

On Motion of Mr. Ross (Kingston), seconded by Mr. Crawford.

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing:—1. What places in the City of Toronto are employed for Government use outside the Legislative Building. 2. For what Department, Commission or Board are they being used. 3. What are the terms of rental or lease. 4. How much has been expended on improvements on each place to date. 5. On what dates was possession taken under the different leases. 6. How many employees are at work in each of the respective buildings so leased.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 113), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 121), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 130), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 131), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 132), Respecting the collection of Income Tax by Municipalities.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 138), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 139), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 125), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 66), Respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Statement and Report of the Ontario Athletic Commission and of Auditor for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 76.*)

Also—Report of the Commission upon the rates of wages paid to men employed by The Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the construction of the Queenston-Chippawa Development. (*Sessional Papers, No. 77.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 23rd February, 1921, for a Return showing copy of Agreement between Provincial Board of Health and Federal Health Department relating to prevention of Venereal Diseases. 2. What amount has already been received by the Province to date. (*Sessional Papers, No. 73.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 4th February, 1921, for a Return of copies of all correspondence passing between the Government of Ontario or any member, officer or official thereof, or of any department thereof and any member of the House or other person leading up to it, and dealing with the suspension and resignation of Messrs Smith and Hanna from the Provincial Police. (*Sessional Papers, No. 74.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of the 4th February, 1921, for a Return of copies of all correspondence with and by the Government or any Department thereof leading up to and relating to the dismissal of Mr. Lewis R. Luke as License Inspector for Ontario County. (*Sessional Papers, No. 75.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Monday, March 7th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 152), intituled "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act." Mr. Rankin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 153), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act." Mr. Freeborn.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 33), Respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 26), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 41), To establish a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 17), Respecting Sons of England Benefit Society.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 21), Respecting the Township of Stamford.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 22), Respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 35), Respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 39), Respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 68), Providing for One Day of Rest in Seven.

Referred to the Committee on Labour.

Bill (No. 123), Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 137), Respecting Reciprocal or Inter-Insurance.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 140), To amend the Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 141), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 145), To amend the Factory, Shop, and Office Building Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 144), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 103), To amend the Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 108), To amend the Bureau of Municipal Affairs Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 114), Respecting Liens of Mechanics and Wage-earners, Supply Men and others.

Referred to a Select Committee to be hereafter named.

Bill (No. 148), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 115), To amend the Toronto and Hamilton Highway Commission Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 117), To amend the Police Magistrates Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 127), To amend the Municipal Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 133), To amend the Audit Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 135), The Highway Improvement Act, 1921.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 75), To provide for Development Work in Northern and North-Western Ontario.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Mr. Price asked the following Question:—

1. Is it the intention to carry on the Soldiers' Aid Commission, and if so, how long.

And Mr. Carmichael, Minister without Portfolio, replied as follows:—

Yes, as long as it may be necessary.

Mr. Hay asked the following Question:—

1. Was the uniform price of 96.787 obtained by the Government for the \$10,000,000, six *per cent.* 20 year gold bonds designated as loan "S.S." of the 1st February, 1921. 2. If not, what was the price realized for each of the issues which made up the said loan. 3. If sold at a uniform price, at what date was the price fixed in the case of each issue.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. Answered by number 1. 3. January 24th, 1921.

Mr. Hay asked the following Question:—

1. Was the uniform price of 92.34 obtained by the Government for the whole of \$16,000,000 six *per cent.* 15 year gold bonds designated as loan "R.R." of 1st December, 1920. 2. If not, what was the price realized for each of the issues which made up the said loan. 3. If sold at a uniform price, on what date was the price fixed in the case of each issue.

To which the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Yes. 2. Answered by number 1. 3. November 30th for \$7,000,000, December 3rd for \$5,000,000, December 7th for \$3,000,000. December 9th for \$1,000,000.

Mr. Evanturel asked the following Question:

1. What is the total number of the inside Civil servants in the employment of the Province. 2. How many French-Canadians are at present in the inside Civil Service of the Province. 3. (a) What are the names of such French-

Canadians; (b) What were their former places of residence. 4. What was the number of French-Canadians in the inside Civil Service in the year 1900: 5. What is the maximum salary paid to a French-Canadian employed in the inside Civil Service of the Province.

And the Premier replied in the words following:—

1. 1,463 on November 1st, 1920. 2. No record is kept of the racial origin of Civil servants. 3. 4 and 5 answered by the reply to question 2.

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

1. Who is the Mr. McPherson that appears to be acting in the official investigation of the conduct of Police Magistrate Hastings at Dunnville; is he retained by the Government, and if so, upon what terms. 2. Is this Mr. McPherson a member of the firm of Campbell, McPherson, Clarke & Jarvis mentioned in the Public Accounts (page 531), and to whom a payment of \$750 was made for legal services *re* Dominion and Provincial Temperance legislation. 3. Is the Mr. Campbell who is retained as assistant Counsel for the Government upon the Timber investigation the George Campbell who is a member of the same firm; and if so, what amount has been paid to him up to date for his services as such Counsel.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words following:—

1. He is R. U. McPherson, barrister-at-law, of Toronto. He has been retained by the Government and, when rendered, his account will be taxed by the Attorney-General's Department. 2. He is a member of the firm of Messrs. Clark, McPherson, Campbell & Jarvis, whose account is mentioned. 3. Yes. Nothing has been paid up to date.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 128). To amend The Motor Vehicles Act, having been read.

Mr. Tooms moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 77), To amend The Highway Travel Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 126), To amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 150), To Regulate the Practice of Chiropody, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 74), The Reforestation Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Swayze reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 78), To amend The Municipal Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Swayze reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 81), To amend The Succession Duties Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr.

Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Swayze reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 116), To amend The Provincial Highway Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Swayze reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Hall,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Report of the Game and Fisheries Department for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 14.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council made since February 14th, 1921, of the Department of Education or of the Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

The House then adjourned at 11.00 P.M.

Tuesday, March 8th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill:—

Bill (No. 124), An Act to amend The Fire Departments Hours of Labour Act, and recommend that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Your Committee have also carefully considered

Bill (No. 89), An Act respecting the Two-Platoon System for the Employees of Permanent Fire Departments, and beg to report the same with certain amendments.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 154), intituled "An Act to amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act, 1919." Mr. Crockett.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 155), intituled "An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act." Mr. Black.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 156), intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act." Mr. Swayze.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 157), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Bragg.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Brackin moved, seconded by Mr. Dewart,

That whereas it has been made to appear to the House that at a public meeting of the Council of the City of London, Ontario, held on the 7th March, one H. B. Ashplant publicly asserted that the City Gas Company of London, Ontario, could and might bribe Members of this House to induce such Members to vote in favour of a certain Private Bill presented to this House on behalf of the said City Gas Company; Be it therefore resolved that the said H. B. Ashplant be ordered to appear before the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections, at such time as the Chairman may direct, to be examined and for such further action as the House may direct upon report of the Committee.

Mr. Ferguson then moved, in Amendment, seconded by Mr. Henry,

That the Motion of the Member for West Kent be amended by adding thereto the following:—

That whereas one Andrew Hicks, of Centralia, Ontario, and a Member of the Legislative Assembly, representing the riding of South Huron, did make a statement on or about the 9th day of June, 1920, as reported in the Press as follows:—

London, Ont., June 9th.—“The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling,” was the startling statement made by Andrew Hicks, U.F.O. Whip, in an address to the East Middlesex U.F.O. picnic here this afternoon. “But, thank God,” he added, “not one of the U.F.O. Members succumbed to the effort of bribery.”

And whereas one David James Taylor, of Warton, and a Member of the Legislative Assembly for the riding of North Grey, did make a statement on or about the 11th day of June, as reported in the Press, as follows:—

“The principle of the \$2,500 indemnity for the Members is wrong, but I did favour a bonus for the present Session. The hotel bill alone was about \$4 a day, and in the Session each Member would spend about \$700. And if you don't believe me, just try it,” said Mr. Taylor. “If the Member was a farmer he had to hire someone to run his farm, while if he was a labourer he lost his job. If the public want honest service they should pay their representatives a fair amount. Every dollar I get the public will know about it,” said Mr. Taylor, telling of an offer of \$1,000 he had received—and refused—for his influence in a certain measure, and three weeks after his election. “And if the past Governments had not been in the habit of taking money on the side, how was it that the man should come to me?” queried Mr. Taylor.

And whereas one J. W. E. Burnaby, of North York, President of the U.F.O. Co-operative Association, did make a statement on or about the 23rd day of June, 1920, as reported in the Press, as follows:—

Kettleby, June 23.—Mr. Burnaby declared that a direct attempt had been made to bribe him; cited the offer made, and said he was ready at any time to back up his statement:—

“ I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately,” the U.F.O. President said, “ but I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him that I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job.”

And whereas all these statements are serious reflections on the independence and honour of the Legislature; and whereas the dignity and honour of the House and the safety of the public interests demand that these allegations be fully and thoroughly investigated and proper punishment be meted out to anyone who may be found guilty of any of the acts alleged; be it therefore resolved that in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government to refer the allegations and charges to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And after some time, the Motion, as amended, having been submitted, was carried unanimously, and it was

Resolved, That whereas it has been made to appear to the House that at a public meeting of the Council of the City of London, Ontario, held on the 7th March, one H. B. Ashplant publicly asserted that the City Gas Company of London, Ontario, could and might bribe Members of this House to induce such Members to vote in favour of a certain Private Bill presented to this House on behalf of the said City Gas Company. Be it therefore resolved that the said H. B. Ashplant be ordered to appear before the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections at such time as the Chairman thereof may direct, to be examined for such further action as the House may direct upon report of the Committee, and

That whereas one Andrew Hicks, of Centralia, Ontario, and a Member of the Legislative Assembly, representing the riding of South Huron, did make a statement on or about the 9th day of June, 1920, as reported in the Press, as follows:—

London, Ont., June 9th.—“ The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling,” was the startling statement made by Andrew Hicks, U.F.O. Whip, in an address to the East Middlesex U.F.O. picnic here this afternoon. “ But, thank God,” he added, “ not one of the U.F.O. Members succumbed to the effort of bribery.”

And whereas one David James Taylor, of Wiarton, and a Member of the Legislative Assembly for the riding of North Grey, did make a statement on or about the 11th day of June, as reported in the Press, as follows:—

“The principle of the \$2,500 indemnity for the Members is wrong, but I did favour a bonus for the present Session. The hotel bill alone was about \$4 a day, and in the Session each Member would spend about \$700. And if you don't believe me, just try it,” said Mr. Taylor. “If the Member was a farmer he had to hire someone to run his farm, while if he was a labourer he lost his job. If the public want honest service they should pay their representatives a fair amount. Every dollar I get the public will know about it,” said Mr. Taylor, telling of an offer of \$1,000 he had received—and refused—for his influence in a certain measure, and three weeks after his election. “And if the past Governments had not been in the habit of taking money on the side, how was it that the man should come to me?” queried Mr. Taylor.

And whereas one J. W. E. Burnaby, of North York, President of the U.F.O. Co-operative Association, did make a statement on or about the 23rd day of June, 1920, as reported in the Press, as follows:—

Kettleby, June 23.—Mr. Burnaby declared that a direct attempt had been made to bribe him; cited the offer made, and said he was ready at any time to back up his statement:—

“I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately,” the U.F.O. President said, “but I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him that I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job.”

And whereas all these statements are serious reflections on the independence and honour of the Legislature; and whereas the dignity and honour of the House and the safety of the public interests demand that these allegations be fully and thoroughly investigated and proper punishment be meted out to anyone who may be found guilty of any of the acts alleged; be it therefore resolved that in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government to refer the allegations and charges to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Price asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Government been conducting a scale of the logs and mill-cut at any of the lumber mills throughout the sawing season of 1920 for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of over-run or increase shown in the actual

amount of lumber cut from logs over the Doyle Rule of measurements of such logs. 2. If so, at how many mills was this done. 3. What was found to be the average percentage of increase or over-run in lumber actually cut from logs so scaled over the amount indicated by the Doyle Rule measurement of such logs. 4. What is the highest percentage of over-run shown.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. 26 mills of twenty-two lumber companies. 3. 100.1 total over-run. 4. 171.9 total over-run.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 76), To amend The Motor Vehicles Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 115), To amend The Toronto and Hamilton Highway Commission Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 116), To amend The Provincial Highway Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 133), To amend The Audit Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 135), The Highway Improvement Act, 1921, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 109), For the protection of Children of Unmarried Parents, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 75), To provide for Development Work in Northern and Northwestern Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Joynt,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Auditor's Report for the year 1919-20. (*Sessional Papers, No. 54.*)

The House then adjourned at 11.00 p.m.

Wednesday, March 9th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Speaker informed the House:—

That the Clerk had received from the Commissioners of Estate Bills, their Report in the following case:—

Bill (No. 50), Respecting the Title to certain lands devised under the Will of Pierre Charron, deceased.

The Report was then read by the Clerk at the Table as follows:—

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

In the matter of the Bill respecting "An Act respecting the Title of certain lands devised under the Will of Pierre Charron, deceased" Bill No. 50, the undersigned, two of the Commissioners of Estate Bills, pursuant to the request of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, bearing date the 16th February, 1921, respectfully report as follows:—

The effect of the proposed Act is to deprive those, whom the Courts have declared, are owners of property, or interest therein, of their property, or property rights, without compensation. This appears to us to be contrary to a well established practice of Constitutional Government, and to the rights of property established thereunder. See *Attorney-General vs. De Keyser Royal Hotel* (1919), 2 chy. 197, 1920, A. c. 508.

Presuming the allegations contained in the preamble of the Bill to be proved to the satisfaction of the House, it is not, in our opinion, reasonable that the Bill do pass into law. We take the liberty of pointing out that the petition for the Bill and the preamble of the Bill, do not, in our opinion, accurately state the meaning and effect of the judgments therein referred to.

We have the honour to be,

Your obedient servants,

W. MULOCK,

C.J., Ex.

W. N. FERGUSON,

Commissioners.

Osgoode Hall,
8th March, 1921.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 158), intituled “An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.” Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 159), intituled “An Act to amend The Police Magistrates Act.” Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Cooper (Welland) asked the following Question:—

1. What amounts were received by any official or officials in the Attorney-General's Department, specifying each official for each of the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920 respectively (a) For Counsel fees or costs allowed to the Crown or to the Law Department upon appeals or motion to quash convictions or other matters in connection with The Ontario Temperance Act, or liquor cases; (b) For Counsel fees or costs in connection with legal cases or matters of any other character than those specified above. 2. What amounts were received specifically in respect of any legal matter during the year 1920. State specifically the cases in which Counsel fees or costs were allowed or received in each particular case. 3. If such Counsel fees or costs have been received by or allowed to officials or law officers of the Crown in connection with the matters referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 were such fees or costs in addition to the annual stipend of the official in question.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1.—(a) None. Officers of the Attorney-General's Department appearing on Motions to quash convictions appear not for the Crown or any Law Department but for the Magistrate and costs, when given, are payable to them personally or to the Magistrate; (b) Counsel fees in connection with legal cases for the Attorney-General's Department in most instances are a perquisite of the Deputy Attorney-General. During the years 1917, 1918 and until September, 1919, the late J. R. Cartwright, K.C., was Deputy Attorney-General and there is no means of finding out the fees received by him during those years. The Solicitor of the Department received small fees, of which he kept no accurate account, but he estimates them, during the years mentioned, at about \$200 *per annum*. 2. About 160 cases, appeals and Motions were handled by the Deputy Attorney-General or the Assistant Solicitor to the Department during 1920. The majority of these were motions for *certiorari* under The Ontario Temperance Act, in which no fees are payable to the Crown or to the Law Department, but to the Magistrates and to Counsel per-

sonally. These fees are not subject to be accounted for and the records do not in most cases show the amount received. The Deputy Attorney-General and the Assistant Solicitor have gone through the files and memoranda and state that while it is impossible to set out positively the fees received during 1920, the following figures are substantially accurate: The Deputy Attorney-General, \$800; the Assistant Solicitor, \$300. 3. Such fees or costs are in addition to the stipend or salary of these officials and the fact that each receives fees as perquisites was taken into consideration in fixing such salaries. Fees are collected only in about one case in ten, and as the preparation of cases involves much overtime work, which is not otherwise paid for, the present system is a satisfactory one for paying such overtime work without expense to the Government. As the fees increase the overtime increases eight or ten fold. A similar system prevails in the Department of Justice at Ottawa, the Attorney-General's Department of Quebec, and the City Solicitor's Office in the City of Toronto.

Mr. MacBride asked the following Question:—

1. What is the total number of mothers who have applied for allowance under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the City of Brantford up to 31st January, 1921. 2. What is the total number of mothers who have received allowances under The Mothers' Allowance Act in the City of Brantford up to the 31st January, 1921.

And the Minister of Labour replied:—

1. 33. 2. 31.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 105), Allowing Municipalities to adopt Proportional Representation in Municipal Elections.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 111), To incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Dewart,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House:—

Return to an Order of the House of 28th February, 1921, That there be laid before the House a Return of copies of all letters, reports and communications of every kind received by the Minister of Mines or any Member of the Government with respect to the proposed increase in mining taxes. (*Sessional Papers, No. 78.*)

The House then adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Thursday, March 10th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Seventh Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 45), An Act to incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Your Committee recommend that notwithstanding Rule 51 of Your Honourable House, the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended to and inclusive of Thursday, the twenty-fourth day of March.

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports of Committee on Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the twenty-fourth day of March, instant.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. Homuth and Mr. Marshall be added to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time,

Mr. Dewart moved in Amendment, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

That all the words of the Motion, after the first word "That," be stricken out and the following substituted therefor: "this House condemns the extravagant expenditure of the Government involving, despite an increased revenue for ordinary receipts of \$5,173,322.58 for the last fiscal year, a deficit of \$812,848.83, and further deplores the imprudent borrowing of large sums at excessive prices, for long terms, notably the loans of \$16,000,000 in December, 1920, and \$10,000,000 in February, 1921, without any vote of this House appropriating the same to particular works or purposes, the last loan, while the House was in Session, contrary to constitutional usage and the right of the people through their representatives in the Legislative Assembly to control and direct the expenditure of public moneys."

And the Amendment, having been put, was lost on a Division.

The original Motion, having then again been submitted, was carried on a Division and the House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sum:—

108. To defray the expenses of the Civil Government.....\$210,888 81

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution; also, That the Committee had directed his to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 48.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 23rd February, 1921, for a Return of copies of all correspondence between the Government or any Member, or any Minister or Official and the Canada Copper Company (International Nickel Company) and George E. Buchanan relating to leases or grants of nickel-bearing or other mineral lands in the Township of Creighton, District of Sudbury, since 13th November, 1919. (*Sessional Papers, No. 79.*)

The House then adjourned at 11.00 p.m.

Friday, March 11th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 161), intituled “ An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.” Mr. Halcrow.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 162), intituled “ An Act respecting the Lake Huron and Northern Ontario Railway Company.” Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 164), intituled “ An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.” Mr. Cameron.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

The following Bills were, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 160), intituled “ An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Halcrow.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 163), intituled “ An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Thompson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 4.30 p.m.

Monday, March 14th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Speaker informed the House:—

That the Clerk had received from the Railway and Municipal Board, their Report in the following case:—

Bill (No. 40), Respecting the Town of Kincardine.

The Report was then read by the Clerk at the Table, as follows:—

To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Upon the reference, under Rule 61 (a) of Your Honourable House to The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, of Bill (No. 40), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Kincardine," the Board begs leave respectfully to report that in the judgment of the Board it is reasonable that such Bill should be passed by your Honourable House, provided that it is amended by striking out the word "twenty" in the second line of section 3 and inserting instead thereof the word "ten."

The indebtedness of \$38,000.00 referred to in the Bill is partially for permanent works and partially for expenditures which should have been paid out of the taxes or out of the electric light, or water rates, and for this reason the Board recommends that the period for which the debentures be issued be reduced from twenty years to ten years.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. M. McINTYRE,
Chairman.

A. B. INGRAM,
Vice-Chairman.

J. A. ELLIS,
Commissioner.

Dated at Toronto,
this 11th day of March, 1921.

Ordered, That Bill (No. 40), Respecting the Town of Kincardine be referred to the Committee on Private Bills with instructions to consider the same with reference to the suggestions of the Railway and Municipal Board thereon.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 26), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 41), To establish a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville.

Bill (No. 17), Respecting Sons of England Benefit Society.

Bill (No. 21), Respecting the Township of Stamford.

Bill (No. 22), Respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 35), Respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William.

Bill (No. 39), Respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendment.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 165), intituled “An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.”
Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 166), intituled “An Act to amend The Public Health Act.”
Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 167), intituled “The Anatomical Act.” Mr. Price.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 168), intituled “An Act to amend The Board of Education Act.” Mr. Thompson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 169), intituled “An Act to amend The Workmen’s Compensation Act.” Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 170), intituled "An Act respecting Fair Rentals of Dwelling Houses." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 171), intituled "An Act to amend the Law relating to the Guardianship and Custody of Infants." Mr. Dewart.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Calder asked the following Question:—

1. What was the total number of Civil Service employees (both inside and outside service) employed by the Province at the end of the fiscal year 1919. 2. What was the total number of Civil Service employees (both inside and outside service) employed by the Province at the end of the fiscal year 1920.

And the Premier replied as follows:—

1. 5,655. 2. 6,025; the increase being due mainly to the strengthening of the medical and nursing staffs of the Provincial Institutions depleted during the war, the increased assistance required for the administration of The Ontario Temperance Act and for the work of the Provincial Highways Department.

Mr. Price asked the following Question:—

1. Has James Higgins, the defeated Labour candidate in the recent election in North-East Toronto, been appointed to a position under the present Government. 2. If so, what is the position. 3. When was the appointment made. 4. What is the salary.

To which the Minister of Labour replied:—

1. Yes. 2. Employment Scout, Soldiers' Department, Ontario Government Employment Bureau. 3. December 16th, 1920. 4. \$141.66 *per* month.

On Motion of Mr. McLeod, seconded by Mr. Stover, it was

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House the Government should take immediate steps and make representations to the Postmaster-General and the Dominion Government to insure the continuance of the franking privilege upon (a) All forms transmitted to and from any Board of Health, Division

Registrar or other official in the matter of reports of births, marriages, and deaths, and of communicable diseases; (b) All literature upon the aforementioned subject transmitted to or from any Board of Health or Registrar-General's branch in the several provinces.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 45), To incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 63), To amend The Trustee Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 69), For the protection of Women during Confinement.

Referred to the Labour Committee.

Bill (No. 146), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 151), To amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 152), To amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 153), To amend The Public Schools Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 157), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 119), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 155), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act.

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Bill (No. 102), Respecting the Ontario Provincial Police Force.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 118), To provide for the Appointment of Police Magistrates with extended jurisdiction.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 129), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting a license fee to be paid by Billiard Rooms, Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, 1. That notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other Act, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may impose a license upon and make regulations for licensing and defining Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

2. Every owner, lessee or manager of a billiard room, pool room or bowling alley shall pay, in such manner as may be fixed by regulation, to the Treasurer of Ontario, an annual license fee not exceeding \$50 *per annum* for each table or alley in the cities having a population of over fifty thousand, as ascertained by the last census of Canada, and not more than \$30 *per annum* for each table or alley in other cities in Ontario, and not more than \$20 *per annum* for each table or alley in other municipalities in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other Act, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may impose a license upon and make regulations for licensing and defining Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

2. Every owner, lessee or manager of a billiard room, pool room or bowling alley shall pay, in such manner as may be fixed by regulation, to the Treasurer of Ontario, an annual license fee not exceeding \$50 *per annum* for each table or alley in the cities having a population of over fifty thousand, as ascertained by the last census of Canada, and not more than \$30 *per annum* for each table or alley in other cities in Ontario, and not more than \$20 *per annum* for each table or alley in other municipalities in Ontario.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 178), To license Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 127), To amend The Municipal Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Tuesday, March 15th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 172), intituled "An Act to amend The Counties Reforestation Act." Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 173), intituled "An Act to amend The Trades and Labour Branch Act." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 174), intituled "An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act." Mr. Brackin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 175), intituled "An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act." Mr. Lewis.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. McCrea moved, seconded by Mr. Cooke,

That there be laid before this House, a Return of the Report of the officer, or person, who has been conducting a scale of the logs and mill-cut at twenty-six lumber mills of Ontario throughout the sawing season of 1920, and which the Minister of Lands and Forests has reported to the House is now in his possession.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Mathieu,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Wednesday, March 16th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Second Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills and beg to report the same without amendment:—

Bill (No. 90), An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.

Bill (No. 112), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Your Committee have also carefully considered the following Bill and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 138), An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 176), intituled "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 177), intituled "An Act to Provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children." Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Buckland asked the following Question:—

1. When was the \$2,000 on account of their services paid to Commissioners Riddell and Latchford, respectively. 2. By whom was the amount to be received by the Commissioners settled. 3. Who requested the Commissioners to accept the commission. 4. What was the date of the first sitting of the Commission. 5. On what date did the Dominion legislation come into force preventing payment to judges acting on Commissions. 6. How many days had the Commission sat in the meantime. 7. What is the total amount claimed by R. T. Harding for his services in connection with the Timber Enquiry. 8. What is the total amount of accounts received: (a) for payments of assistants; (b) for travelling expenses. 9. Has the Attorney-General read the evidence taken before the Commission. 10. What are the respective rates of compensation being paid to several counsel paid by the Government.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. 2nd July, 1920. 2. Amount not yet settled. 3. Attorney-General.
 4. 12th April, 1920. 5. Cap. 56, 10-11 George V, Statutes of Canada came into force 1st July, 1920. 6. 29 days. 7. Account not yet rendered. .8 (a) If the question refers to Legal Assistants accounts amounting to \$4,440 have been received. (b) The amount for travelling expenses cannot be ascertained until the accounts have been audited. 9. Yes; in part. 10. Mr. J. M. McEvoy was allowed at \$70 per diem while engaged on the hearing before the Commission and \$40 per diem while engaged on work outside the hearing. No rates have been fixed as to the counsel.

The following bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 143), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 147), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 156), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 33), Respecting the City of St. Thomas.

Bill (No. 45), To incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time Tomorrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 102), Respecting the Ontario Provincial Police Force.

And the House having continued until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Thursday, 17th March, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

And after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 134), Respecting the Taxation of Real Estate Transfers.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-day.

The House then adjourned at 12.55 a.m.

Thursday, March 17th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Eighth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 7), An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the Village of Acton.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting the Town of Pembroke.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting Two Abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne.

Bill (No. 42), An Act to incorporate the Town of River Side.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes, be remitted on Bill (No. 58), of 1920, being "An Act to incorporate The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hearst, in Ontario, Canada," on the ground that it is one relating to a religious institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill and of printing the Act in the Statutes, be remitted on Bill (No. 58), of the Session of 1920, being An Act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hearst.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 178), intituled "An Act to license Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys." Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 179), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Thompson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 116), To amend The Provincial Highway Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 111), To incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 79), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario, having been read,

Mr. Mills moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And a Debate having arisen

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, 18th March, 1921.

The Debate continued,

And after some time, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Drury,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until the next sittings of the House To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Interim report respecting Coroners of the Commission to inquire, consider and report upon the best mode of selecting, appointing and remunerating Sheriffs, etc. etc. (*Sessional Papers, No. 80.*)

The House then adjourned at 12.05 a.m.

Friday, March 18th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Ninth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 15), An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 180), intituled "An Act to amend The Registry Act." Mr. O'Neill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Tolmie asked the following Question:—

1. How many officers, operators, or other employees, of any grade, engaged by the Board of License Commissioners in respect to the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act, have been dismissed since October 31st, 1919, to the present time. 2. What are the names of the persons dismissed and the dates of dismissal. 3. How many officers, operators, or other employees, of any grade, so engaged in respect to the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act, have resigned since October 31st, 1919, to the present time. 4. What are the names of the persons who resigned and what are the dates of resignation.

To which the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. 27.

2. Name and date of dismissal.

Name and date of dismissal.

Barnes, J. H., Aug., 1920.

Catts, R., May, 1920.

Edmonds, Art, July, 1920.

Jeffrey, A. J., Sept., 1920.

Hallam, S. M., Oct., 1920.

Signarallo, J., Feb., 1920.

Hallam, Wm., Sept., 1920.

Rutko, G., Feb., 1921.

Burnett, A., Feb., 1920.

Doucette, W., Dec., 1920.

2. Name and date of dismissal.

Stalman, S., Dec., 1920.
 Symonds, S., July, 1920.
 Blume, Ed., Sept., 1920.
 Hallam, G., Oct., 1920.
 Skyepeck, H., Oct., 1920.
 Dawson, J., Jan., 1921.
 Zothawel, C., Nov., 1920.
 Meeks, J., Feb., 1921.
 Sterewiski, F., Feb., 1921.

Name and date of dismissal.

Galbraith, G., Feb., 1921.
 McDonald, E., Mar., 1921.
 White, J., Jan., 1921.
 Hoey, P., Jan., 1921.
 Hicks, R., Jan., 1921.
 Padgett, Hy., Jan., 1921.
 Fielden, Wm., Mar., 1921.
 Luke, L. R., Dec., 1920.

3. 27.

4. Name and date of resignation.

Torode, H., Mar., 1921.
 Bicks, H. C., Feb., 1921.
 Cross, H. H., Jan., 1921.
 Mulhall, F. J., Nov., 1920.
 Howie, Jas., Oct., 1920.
 Porter, C. J., Sept., 1920.
 Shepherd, F., Aug., 1920.
 Stratton, T. Y., Oct., 1920.
 Trebell, F., Feb., 1921.
 Foley, W., Feb., 1921.
 Schminitz, L., Feb., 1920.
 Blakney, J. A., Apr., 1920.
 McCarthy, E. J., July, 1920.
 McPhaden, M., Sept., 1920.

Name and date of resignation.

Mulholland, R., Sept., 1920.
 Brunet, L. P., Jan., 1921.
 Padgett, Hed., Mar., 1921.
 Lewis, Ed. H., Oct., 1920.
 Carson, A., Mar., 1920.
 Mitchell, J. J., Dec., 1920.
 Torrance, Jno., Dec., 1920.
 French, T., June, 1920.
 Dougherty, T., Oct., 1920.
 Magladery, T., Apr., 1920.
 Stewart, T., Oct., 1920.
 Campbell, Geo., Mar., 1921.
 Tremblay, D., Apr., 1920.

Mr. Tolmie asked the following Question:—

1. Does W. J. Lannin, Divisional Superintendent of Law Enforcement, receive any allowance *per diem* for expenses in addition to his salary of \$4,000 *per annum*. 2. If so, for how many days *per week* is his *per diem* allowance made. 3. Does said Divisional Superintendent of Law Enforcement usually spend the week-end, including Sunday, in the City of Stratford. 4. How many complete days in the week does he usually spend in Windsor. 5. What total sum has been paid to him in respect of the *per diem* allowance for his living expenses in Windsor since the time of his appointment, November 19th, 1920, to the present time. 6. What sum or sums have been paid for travelling expenses to and from Stratford from November 19th, 1920, to the present time. 7. What other sums have been paid him for travelling or other expenses.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Yes. 2. Six. 3. Yes. 4. Six, less the necessary time taken in going to and from the City of Stratford at week-ends. 5. \$172. 6. None. 7. \$74.26.

Mr. Ecclestone asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Government purchased any license or licenses from any licensees or concessionaires within the limits of Algonquin Park. 2. If so (a) What berths were purchased; (b) From whom, and at what price. 3. If not, are negotiations being carried on for that purpose and with whom.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. This Government has not purchased the rights of any timber licensee in Algonquin Park. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Suggestion has been made by licensees that the Government purchase their rights but nothing has been determined by the Government.

Mr. Hall asked the following Question:—

1. How many employees of the Province have been superannuated. 2. Who, and how many Civil servants have been superannuated. 3. What allowance has been made in each case. 4. What persons are still retained in their employment who are over age for superannuation.

And the Premier replied in the words and figures following:—

1. 51. 2. Answered by reply to No. 3.

3. Name and annual allowance.	Name and annual allowance.
James Clancy \$2,000 00	Frank Jones 600 00
J. L. Capreol 1,897 00	James McCreight 525 00
C. R. Sproule 2,000 00	Robert Leslie 512 00
J. N. Belanger 650 00	John R. Dowd 675 00
J. M. Delamere 1,320 00	George Guillet 650 00
J. G. Scott 2,000 00	Michael O'Donnell 925 00
J. B. Reid 748 80	William F. F. Grant. 1,050 00
C. J. S. Bethune 900 00	Joseph M. Lemieux 600 00
Peter Gould 480 00	John Gordon 350 00
Andrew Templeton 500 00	Walter Shaver 650 00
Eudo Saunders 2,000 00	Angus McDonald 600 00
Charles H. Henderson. 1,243 33	Edwin Ruthvan Lucas. 705 67

3. Name and annual allowance.		Name and annual allowance.	
Cuthbert Sendall	501 67	Margaret Carlyle	550 00
Edmund John Darby..	900 00	William Kennedy	700 00
William Margach	960 00	Miss Matura Jane Cronk	198 60
John Hamilton Bradshaw	840 00	Frank Manley Nicholson	1,080 00
Robert Armstrong	575 00	Bidwell Way	1,311 60
F. W. Macqueen	1,000 00	Henry Watson	540 00
William H. Clarke	883 33	John Squirrell	392 40
James B. Macdonald..	1,410 00	Avern Pardoe	1,547 00
John Stokes	550 00	W. F. Lewis	828 33
A. J. Rattray	1,663 33	John A. G. Crozier	1,370 00
Charles E. C. Newton.	569 00	Wellington Fisher	800 00
Dr. Edward A. A. Grange	1,500 00	Thomas Evans	417 60
John A. Torrance	450 00		

Lump Sum Payments.

Thomas Mara	\$100 00	M. M. Nesbitt	\$864 00
-----------------------	----------	-------------------------	----------

Total number of superannuates—51.

4. Charles Chase.	James N. Sawyer.
E. A. MacLaurin.	J. D. Flavelle.
G. B. Nicol.	David Rodgers.
E. Oliver.	John Stenson.
N. F. Patterson.	Samuel Lorimer.
G. S. Holmstead.	V. P. Fayle.
G. M. Lee.	J. J. Murphy.
G. O. Alcorn.	D. G. Ross.
D. J. Goggin.	R. H. Hodgson.
W. A. Poole.	W. P. Christie.
J. Thompson.	T. Tapping.
J. Boasi.	J. B. McLaughlin.
W. J. McLeary.	J. O. Anderson.
R. J. Beeman.	H. Barron.
C. Maddock.	A. E. Belcher.
W. Hunt.	J. W. Sharp.
J. A. Houston.	F. J. Glackmeyer.
J. W. Pearce.	A. H. Sydere.
D. R. Coleman.	J. Gorman.
C. W. Nash.	J. Beck.
T. Mannell.	W. H. Cooper.
J. T. Robinson.	A. Bristow.
C. S. Jones.	A. Curry.
Joe Pelletier.	J. Kirby.

S. Hawkins.
 J. Gillespie.
 N. Reed.
 Henry Jackson.
 George Godda.
 Albert Ranger.
 J. D. O'Brien.
 W. H. Talbot.
 T. N. Harte.
 J. G. Moorhead.

Donald McCrimmon.
 J. H. Ross.
 S. Peaker.
 J. J. Barry.
 R. C. Davies.
 C. McDowell.
 J. J. Foley.
 W. P. Strickland.
 Robert Quillie.

Mr. Allan asked the following Question:—

1. What was the total cost of the Committee appointed to investigate the problem of "Rural Credits." 2. What was the sums paid to each of the members of the Committee, for their services and expenses, *viz.*, W. J. Jackman, Thomas McMillen and M. H. Staples.

To which the Premier replied in the words and figures following:—

1. \$2,551.50. 2. W. T. Jackman, services, \$1,275; expenses, \$202.58. Thomas McMillen, services, \$300; expenses, \$206.15. M. H. Staples, services, \$180; expenses, \$126.75.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 89), Respecting the Two-Platoon System for the Employees of Permanent Fire Departments, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 80), To amend The Limitations Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 154), To amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act, 1919.

Referred to the Labour Committee.

Bill (No. 160), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 161), To amend The Public Parks Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 163), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The House then adjourned at 5.05 p.m.

Monday, March 21st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. McCrea, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills and have prepared amendments thereto respectively:—

Bill (No. 60), Respecting Legitimation of Children by the Subsequent Intermarriage of their Parents.

Bill (No. 63), To amend The Trustee Act.

Your Committee recommends that Bill (No. 123), Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies, be referred to the same Special Committee as that to which Bill (No. 114), Respecting Liens of Mechanics and Wage-Earners, Supply Men and Others, was referred.

Ordered, That Bill (No. 123), Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies, be referred as recommended.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 7), Respecting the City of Brantford.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 34), Respecting the Village of Acton.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 5), Respecting the Town of Pembroke.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 15), To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 167), The Anatomical Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 168), To amend The Board of Education Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 171), To amend the Law relating to the Guardianship and Custody of Infants.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 142), To amend The School Sites Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 120), Respecting the Adoption of Children.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 56), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 90), To amend The Public Parks Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 112), To amend The Public Health Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 138), To amend The Local Improvement Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 118), To provide for the appointment of Police Magistrates with extended jurisdiction, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 134), Respecting the Taxation of Real Estate Transfers, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 50.*)

Also—Report of Soldiers' Aid Commission for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 69.*)

Also—Report of Department of Mines for 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 4.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council made since February 28th, 1921, under authority of Department of Education Act or Acts relating to Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

Also—Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for the year ending 31st December, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 6.*)

Also—Report of the Inspector of Registry Offices, for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 7.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of the 16th February, 1921, that there be laid before the House a Return showing what are the amounts paid by each Company respectively which make up the total credited to The Mining Tax Act in the Public Accounts for 1920 at page a31 under the heading: (a) Acreage tax, \$71,223.26; (b) Profits tax, \$713,291.46. (*Sessional Papers, No. 82.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Tuesday, March 22nd, 1921.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The Clerk having announced to the House,

That Mr. Speaker was unavoidably absent on account of illness, and unable to take the Chair, and having requested the House to nominate a Member to take the Chair,

Mr. Drury moved, seconded by Mr. Raney,

That the Honourable the Speaker, being unavoidably absent To-day, this House doth, under the provisions of the Statute in such case made and provided, elect The Honourable Thomas Crawford, to take the Chair and preside as Speaker for the day.

And the Motion having been put by the Clerk, was declared carried unanimously, and

The Honourable Mr. Crawford having taken the Chair in accordance therewith, the Mace was laid upon the Table.

PRAYERS.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Black, the Petition of the County Council of the United Counties of Lennox and Addington.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Tenth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 14), An Act to confirm By-law 744 of the Town of Orillia.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke and The Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited.

Bill (No. 37), An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting the Town of Gananoque.

Bill (No. 43), An Act to annex certain land to the Town of Ford City.

Your Committee recommend that notwithstanding Rule 51 of (Your Honourable House, the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended to and inclusive of Thursday the Seventh day of April next.

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Thursday the Seventh day of April next.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 181), intituled “An Act to amend The Burlington Beach Act.”
Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 182), intituled “An Act to amend The Statute of Frauds.”
Mr. Brackin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 183), intituled “An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act.”
Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 185), intituled “The Public Lands Act.” Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 186), intituled “An Act respecting Natural Gas.” Mr. Mills.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 187), intituled “An Act respecting Long Point Park.” Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 184), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Gray.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 26), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 41), To establish a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville.

Bill (No. 17), Respecting Sons of England Benefit Society.

Bill (No. 21), Respecting the Township of Stamford.

Bill (No. 22), Respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 35), Respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William.

Bill (No. 39), Respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill (No. 33), Respecting the City of St. Thomas.

The following Bills were severally read the second time: —

Bill (No. 136), To amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 58), Respecting the construction of certain works on Lakes and Streams in Ontario.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 57), To amend The Planning and Development Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 158), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Referred to a Select Committee to be composed as follows:—Messieurs Smith, Sandy, MacVicar, Casselman, Warren, Rollo, Homuth, Swayze, Raney, Sinclair, Marshall, McLeod, Cooper (Welland), Henry, McCrea, Hill and Buckland.

Bill (No. 159), To amend The Police Magistrates Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 165), To amend The Minimum Wage Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 166), To amend The Public Health Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 173), To amend The Trades and Labour Branch Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 162), Respecting the Lake Huron and Northern Ontario Railway Company.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 172), To amend The Counties Reforestation Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 178), To amend The Amusements Tax Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

And after some time spent therein,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Sandy reported, That the Committee had made some progress; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 11 p.m.

Wednesday, March 23rd, 1921.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The Clerk having announced to the House,

That Mr. Speaker was still unavoidably absent on account of illness, and unable to take the Chair, and having requested the House to nominate a Member to take the Chair,

Mr. Drury moved, seconded by Mr. Raney,

That the Honourable the Speaker, being unavoidably absent again To-day, this House doth, under the provisions of the Statute in such case made and provided, elect The Honourable Thomas Crawford, to take the Chair and preside as Speaker for the day.

And the Motion having been put by the Clerk, was declared carried unanimously, and

The Honourable Mr. Crawford having taken the Chair in accordance therewith, the Mace was laid upon the Table.

PRAYERS.

Mr. Cooper (Toronto) presented the Report of the Committee regarding a Monument to members of His Majesty's Forces, which was read as follows:

To the Honourable the Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

The undersigned respectfully beg to submit the following Report, viz.:—

Whereas on the 22nd day of April, 1920, "On Motion of Mr. Cooper (Toronto), seconded by Mr. Carmichael, it was resolved, that this House desires to record in some appropriate manner its deep appreciation of the distinguished services of all members of His Majesty's forces from the Province of Ontario, who so gallantly fought for the Empire in the recent War, and that a committee to consider how best to provide a permanent record of such appreciation be appointed and to report to this House at its next Session"; and

Whereas on the 28th of April, 1920, "On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney, it was ordered that the following be a Committee to consider and report to this House in accordance with the resolution adopted by this

House of 22nd April, instant, regarding a monument to and permanent record of all members of His Majesty's Forces from the Province of Ontario who served in the late War, and that the said Committee be authorized to sit during the Recess: The Hon. Mr. Carmichael, the Hon. Mr. Ross (Kingston), and Messrs Cooper (Toronto), Fenton, Stover and McNamara."

In pursuance of the foregoing instructions, the Committee held several meetings, at the first of which Lieut.-Colonel H. S. Cooper, O.B.E., M.C., with Bar, was elected Chairman, and a careful and thorough consideration was given to the subject referred to them. They invited suggestions through the Press from all interested, and, the better to ascertain the feeling of the public, conferred, individually, as opportunity offered, with returned soldiers—officers and men—and with representative citizens.

While it is admitted that it is often a most difficult thing to gauge public opinion accurately on any given subject, yet on this question the evidence is overwhelming that the people of Ontario are practically unanimous. We have found a deep-rooted, widespread desire and determination to commemorate the immortal deeds of our soldiers in a manner worthy of them and worthy of the standing and good name of this Province. This cannot be done on a small, inadequate scale. That fact need not be urged, for we take it that this House will discharge its full duty, generously and handsomely in this matter. Posterity will be the real judge. The measure of our appreciation of what our people as a whole achieved in the Great War will be estimated largely by what we shall do now. What we propose, however, to this House we hope will be considered moderate and well within practical bounds, and yet meet the prevailing feeling fairly well.

We have considered what is being done in Great Britain, in France and in Flanders, and we realize that in the time to come our memorial will be placed in comparison with War Memorials in these and other lands. During the War, Ontario indisputably led Canada in men, in money and in Red Cross comforts for hospital and field. Nay, comparatively speaking, our Province led the British Empire in some of these respects, and this proud place she desires to maintain in her reverence for the dead and in her appreciation of those soldiers happily still alive. The strength of the public sentiment of our Province is strikingly testified to by the steps taken by township and county councils, by cities, by churches, colleges and schools, to erect Heroic Monuments and Triumphal Arches, bronze, marble and mural Tablets, and Memorial Windows, to preserve Honour Rolls, to found Scholarships, and in a variety of other ways—by book and picture—to honour our glorious dead.

The resolutions of this Legislature have aroused keen and appreciative interest and we have had nothing but encouragement in our deliberations during the year.

The Recommendations which we respectfully beg to submit are threefold and are as follows, *viz.*:—

DIVISION I.

Overseas Activities.

(1) The collecting and publishing of the names of all the men who enlisted within the Province for any branch of war service. This would include particulars of enlistment, such as locality, unit, draft, etc. Also biographical data, such as names of parents, next of kin, whether married or single; if married, name of wife, and of children, if any. Service record in the war, mention in despatches, decorations, awards, promotions, etc. Composition of units throughout all stages of the war, including battalions, brigades, division and corps, with names of commanders and staffs in all branches of the Canadian Army.

(2) Photographs—individuals, units, camps, places of interest associated with service, such as trench life, barracks, hospitals, field camps, etc.; specimens of uniforms, accoutrements, arms, etc.

(3) Collections of letters, diaries, soldiers' newspapers, cartoons, etc.

(4) Hospital activities supported directly by the Province of Ontario.

(5) Camps in England in which Ontario Battalions were located.

(6) Accounts from officers and men of the hospitality extended to them in Britain and in France.

(7) Hut life, such as that in which the Y.M.C.A., the Knights of Columbus, the Salvation Army, and other organizations were interested.

(8) Nursing Sisters and V.A.D.'s.

(9) Field kitchens, field ambulances, armoured trucks, batteries, etc., contributed from private sources.

(10) An account of direct military work within the Province not included in that done by Overseas units, including accounts of camps of instruction, mobilization and detention camps, Memorial Tablets, Rolls of Honour, etc. A complete record for identification purposes of the graves of Ontario soldiers who are buried in France, Flanders and elsewhere Overseas.

DIVISION II.

Civil Activities Within the Province.

(11) Manufacture of the munitions of war, with specimens.

(12) An account of all work performed by numerous organizations throughout the Province of Ontario, branches of the Red Cross, St. John's

Ambulance, Women's Institutes, church organizations, knitting circles, etc., and such organizations as the Daughters of the Empire, National Council of Women, National Societies, Fraternal Societies, Girl Guides, Boy Scouts, Cadet Corps, etc., etc.

(13) Service rendered by Universities, Colleges, Schools, Municipalities, etc., etc., and contributions by individuals such as The Acetone Works, Toronto, Connaught Laboratories, Royal Canadian Institute, and other institutions interested in the mobilization of Canadian Men of Science for war purposes and in the application of science to the production of munitions, for the prevention of disease, or the amelioration of hospital conditions.

(14) Organization and results of the Patriotic Fund throughout the Province of Ontario.

(15) British Red Cross appeals.

(16) Special funds raised to meet conditions in France, Belgium, Serbia, Roumania, the Dardanelles, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Egypt, etc., etc.

(17) Direct effect of war conditions on the agricultural, industrial, commercial and financial life of the Province, as far as this can be estimated; also on church and educational life.

(18) That military units be thoroughly organized for the purposes of this work.

DIVISION III.

Monuments.

(19)—(a) A Cenotaph or other form of monument at the head of University Avenue, Toronto, or some other suitable site in that city.

(b) Cenotaph or other form of monument at the Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario, provided this can fit in with the general War Memorial Scheme projected for the College.

(20) A Memorial Hall of worthy proportions and architecture which would form a museum of relics of the War, including photographs, engravings, paintings, statuary, regimental colours, badges, souvenirs, etc. This hall might be regarded as the Valhalla of the Province. Its facade should be of suitable design, decorated with appropriate carvings. Within the hall there ought to be niches for statues, and an arrangement that would allow of coloured windows to be presented by battalions or individuals emblematic of incidents in the War.

This building ought to be erected in conjunction with the Ontario Archives, so that the administration would be in the hands of the Archives Branch, thus reducing the maintenance expenses to that necessary for proper caretaking.

(21) In general—the preservation of all and sundry data illustrative of the Great War.

(22) That the Committee be empowered to call for competitive plans for both the Cenotaph and Memorial Hall, and in conjunction with the Government be authorized to make a selection from those submitted or from those that may be received from other sources.

(23) That a sum of money be provided in the estimates, not exceeding \$10,000, to cover the expenses for carrying on the clerical work, the collection and securing of historical material, and the preservation, editing, and publishing of what may be deemed desirable to be published as set forth in Divisions Nos. I and II of this Report.

It remains to acknowledge the great assistance we have had from Colonel Fraser, A.D.C., Provincial Archivist, who is accumulating an invaluable collection of War records, and who unofficially acted at our request as Secretary of the Committee.

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the foregoing Report.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 189), intituled “An Act to amend The Ontario Railway Act.”
Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 190), intituled “An Act to amend The Assessment Act.” Mr. Lewis.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

On Motion of Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Calder,

Ordered, That notwithstanding the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills has elapsed, the rule be suspended and leave be given to present a Petition of Arthur A. Craise and others of Louth praying for the incorporation of the Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited, and that the same be now read and received.

The following Petition was then read and received:—

Petition of Arthur A. Craise and others of Louth, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

On Motion of Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Calder,

Ordered, That notwithstanding the time for introducing Private Bills has expired, the rule be suspended and leave be given to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited, and that the same do stand referred to the Committee on Private Bills without the formality of report from the Committee on Standing Orders in such case made and provided.

The following Bill was thereupon introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 188), intituled “An Act to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.” Mr. Marshall.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Ross (Kingston), it was

Ordered, That the Committee on Public Accounts request the permission of the House to investigate the operation of, and purchase of cattle for, the Ontario Reformatory Abattoir at Guelph, and to have produced before it all accounts and vouchers in respect thereto, up to, or, as close as possible to April 1st, 1921.

On Motion of Mr. Buckland, seconded by Mr. Thompson, it was

Ordered, That the Committee on Public Accounts request the permission of the House to enquire into purchases from the T. Eaton Co., Ltd., from the

end of the last fiscal year to 1st March, 1921, and that the accounts be produced.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered; That when this House adjourns To-day, it do stand adjourned until Three of the Clock in the afternoon of Tuesday, the Twenty-ninth day of March, instant.

Mr. Price asked the following Question:—

Has the Government read the pamphlet entitled, “Don Quixote in Finance,” or “Has Canada a Medici,” a tale of Treasons, Stratagems and Spoils, by W. H. P. Jarvis, placed on the desks of all members last Session. If so, what does the Government intend to do concerning the serious allegations contained therein.

And the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

Some members of the Government, including the Attorney-General, have read this pamphlet. The Attorney-General does not consider that the allegations therein contained come within the scope of the duties of his Department or call for any action.

Mr. Marshall asked the following Question:—

1. Is there a Branch of the Provincial Secretary's Department specially devoted to the repair and construction of Public Buildings. 2. If so, when was this Branch created. 3. What was the necessity for its existence. 4. What are the duties of the following persons named on pages 38 and 39 of the Public Accounts for 1920, *viz.*, George Barron, P. F. Butterfield, James Govan, Allan Griffiths, W. G. McJannett, A. Rattray, G. Williams. 5. If the aforesaid persons are engaged in surveying, preparing plans, or architectural work or construction work, why are they not under the direction of the Public Works Department. 6. Did the Public Works Department direct the building of the Hospitals for Insane at Toronto, Hamilton, London, Kingston, Mimico, Woodstock, Brockville, the Central Prison, the Mercer Reformatory and the Parliament Buildings. 7. Is the Public Works Department not now equipped with the facilities for repairing and constructing of all Public Buildings required by the Province. 8. To whom are the aforesaid persons responsible for the proper performance of their work.

And the Provincial Secretary replied in the words following:—

1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. Allan Griffiths is not now an employee of the Ontario Government; James Govan, Architect; G. Williams, Assistant Architect. The Hospital and Charitable Institutions Act and others require that plans and specifications of all Prisons, Gaols, Public or Private Hospitals, Houses of Refuge, Orphanages, Infants' Homes or other Public Charities shall be approved by the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities. Schemes for the development of the Public Institutions under the direction of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities must originate in the Department charged with their control. The Ontario Housing Act requires that the building schemes and the plans and specifications of the houses to be erected be approved by the Director of Bureau of Municipal Affairs. The Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities and the Director of the Bureau of Municipal Affairs are both attached to the Provincial Secretary's Department, and require professional advice in the discharge of their duties. P. F. Butterfield, Surveyor, for repairing of roads, sewers, fences and grounds of Public Institutions and to bring the maps of the several Institutions up to date. A. Rattray, Clerk of Works; George Barron, Superintendent Plumber; W. G. McJannett, Electrical Engineer, are engaged in supervising the maintenance and repair of Public Institution Buildings and Plants. 5. Answered by No. 4. 6. Yes. 7. Yes, but under a ruling of the Provincial Auditor in the year 1917, appropriations for maintenance and repairs of all buildings, plumbing, steam and electric plants, furniture and furnishings, etc., were transferred from the service "Public Buildings" controlled by the Public Works Department to "Public Institutions Maintenance" controlled by the Provincial Secretary's Department, as such expenditures did not belong to Capital Account. 8. The Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Buckland asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Government made any payments of any kind to Mr. Arthur Hawkes in connection with the enquiry now being conducted by the Royal Radial Commission. 2. If so, what payments have been made. 3. Does the Government expect to pay for his services.

To which the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Yes. Mr. Hawkes has been employed by Mr. R. S. Robertson to assist him and the Government will pay the assistants employed by Mr. Robertson.

On Motion of Mr. Pinard, seconded by Mr. O'Neill,

Ordered, That there be laid before the House a Return showing: 1. What is the number of applications to the Board of License Commissioner, or any

Commissioner, Official or Minister for the remission of fines or sentences under the O.T.A. in regard to which the member for South-East Toronto (Seat "B") acted personally or was interested professionally. 2. (a) What is the number of such applications favourably considered; (b) Rejected. 3. (a) What is the total sum of fines under the O.T.A. remitted in regard to which the member for South-East Toronto (Seat "B") acted personally or was interested professionally; (b) What is the aggregate number of fines remitted from sentences imposed under the O.T.A. in regard to which the member for South-East Toronto (Seat "B") acted personally or was interested professionally.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 156), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 164), To amend The Line Fences Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 177), To provide for the maintenance of Parents by their Children.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 179), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 174), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Referred to the same Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 158), To amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 107), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 13), Respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne, and

after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Tuesday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 117), To amend The Police Magistrates Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 111), To incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Tuesday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 120), Respecting the Adoption of Children, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 136), To amend The Corporations Tax Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Tuesday next.

The House then adjourned at 10 p.m.

Tuesday, March 29th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Buckland, Two Petitions of the County Council of Wellington.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the United Counties of Lennox and Addington, praying for certain Amendments to The Highway Improvement Act, 1920.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 191), intituled "An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 192), intituled "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 109), For the Protection of Children of Unmarried Parents, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 159), To amend The Police Magistrates Act, and after some time spent therein,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 165), To amend The Minimum Wage Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 162), Respecting the Lake Huron and Northern Ontario Railway Company, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 172), To amend The Counties Reforestation Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 55), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The following Bill was then introduced and read a first time: —

Bill (No. 193), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Inquiries Act."
Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Wednesday, March 30th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Third Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill and beg to report the same without amendment:—

Bill (No. 152), An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Your Committee have also carefully considered the following Bills and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 166), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill (No. 168), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 194), intituled "An Act respecting the Office of King's Printer." Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Swayze, the Member for Niagara Falls, having stated, while addressing the House, that a member of the Chippawa Commission of 1920, was insincere as a member thereof.

Mr. MacBride, rising in his place, demanded that Mr. Swayze should state specifically the name of such Member, and thereupon Mr. Swayze stated that Mr. MacBride was the Member of said Committee he referred to.

Mr. MacBride then moved,

That the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation and report.

And the question being submitted to the House, was carried, and it was

Ordered, That the matter in question do stand referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for enquiry and report.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 180), To amend The Registry Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 14), To confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 29), Respecting the Township of Etobicoke and The Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 37), Respecting the City of London.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 38), Respecting the Town of Gananoque.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 34), Respecting the Village of Acton.

Bill (No. 5), Respecting the Town of Pembroke.

Bill (No. 15), To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That Order No. 49 be discharged and that Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side, be recommitted to the Standing Committee on Private Bills for further consideration and report.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That Order No. 55 be discharged and that Bill (No. 43), To annex certain lands to the Town of Ford City, be recommitted to the Standing Committee on Private Bills for further consideration and report.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting apparatus to be used for the protection of buildings from damage by lightning.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, 1. That no person, or corporation, shall sell or offer for sale material or apparatus intended to be used for the protection of buildings from damage by lightning, or to install upon any building or structure any apparatus intended to, or purporting to be used for such purpose until authorized to do so by a license obtained from the Provincial Fire Marshal, for which a fee of \$50 *per annum* shall be payable to the Treasurer of Ontario, together with a tax of 80 cents on every \$100 received from the sale of lightning rods and equipment in respect of business transacted in Ontario.

2. That upon written notice from the licensee of the appointment of a suitable person to act as his agent in this Province, the Fire Marshal may, if he is satisfied that the appointee is a suitable person, issue to him a license as such agent upon the receipt of a fee of \$3, payable to the Treasurer of Ontario, such license to continue in force for the current year.

3. That any person not licensed as above, selling, offering for sale or installing lightning rods shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$200 or six months' imprisonment, or both.

4. That the license fees and tax paid to the Treasurer of Ontario as above be added to the special fund for maintenance of the office of Fire Marshal and the expense incidental thereto.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That no person, or corporation, shall sell or offer for sale material or apparatus intended to be used for the protection of buildings from damage by lightning, or to install upon any building or structure any apparatus intended to, or purporting to be used for such purpose until authorized to do so by a license obtained from the Provincial Fire Marshal, for which a fee of \$50 *per annum* shall be payable to the Treasurer of Ontario, together with a tax of 80 cents on every \$100 received from the sale of lightning rods and equipment in respect of business transacted in Ontario.

2. That upon written notice from the licensee of the appointment of a suitable person to act as his agent in this Province, the Fire Marshal may, if he is satisfied that the appointee is a suitable person, issue to him a license as such agent upon the receipt of a fee of \$3, payable to the Treasurer of Ontario, such license to continue in force for the current year.

3. That any person not licensed as above, selling, offering for sale or installing lightning rods shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$200 or six months' imprisonment, or both.

4. That the license fees and tax paid to the Treasurer of Ontario as above be added to the special fund for maintenance of the office of Fire Marshal and the expense incidental thereto.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 195), To regulate the sale and installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario.

The following Bill was then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 195), intituled "An Act to regulate the sale and installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario." Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 182), To amend The Statute of Frauds, having been read,

Mr. Brackin moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 184), To amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Mr. Gray moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 66), Respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 173), To amend The Trades and Labour Branch Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 11.00 p.m.

Thursday, March 31st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the County Council of Wellington, praying for certain amendments to The Provincial Highways Act.

Of the County Council of Wellington, praying for certain amendments to The Game and Fisheries Act.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Eleventh Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 49), An Act respecting the Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Corporation of the Town of Oakville.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 10), An Act respecting The City Gas Company of London.

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the Town of Kincardine.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Fourth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill, and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 161), An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 196), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 129), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 193), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, having been read

Mr. Drury moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

Mr. McCrea raised the point of order that the Bill was in effect exactly the same in its provisions as Bill (No. 55), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, which was, on the Motion of the Premier discharged from the Order Paper on Tuesday last, and that therefore the matter, having been disposed of by the House, could not again be brought up during the present Session and asked for the ruling of Mr. Speaker upon the point involved.

Mr. Speaker said

That he preferred to consider the question raised by the Honourable Member and would therefore postpone his decision until the afternoon of To-morrow.

Mr. McCrea then moved,

That the Debate on the Motion for the second reading be postponed until To-morrow, which was acceded to

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

109. To defray the expenses of Legislation.....	2,000 00
---	----------

110. To defray the expenses of the Administration of Justice, Sundry Civil and Criminal Justice.....	3,980 00
111. To defray the expenses of the Administration of Justice in Districts	15,738 00
113. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Toronto	6,366 67
114. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa	1,939 00
115. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, London...	1,350 00
116. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Hamilton..	1,725 00
117. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Peterborough..	1,400 00
118. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Stratford..	1,450 00
119. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, North Bay	3,100 00
120. To defray the expenses of the English - French Training School, Ottawa	280 00
122. To defray the expenses of the English - French Training School, Vankleek Hill	700 00
123. To defray the expenses of the English - French Training School, Sandwich	300 00
124. To defray the expenses of the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes	51,608 27
125. To defray the expenses of the Public Libraries, Art Schools, Historical, Literary and Scientific Societies....	15,100 00
127. To defray the expenses of the Provincial and other Uni- versities	30,000 00
128. To defray the expenses of the Northern Academy, Monteith	53,480 00
129. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville	11,775 67
130. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford	1,300 00

131. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Education..... 50,975 00

And the House having continued in Committee until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, 1st April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

132. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Brockville..	25,500 00
133. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Cobourg....	16,400 00
134. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton..	64,900 00
135. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Kingston..	18,200 00
136. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, London....	36,000 00
137. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Mimico....	14,000 00
138. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Orillia....	12,500 00
139. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Penetanguishene	12,500 00
140. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Whitby....	63,500 00
141. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Woodstock..	10,800 00
142. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Burwash..	14,500 00
143. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Fort William	2,800 00
144. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Public Institutions	5,100 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The House then adjourned at 12.55 a.m.

Friday, April 1st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 197), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Insurance Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 198), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Insurance Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 199), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 200), intituled "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act." Mr. Hay.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Upon the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. Speaker said, that in accordance with his promise of yesterday to give a decision upon the point of order raised by Mr. McCrea upon the Motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 193), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, he would rule as follows:—

"Where changes to be made in a Bill in Committee are so extensive as to amount substantially to a new Bill, the proper course to take is to withdraw the first Bill and introduce a new one. There is no rule or custom which restrains the introduction of two or more Bills relating to the same subject—and containing similar provisions—much less is there anything to prevent the introduction of two or more Bills dealing with the same subject—in an entirely different manner. Bill (No. 55), proposes to deal with a certain situation in one way—Bill (No. 193), proposes to deal with the same situation in another way. Bill (No. 55), was withdrawn without the House having passed upon the principle involved, but even if a vote had been taken and the motion for second reading defeated, there would have been nothing to pre-

vent Bill (No. 193) being introduced and considered—they are entirely different measures. (See May's Parliamentary Practice, 12th edition, pp. 354-355.)

“While the English authorities are clear it may be added that the practice followed in the present instance has been adopted in numerous instances in this Legislature, so that the practice is well settled here that a Member may with the consent of the House withdraw a Bill at any stage and substitute another containing similar, or, as in this case, totally different provisions.”

On Motion of Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Dewart,

Resolved, That whereas it has been made to appear to the House by the statement made this day to this House, by Richard Reece Hall and by an article appearing on page 27 of the *Toronto Telegram* newspaper of date of March 31st, referring to the Parry Sound Development Plant, that the said statement and the matters therein contained be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the said Committee be instructed to inquire into and report thereon, with power to send for and examine all necessary persons and papers in or concerning the premises. And that the said Committee be empowered to sit for such purpose.

Mr. Fowler asked the following Question:—

1. How many persons have been added to the service of each of the departments of the Government since the 13th November, 1919.
2. How many persons have been temporarily employed in any capacity by each of the departments of the Government since 13th November, 1919.

And the Premier replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Inside service—

Increases—

Office of the Lieutenant-Governor	2
Department of Education	15
Department of Game and Fisheries	1
Department of Attorney-General	17
Additions—Board of License Commissioners for Ontario, Office of Public Trustee.	
Department of Labour	27
Addition—Mother's Allowances Commission.	
Provincial Board of Health	37

Department of Lands and Forests	8
Department of Mines	16
Addition—Office of Fuel Controller.	
Department of Public Highways	30
Department of the Treasurer	11
Civil Service Commissioner's Office	3
	<hr/>
Total	167

Decreases—

Department of the Prime Minister and President of the Council	1
Department of Agriculture	5
Department of Provincial Secretary	19
Department of Public Works	19
	<hr/>
Total	44

Net increase—123.

2. Inside service—

Department of the Prime Minister and President of the Council	13
Department of Agriculture	30
Department of Attorney-General	44
Department of Education	150
Department of Game and Fisheries	9
Department of Labour	117
Department of Lands and Forests	21
Department of Mines	23
Department of Provincial Secretary	94
Department of Public Highways	85
Department of Public Works	150
Department of the Treasurer	85
	<hr/>
Total	821

Mr. Lewis asked the following Question:—

What is the estimated cost of the alterations and extensions necessary on the Old Knox College to make it suitable for the Government requirements.

And the Minister of Public Works replied in the words following:—

Alterations including elevator, vaults, sanitary fittings and alterations for laboratories for Provincial Board of Health, forty-two thousand dollars. Extensions—fireproof vaults and offices for Registrar-General (Vital Statistics), seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. McLeod asked the following Question:—

1. What is the number of petitions that have been received by the Government or any Minister or Official connected therewith praying that the findings of the Special Committee on Hydro rates be incorporated into legislation at the present Session (a) From Farmers' Clubs; (b) From Municipal Councils; (c) From other organized bodies, societies or associations.

And the Premier replied in the words and figures following:—

(a) 32. (b) 131. (c) None; but 154 petitions signed by various numbers of electors.

Mr. Marceau asked the following Question:—

1. Who is G. Dupuis in respect to whom there appears to have been paid a refund of \$2,000 on account of O.T.A. fine (Public Accounts, page 666).
2. Upon whose recommendation was such fine remitted or refunded and on what grounds.

To which the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. G. Dupuis, who received a refund of \$2,000 on account of an O.T.A. fine, as mentioned in Public Accounts, page 666, is Gilbert Dupuis, a farmer of Essex County, residing near Amherstburg. 2. The refund mentioned was made pursuant to an Order-in-Council dated the 20th October, 1920, which was passed upon the recommendation of the Attorney-General on the suggestion of the Board of License Commissioners for Ontario. The grounds for the said recommendation are as follows:—The said Gilbert Dupuis was convicted at Amherstburg on the 2nd July, 1920, of a breach of The Ontario Temperance Act and fined \$1,300 and costs. Subsequently the said Gilbert Dupuis was convicted of an offence against The Ontario Temperance Act by Police Magistrate W. D. Beaman of Essex County, and fined \$2,000 and costs. Upon investigation it was found that the second conviction was upon the same facts and was really for the same offence as the first conviction.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 175), "To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act," having been read,

Mr. Lewis moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 189), To amend The Ontario Railway Act.

Referred to the Railway Committee.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House:—

Return to an Order of the House, of February 9th, 1921, that there be laid before the House a Return showing:—1. What was the total quantity of fish caught in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon, respectively, and marketed in the following years—1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. 2. What were the varieties of fish caught and marketed in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon respectively, and the quantity of each. 3. What was the price paid to fishermen for each variety; what was the price at which the Government sold each variety; to whom were such sales made. 4. To whom were licenses issued to take fish from Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon respectively, in the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. 5. Is it the intention of the Government to continue this Fishery Department as a commercial enterprise. 6. What were the gross receipts from fish sales in Lake Nipissing and Lake Nipigon in the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920, and what were the net profits of the Government in each of said years. (*Sessional Papers, No. 83.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

Monday, April 4th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 201), intituled "An Act to amend The County Judges Act."
Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 202), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Telephone Act." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 112), To amend The Public Health Act.

Bill (No. 13), Respecting two abandoned Cemeteries in the Town of Port Colborne.

Bill (No. 34), Respecting the Village of Acton.

Bill (No. 5), Respecting the Town of Pembroke.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 38), Respecting the Town of Gananoque, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

Mr. O'Neill asked the following Question:—

1. What is the number of applications that have been made to the Attorney-General or any Minister or Member of the Government or the Board of License Commissioners for clemency and remission of fine or penalty imposed under The Ontario Temperance Act from the 13th day of November, 1919, to the 1st day of March, 1920. 2. What is the total number of cases in which clemency was exercised in whole or in part. 3. What is the number of cases in which clemency was recommended in whole or in part by the Board of License Commissioners and refused by the Attorney-General or the Executive Council. 3. What is the number of cases in which the Attorney-General has acted upon his own initiative.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. 178. 2. 93. 3. None. 4. None, between dates mentioned.

Mr. Cook asked the following Question:—

1. What, if any, timber has been sold in Algonquin Park since Nov. 13, 1919. 2. Was it advertised for tenders. 3. To whom was it sold and what was the price. 4. What was the size of the area disposed of.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. For the purpose of cleaning up Algonquin Park, and following the recommendation of the Crown Timber Agent and the Superintendent of the

Park, the dead and down timber only is being removed on an area formerly under license for standing timber. 2. No. 3. George Jamieson. \$1.50 *per* M. ft. B.M. for pine, cedar, etc., taken out in the log. Pulpwood, 50c. *per* cord. Railway ties, 10c. each. Cordwood, 25c. *per* cord. 4. 68¾ square miles.

Mr. Stover asked the following Question:—

1. Who is M. A. Mackenzie, for whose services as an Actuary investigating Civil Service Superannuation, the sum of \$1,000 appears to have been paid (Public Accounts, page 538). 2. Has his report been received by the Government. 3. Is it the intention of the Government to publish same for the information of the House.

To which the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

1. Professor of Mathematics, University of Toronto. 2. It was received by former Government, on January 3rd, 1918. 3. It has not been considered.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 117), To amend The Police Magistrates Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 120), Respecting the Adoption of Children, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 60), Respecting Legitimation of Children by subsequent inter-marriage of their Parents, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 178), To amend The Amusements Tax Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 181), To amend The Burlington Beach Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 185), The Public Lands Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 187), Respecting Long Point Park.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 194), Respecting the Office of King's Printer.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

146. To defray the expenses of the Dairy Branch.....	1,000 00
147. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural Representative Branch.....	15,000 00
148. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Agriculture..	2,139 02
149. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College..	22,170 00
150. To defray the expenses of the Macdonald Institute and Hall	3,300 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for the year 1920.
(*Sessional Papers, No. 49.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Tuesday, April 5th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 158), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, presented their Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the Bill to them referred, and report the same without amendment.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Fifth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills, and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 56), An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 203), intituled "An Act to amend The School Attendance Act, 1919." Mr. Brackin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 193), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time,

The Motion for the second reading, having been again put, was carried, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Committee on Proportional Representation. (*Sessional Papers, No. 81.*)

Also—Report on the Administration of Criminal Justice and Treatment of Prisoners in New York, Chicago, Detroit and Toronto, by His Honour Judge Coatsworth, Senior Judge of the County of York, Province of Ontario. (*Sessional Papers, No. 56.*)

The House then adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Wednesday, April 6th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Twelfth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:

Bill (No. 44) An Act respecting the County of Carleton.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 32), "An Act providing for the appointment of a Town Planning Commission for the City of Ottawa and defining the powers of such Commission," the same having been withdrawn by the promoters thereof.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 32), Ottawa Town Planning Commission.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 204), intituled "An Act to amend The Community Halls Act."
Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 205), intituled "An Act respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 206), intituled "An Act to provide for the construction of Township Roads by Special Assessment." Mr. Biggs.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 207), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 208), intituled "An Act respecting Professional Engineers." Mr. Gray.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 209), intituled "An Act to amend The Parole Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 210), intituled "An Act to amend The Marriage Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 211), intituled "An Act to amend The University Act." Mr. Grant.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Magladery asked the following Question:--

1. What has been the annual revenue collected by the Department of Mines or any Department year by year, since and including 1907, under the following headings: (a) Sale of mining lands and leases; (b) Royalties collected; (c) Profits tax collected; (d) Acreage tax collected. 2. What has been paid by the mines to the T.N.O. Railway Commission by way of royalties on mineral production.

And the Minister of Mines replied in the figures following:—

1. (a) 1907	\$1,206,282	22	1914	272,610	89
1908	44,057	11	1915	139,978	62
1909	254,114	78	1916	140,559	60
1910	435,580	92	1917	1,503,967	62
1911	90,065	57	1918	863,547	75
1912	84,732	82	1919	553,027	15
1913	115,947	37	1920	713,291	46
1914	57,497	26	(d) 1907	\$5,003	88
1915	60,426	46	1908	9,502	47
1916	52,797	05	1909	10,719	85
1917	73,899	51	1910	15,394	14
1918	47,544	73	1911	14,570	91
1919	42,781	32	1912	15,770	62
1920	61,506	92	1913	13,915	70
(b) 1907	\$207,945	06	1914	10,046	41
1908	218,071	96	1915	10,716	24
1909	338,426	66	1916	12,637	38
1910	246,529	13	1917	14,347	99
1911	285,913	26	1918	29,301	62
1912	250,145	65	1919	33,126	34
1913	200,333	01	1920	71,223	26
1914	74,685	11	2. 1907	\$50,901	32
1915	52,860	60	1908	134,820	27
1916	29,763	93	1909	172,856	98
1917	28,372	93	1910	31,762	92
1918	29,464	21	1911	17,060	56
1919	25,218	16	1912	135,500	31
1920	179,723	86	1913	81,421	20
(c) 1907	\$26,922	00	1914	55,874	45
1908	100,538	57	1915	26,268	74
1909	28,812	60	1916	49,877	62
1910	120,687	54	1917	119,576	04
1911	176,314	33	1918	96,579	78
1912	155,506	86	1919	25,396	08
1913	173,532	65	1920	57,296	28

Mr. Ireland asked the following Question:—

1. Is there an official known as "Assistant to the Deputy-Minister of Lands and Forests." 2. If so, what is his name. 3. At what date was he appointed to the position and what salary. 4. Has his salary been increased since his appointment. 5. If so, from what time did such increase date and what amount of arrears, if any, was paid with respect to such increase.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

(1) Yes. (2) Walter C. Cain. (3) 9th of July, 1920. At \$3,300 *per annum*. (4) Yes. (5) From the 1st of November, 1919, arrears \$825.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 168), To amend the Boards of Education Act, and after some time spent therein, the Committee rose.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 161), To amend The Public Parks Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 193), To amend The Public Inquiries Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 129), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 181), To amend The Burlington Beach Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 185), The Public Lands Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 190), To amend The Assessment Act, having been read,

Mr. Lewis moved, That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

145. To defray the expenses of the Live Stock Branch.....	12,221 00
151. To defray the expenses of the Colonization and Immigration	8,500 00
121. To defray the expenses of the English - French Training School, Sturgeon Falls	4,085 00

And the Committee having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Thursday, 7th April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

198.	To defray the expenses of the Department of Mines.....	20,700 00
200.	To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous.....	2,100 00
202.	To defray the expenses of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission	1,443,283 33
153.	To defray the expenses of the Parliament and Departmental Buildings Maintenance	104,653 00
154.	To defray the expenses of the Osgoode Hall Maintenance..	7,000 00
155.	To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous, Maintenance and Repairs of Government Buildings	19,516 00
156.	To defray the expenses of the Osgoode Hall, Repairs.....	21,500 00
157.	To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Toronto, Repairs	11,300 00
158.	To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa, Repairs	9,400 00
159.	To defray the expenses of the Normal School, London, Repairs	2,570 00
160.	To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Hamilton, Repairs	1,130 00
161.	To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Peterborough, Repairs	2,750 00
162.	To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Stratford, Repairs	1,700 00
163.	To defray the expenses of the Normal School, North Bay, Repairs	1,400 00
164.	To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for Deaf, Belle- ville, Repairs	20,575 75
165.	To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for Blind, Brantford, Repairs	7,700 00

166. To defray the expenses of the Training School, Sandwich..	1,345 44
167. To defray the expenses of the Training School, Sturgeon Falls	18,000 00
168. To defray the expenses of the Northern Academy, Monteith	2,000 00
169. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Brockville..	4,000 00
170. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton..	6,500 00
171. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Kingston..	28,136 72
172. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, London....	11,000 00
173. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Mimico....	10,000 00
174. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Orillia....	11,000 00
175. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Whitby....	393,000 00
176. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Woodstock..	3,500 00
177. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Burwash....	35,350 00
179. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Veterinary College, Repairs	500 00
180. To defray the expenses of the Horticultural Experiment Station, Vineland	11,000 00
181. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Algoma..	1,450 00
182. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Kenora....	300 00
183. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Manitoulin	200 00
184. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Muskoka..	300 00
185. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Nipissing..	1,400 00
186. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Parry Sound	38,400 00
187. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Rainy River	2,000 00

188. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Sudbury..	36,600 00
189. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Temiskaming	24,010 00
190. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings, Thunder Bay	20,600 00
191. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Public Buildings	500 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The House then adjourned at 5.15 a.m.

Thursday, April 7th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'Clock, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Thirteenth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 42), An Act to incorporate the Town of River Side.

Bill (No. 43), An Act to annex certain land to the Town of Ford City.

Bill (No. 52), An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

Bill (No. 188), An Act to incorporate Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

Your Committee recommend that notwithstanding Rule 51 of Your Honourable House, the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended to and inclusive of Thursday, the Twenty-first day of April instant.

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the twenty-first day of April instant.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 212), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.” Mr. Webster.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 213), intituled “An Act to amend The Municipal Act.” Mr. Ireland.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 99), To amend The Agricultural Associations Act.

Bill (No. 81), To amend The Succession Duties Act.

Bill (No. 76), To amend The Motor Vehicles Act.

Bill (No. 133), To amend The Audit Act.

Bill (No. 135), The Highways Improvement Act, 1921.

Bill (No. 45), To incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

Bill (No. 102), Respecting The Ontario Provincial Police Force.

Bill (No. 162), Respecting the Lake Huron and Northern Ontario Railway Company.

Bill (No. 165), To amend The Minimum Wage Act.

Bill (No. 15), To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Bill (No. 66), Respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York.

Bill (No. 38), Respecting the Town of Gananoque.

Bill (No. 117), To amend The Police Magistrates Act.

Bill (No. 120), Respecting the Adoption of Children.

Bill (No. 60), Respecting Legitimation of Children by subsequent inter-marriage of their parents.

Bill (No. 178), To license Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

Bill (No. 193), To amend The Public Inquiries Act.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 118), To provide for the appointment of Police Magistrates with extended jurisdiction, having been read,

Mr. Raney moved,

That the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. Dewart moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. O'Neill,

That all the words of the Motion after the first word "That" be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:—

"The Bill be not now read the third time but be forthwith recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by striking out subsection one of section 5, and by substituting therefor the following:—

(1) Subject to the provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3)—a Police Magistrate appointed under this Act shall have concurrent jurisdiction with any other Police Magistrate in any Municipality or Territory which is within the territorial jurisdiction described in his Commission and may act within such territorial jurisdiction described in his Commission, in the case of the illness, or absence, or at the request of the existing Police Magistrate whose appointment has been heretofore or may be hereafter made, and independently

of such illness or absence or request in case there is no Police Magistrate existing for the Municipality or Territory in question.”

And the Amendment, having been put, was lost on a division.

The Motion for the third reading, having been again submitted, was carried, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 111), To incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing, having been read, Mr. Drury moved,

That the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. Lang moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Hall,

“That all the words of the Motion after the first word “That” be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

“The Bill be not now read the third time but be forthwith recommitted to a Committee of the whole House with instruction to amend the same by adding to Section 2 the following words:

“And all lands that are the property of or may be hereafter acquired by Spruce Falls Company, Limited.”

And the Amendment having been put was lost on a division.

The Motion for the third reading having been then again put was carried and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 115), To amend the Toronto and Hamilton Highway Commission having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instruction to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 185), The Public Lands Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 194), Respecting the Office of King's Printer, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 166), To amend the Public Health Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 158), To amend the Loan and Trusts Corporations Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 170), Respecting Fair Rentals of Dwelling Houses, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

193. To defray the expenses of the Department of Public Highways	14,250 00
178. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph	171,600 00
195. To defray the expenses of the Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous	101,400 00
196. To defray the expenses of the Treasury Department, Miscellaneous	78,088 10
112. To defray the expenses of the Public and Separate School Education	649,627 95
126. To defray the expenses of the Technical Education	485,175 00
152. To defray the expenses of the Hospitals and Charities.....	81,000 00
197. To defray the expenses of the Department of Lands and Forests, Outside Service and Surveys.....	265,000 00

And the Committee having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, 8th April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Warren reported. That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The House then adjourned at 5.05 a.m.

Friday, April 8th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker then addressed His Honour as follows:

May it please Your Honour,

The Legislative Assembly of the Province, having at its present Sittings passed certain Bills to which, on behalf and in the name of the said Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant then read the Titles of the Acts that had been passed as follows:—

An Act to amend The Agricultural Associations Act.

An Act to amend The Succession Duties Act.

An Act to amend The Motor Vehicles Act.

An Act to amend The Toronto and Hamilton Highway Commission Act.

An Act to amend The Audit Act.

An Act, The Highway Improvement Act, 1921.

An Act to incorporate the Town of Tecumseh.

An Act respecting the Ontario Provincial Police Force.

An Act to provide for the Appointment of Police Magistrates with Extended Jurisdiction.

An Act to incorporate the Town of Kapuskasing.

An Act respecting the Lake Huron and Northern Ontario Railway Company.

An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

An Act respecting the Office of Crown Attorney in the City of Toronto and the County of York.

An Act respecting the Town of Gananoque.

An Act to amend The Police Magistrates Act.

An Act respecting the Adoption of Children.

An Act respecting Legitimation of Children by subsequent inter-marriage of their Parents.

An Act to license Billiard and Pool Rooms and Bowling Alleys.

An Act to amend The Public Inquiries Act.

An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

An Act respecting the Town of Mimico.

An Act respecting the City of Belleville.

An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

An Act respecting the Town of Pembroke.

An Act to legalize and confirm By-law No. 29 (1920), of the City of Kingston.

An Act respecting the Town of Port Colborne.

An Act respecting Sons of England Benefit Society.

An Act respecting the City of Chatham.

An Act to authorize the Law Society of Upper Canada to admit James Petrie Pratt to practise as a Barrister and Solicitor.

An Act to incorporate the Provincial Synod of Ontario of the Church of England, in Canada, and to make provisions respecting Vestry Meetings.

An Act respecting the Township of Stamford.

An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of Ottawa.

An Act respecting the City of Windsor and to validate sales of land.

An Act to incorporate the Town of Georgetown.

An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.

An Act respecting the Village of Acton.

An Act respecting the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William.

An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

An Act respecting the formation of a joint Industrial and Technical School Board for the City of Windsor and the Town of Walkerville.

An Act respecting the Town of Midland.

An Act respecting the City of Guelph.

An Act to amend the Charter of McMaster University.

To these Acts the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, in the following words:—

“In His Majesty’s name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Acts.”

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Mr. Drury, from the Special Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 67), Respecting Voters’ Lists in Cities, presented their Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the Bill to them referred and have prepared certain amendments thereto.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 214), intituled “An Act to amend The Notaries Act.” Mr. McDonald.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. What settlement has been arrived at, as between either the Government or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario with the different parties who claim to have rights regarding the purchase of properties in the Township of Bruton in the Provisional County of Haliburton and other properties referred to in an agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and A. J. McComber, bearing date 18th February, 1920. 2. Has there been any change in the proprietorship of the properties (a) In the Township of Bruton; (b) In the saw-mill, river improvements and other lands and premises said to have been purchased by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission from the Rathbun Company in 1918; (c) The logging camps buildings and equipments in the Township of Bruton said to be owned by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission; (d) In the pulp mill in the Village of Campbellford said to be owned by the said Power Commission with the lands appertaining thereto.

To which Mr. Carmichael, Minister without Portfolio, replied in the words following:—

1. Settlement was made with Mr. A. J. McComber and representatives, they being paid the sum of \$10,000 in full settlement, including interest on moneys deposited to the credit of the Commission and all the law charges and expenses and the discharge of a registered option which they held. 2. No.

Mr. Tooms asked the following Question:—

1. Is the Provincial Government still encouraging emigration to this Province. 2. How many persons have been influenced through this Department to emigrate to Ontario. 3. What is their destination. 4. How many have been placed in situations on farms or taken up land through this Department. 5. Is any action being taken by the Government to restrict or prevent mechanics or city workers from emigrating to this Province.

And the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. Yes, for agricultural purposes, competent domestic help and investors, especially in farm lands. 2. Impossible to give exact figures. 3. Distributed to farms in different sections of the Province direct from the boat or immediately after arrival. 4. During present fiscal year approximately 1,000 to date. 5. This is a matter of Federal jurisdiction, but Ontario agents are instructed to discourage emigrants other than those defined in answer to Question 1.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 152), To amend The Highway Improvement Act, and after some time spent therein.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 14), To confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 200), To amend The Division Courts Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 203), To amend The School Attendance Act, 1919.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 49), Respecting the Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Town of Oakville.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 40), Respecting the Town of Kincardine.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 183), To amend The Statute Labour Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 196), To amend The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 202), To amend The Ontario Telephone Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

Monday, April 11th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. McNamara, from the Select Committee to which was referred a Resolution of the House respecting the establishment of an Industrial Rehabilitation Board in the Province, presented their Report, which was read. (*Appendix No. 1.*)

On Motion of Mr. Curry, seconded by Mr. Godfrey,

Ordered, That notwithstanding the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills has elapsed, the Rule be suspended and leave be given to present a Petition relating to the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, and that the same be now read and received.

The following Petition was then presented, received and read:—

The Petition of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm a certain agreement.

On Motion of Mr. Curry, seconded by Mr. Godfrey,

Ordered, That notwithstanding the time for introducing Private Bills has expired, the Rule be suspended and leave be given to introduce a Bill relating to the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, and that the same be read a first time and stand referred to the Committee on Private Bills, irrespective of any Report from the Committee on Standing Orders in such case made and provided.

The following Bill was then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 215), intituled "An Act respecting the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited." Mr. Curry.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 216), intituled "An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 217), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act." Mr. Mills.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. McNamara asked the following Question:—

In the event that it is decided by the Dominion Government to open and operate a summer camp, or camps, for the training of active militia and affiliated units on the military strength of Canada, which are established within the Province of Ontario, is it the intention of the Ontario Government to grant leave of absence with pay to members of such units who are employed in the Civil Service of the Province, to the end that they may avail themselves of such training.

To which the Premier replied in the words following:—

Employees in the Civil Service are entitled to three weeks' leave of absence with salary, and may take military training during that time. If considered necessary additional leave will be granted, but will, in all cases be conditional on the requirements of the Public Service.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 158), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Homuth reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 187), Respecting Long Point Park, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 56), To amend The Local Improvement Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr.

Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 183), To amend The Statute Labour Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 196), To amend The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Sandy reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 202), To amend The Ontario Telephone Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Sandy reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 57), To amend The Planning and Development Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

Tuesday, April 12th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 218), intituled "The Northern Light Railways Act." Mr. Bowman.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 219), intituled "An Act respecting the purchase, by the City of Toronto, of the Assets of certain Companies." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 220), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 221), intituled "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 37), Respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 49), Respecting the Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Town of Oakville.

Bill (No. 40), Respecting the Town of Kincardine.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 24), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 10), Respecting the City Gas Company of London.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 44), Respecting the County of Carleton.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 36), Respecting the City of Ottawa.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 43), To annex certain lands to the Town of Ford City.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 52), Respecting the City of Kitchener.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 188), To incorporate Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 201), To amend The County Judges Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 204), To amend The Community Halls Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 199), To amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 195), To regulate the sale and installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 197), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 96), Respecting Farm Loans in Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 97), For the promotion of Agricultural Development, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 98), To finance Agricultural Development, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 196), To amend The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

192. To defray the expenses of the Department of Labour.....	481,710	52
194. To defray the expenses of the Game and Fisheries.....	50,600	00
199. To defray the expenses of the Refund Account.....	75,496	18

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Wednesday, April 13th, 1921.

The Committee continued, and after some time

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Widdifield reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Minister of Education of the Province of Ontario for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 17.*)

Also—Regulations and Orders-in-Council made since March 17th, 1921, of the Department of Education or of the Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of 23rd February, 1921. That there be laid before the House, a Return showing the number of convictions made under The Ontario Temperance Act for breaches of the said Act for years 1919-1920: 1. At the instance of officers of the Board of License Commissioners.

2. At the instance of officers of the Ontario Provincial Police. 3. At the instance of Municipal Police officers. 4. The number of cases in which fines or sentences have been remitted, reduced, or commuted: (1) Upon the recommendation of the Board of License Commissioners; (2) Without the recommendation of the Board of License Commissioners. (*Sessional Papers, No. 84.*)

The House then adjourned at 12.05 a.m.

Wednesday, April 13th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Sixth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill and beg to report the same with certain amendments:

Bill (No. 145), An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 222), intituled "An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgage Act." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 223), intituled "An Act concerning the Employment of Women During the Night." Mr. MacBride.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 224), intituled "An Act concerning the night work of Young Persons Employed in Industry." Mr. MacBride.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 225), intituled "An Act fixing the Minimum Wage for Industrial Employment." Mr. MacBride.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 226), intituled "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 227), intituled "An Act respecting the Practice of Architecture." Mr. Hill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 100), To amend The Agricultural Societies Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 93), Respecting Provincial Auctioneers.

Bill (No. 90), To amend The Public Parks Act.

Bill (No. 138), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Bill (No. 166), To amend The Public Health Act.

Bill (No. 152), To amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill (No. 14), To confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia.

Bill (No. 56), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Bill (No. 57), To amend The Planning and Development Act.

Bill (No. 196), To amend The Municipal Tax Act, 1920.

Bill (No. 37), Respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 49), Respecting the Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Town of Oakville.

Bill (No. 40), Respecting the Town of Kincardine.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 89), Respecting the Two-Platoon System for the Employees of Permanent Fire Departments, having been read,

Mr. Halcrow, for Mr. Crockett, moved,

That the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. Calder moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Marshall,

That all the words of the Motion after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted:

"The Bill be not now read the third time, but be read the third time on this day six months."

And the Amendment, having been put, was lost on the following Division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Allan.	Govenlock.	Mageau.	Rennie.
Asmussen.	Hay.	Marshall.	Ross
Bowman.	Henry.	Mewhinney.	Ross (Kingston)
Calder.	Ireland.	Montgomery.	(Glengarry)
Cooke.	Johnston	Murdoch.	Sewell.
Cridland.	(Lanark)	Nixon.	Stringer.
Ecclestone.	Kennedy.	Oke.	Walker.
Evans.	McArthur.	Racine.	Webster.
Fowler.	McLeod.	Rankin.	Widdifield—34.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Black.	Dewart.	Johnston	Raney.
Brackin.	Doherty.	(Simcoe)	Rollo.
Buckland.	Drury.	Joynt.	Sinclair.
Cameron.	Evanturel.	Lewis.	Slack.
Carmichael.	Ferguson.	McDonald.	Stevenson.
Carty.	Grant.	McNamara.	Swayze.
Casselman.	Halcrow.	MacBride.	Taylor.
Clarke.	Hall.	Marceau.	Thompson.
Cooper	Heenan.	Mathieu.	Tolmie.
(Welland)	Hicks.	Mills.	Tooms.
Crawford.	Hill.	O'Neill.	Warren.
Cunningham.	Homuth.	Ramsden.	Watson—47.
Curry.			

PAIRS.

None.

The Motion for the third reading having been then again proposed, was carried on the following Division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Black.	Dewart.	Johnston	Raney.
Brackin.	Doherty.	(Simcoe)	Rollo.
Buckland.	Drury.	Joynt.	Sinclair.
Cameron.	Evanturel.	Lewis.	Slack.
Carmichael.	Ferguson.	McDonald.	Stevenson.
Carty.	Grant.	McNamara.	Swayze.
Casselman.	Halcrow.	MacBride.	Taylor.
Clarke.	Hall.	Marceau.	Thompson.
Cooper	Heenan.	Mathieu.	Tolmie.
(Welland)	Hicks.	Mills.	Tooms.
Crawford.	Hill.	O'Neill.	Warren.
Cunningham.	Homuth.	Ramsden.	Watson—47.
Curry.			

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Allan.	Govenlock.	Mageau.	Rennie.
Asmussen.	Hay.	Marshall.	Ross
Bowman.	Henry.	Mewhinney.	Ross (Kingston)
Calder.	Ireland.	Montgomery.	Ross (Glengarry)
Cooke.	Johnston	Murdoch.	Sewell.
Cridland.	(Lanark)	Nixon.	Stringer.
Ecclestone.	Kennedy.	Oke.	Walker.
Evans.	McArthur.	Racine.	Webster.
Fowler.	McLeod.	Rankin.	Widdifield—34.

PAIRS.

None.

And the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. Has judgment been given by Mr. Justice Rose in an action instituted by the Attorney-General against the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Company tried before Hon. Mr. Justice Rose in December last, and if so, when. 2. What in short was the effect of the judgment if so given. 3. Has any further action been taken by the Government since the said judgment was so delivered. 4. What action, if any, has been taken with regard to the alleged rights of the said Company in Pic River and Black Sturgeon Timber Limits. 5. Has any work been done by the said Company or anyone else in the erection of mills or buildings upon the said limits. 6. Has any site been approved of for the location of any mill or mills, and if so, where is said site relative to the Town of Port Arthur and Fort William. 7. Has any arrangement been made by the Government or agreement entered into by the Company regarding the power that the Company is to use, if they are to be permitted to continue, and if so, what is the nature of the arrangement or agreement.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words following:—

1. Yes, March 10th, 1921. 2. The action was for a declaration that the defendant company was bound to take from the Hydro-Electric Power Com-

mission the supply of electrical energy necessary to operate certain pulp and paper mills and for an injunction to restrain the defendant company from obtaining elsewhere electrical power for the said purpose. The learned trial judge held that on the evidence he was unable to find that it had been proved that there had been an agreement binding in the defendant company to take electrical power from the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 3. No. 4. None. 5. No. 6. Yes, a portion of what is known as Indian Mission Reserve, which adjoins City of Fort William on the south, but does not touch City of Port Arthur, which latter city is situated some two miles east of the said location. 7. No.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 212), To amend The Municipal Drainage Act.

Referred to the Municipal Committee.

Bill (No. 186), Respecting Natural Gas.

Referred to a Select Committee to be composed as follows:—Messieurs Mills, Crockett, Stringer, Doherty, Webster, Tisdelle, Brackin, Tolmie, Cooper (Welland), Henry and Allan.

Bill (No. 209), To amend The Ontario Parole Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 29), Respecting the Township of Etobicoke and The Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited.

Bill (No. 24), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 10), Respecting the City Gas Company of London.

Bill (No. 44), Respecting the County of Carleton.

Bill (No. 36), Respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 43), To annex certain lands to the Town of Ford City.

Bill (No. 52), Respecting the City of Kitchener.

Bill (No. 188), To incorporate Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 195), To regulate the sale and installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 204), To amend The Community Halls Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sum:—

201. To defray the expenses of the Hydro-Electric Power	
Commission	\$29,347,700 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities upon the Prisons and Reformatories for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 26.*)

Also—Report of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities upon the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 25.*)

The Premier presented to the House by Command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Copy of Report of R. D. Johnson *et al* on the Queenston-Chippawa Power Development, with statement of professional record of H. S. Kerbaugh and Francis Lee Stuart, with letters. (*Sessional Papers, No. 85.*)

Mr. Carmichael, Minister without Portfolio, presented to the House by Command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of R. S. Lea, Consulting Engineer of Progress on Queenston-Chippawa Power Development, January 31st, to April 9th, 1921. (*Sessional Papers, No. 86.*)

The House then adjourned at 12 Midnight.

Thursday, April 14th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'Clock, P.M.

Mr. McCrea, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presented their second report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills and have prepared certain amendments thereto respectively:—

Bill (No. 137), Respecting Reciprocal or Inter-Insurance.

Bill (No. 177), To provide for the maintenance of Parents by their Children.

Your Committee have also carefully considered the following Bills and report the same without amendment:—

Bill (No. 180), To amend The Registry Act.

Bill (No. 203), To amend The School Attendance Act, 1919.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 228), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Public Service Superannuation Act." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 230), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act." Mr. Dewart.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bill was, *nemine contradicente*, introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 229), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." Mr. Johnston (Simcoe.)

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion and Amendment for the adoption of the Special Report *in re* the administration of The Ontario Temperance Act, having been read,

The Debate was resumed.

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, April 15th, 1921.

The Debate continued.

And after some time,

The Amendment to the Amendment, having been again put, was lost on a Division.

The Amendment having been then again put, was lost on a Division.

The Main Motion having been then again put, was lost on a Division.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 209), To amend The Ontario Parole Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 205), Respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-day.

Mr. Watson, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following Resolutions:—

108. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eight thousand three hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-one cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Civil Government for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

109. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Legislation for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

110. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sundry Civil and Criminal Justice for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

111. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand seven hundred and thirty-eight dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Administration of Justice in Districts for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

112. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six hundred and eight thousand one hundred and twenty-seven dollars and ninety-five cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public and Separate School Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

113. *Resolved*. That a sum not exceeding Six thousand three hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-seven cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Toronto, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

114. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand nine hundred and thirty-nine dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

115. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

116. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand seven hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

117. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Peterborough, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

118. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand four hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Stratford, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

119. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, North Bay, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

120. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Ottawa, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

121. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand and eighty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Sturgeon Falls, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

122. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Vankleek Hill, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

123. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Sandwich, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

124. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-one thousand six hundred and eight dollars and twenty-seven cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of High Schools and Collegiate Institutes for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

125. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Libraries, Art Schools, Historical, Literary and Scientific Societies, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

126. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and eighty-five thousand one hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Technical Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

127. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial and other Universities for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

128. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-three thousand four hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Northern Academy, Monteith, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

129. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand seven hundred and seventy-five dollars and sixty-seven cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

130. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

131. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty thousand nine hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

132. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-five thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Brockville, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

133. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixteen thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Cobourg, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

134. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-four thousand nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

135. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighteen thousand two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Kingston, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

136. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-six thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

137. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fourteen thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Mimico, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

138. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Orillia, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

139. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Penetanguishene, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

140. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-three thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Whitby, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

141. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ten thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Woodstock, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

142. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fourteen thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Burwash, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

143. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Fort William, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

144. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Public Institutions for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

145. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand two hundred and twenty-one dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Live Stock Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

146. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Dairy Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

147. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural Representative Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

148. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand one hundred and thirty-nine dollars and two cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

149. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-two thousand one hundred and seventy dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

150. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Macdonald Institute and Hall for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

151. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization and Immigration for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

152. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-one thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hospitals and Charities for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

153. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and four thousand six hundred and fifty-three dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings, Maintenance and Repairs for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

154. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall, Maintenance and Repairs for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

155. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nineteen thousand five hundred and sixteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Maintenance and Repairs for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

156. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-one thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall, Repairs and Alterations, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

157. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Toronto, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

158. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nine thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

159. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand five hundred and seventy dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

160. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand one hundred and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

161. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Peterborough, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

162. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Stratford, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

163. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, North Bay, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

164. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand five hundred and seventy-five dollars and seventy-five cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario School for Deaf, Belleville, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

165. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario School for Blind, Brantford, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

166. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand three hundred and forty-five dollars and forty-four cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Training School, Sandwich, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

167. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighteen thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Training School, Sturgeon Falls, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

168. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Northern Academy, Monteith, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

169. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Brockville, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

170. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

171. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-eight thousand one hundred and thirty-six dollars and seventy-two cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Kingston, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

172. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

173. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ten thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Mimico, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

174. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Orillia, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

175. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and ninety-three thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Whitby, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

176. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Hospital, Woodstock, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

177. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-five thousand three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Burwash, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

178. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seventy-one thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

179. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Veterinary College for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

180. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Horticultural Experimental Station, Vineland, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

181. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand four hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Algoma, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

182. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Kenora, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

183. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Manitoulin, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

184. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Muskoka, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

185. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Nipissing, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

186. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Parry Sound, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

187. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Rainy River, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

188. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-six thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Sudbury, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

189. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-four thousand and ten dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Temiskaming, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

190. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings, Thunder Bay, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

191. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Public Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

192. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and eighty-one thousand seven hundred and ten dollars and fifty-two cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Labour for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

193. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fourteen thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Highways for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

194. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Game and Fisheries for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

195. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and one thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

196. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-eight thousand and eighty-eight dollars and ten cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Treasury Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

197. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Lands and Forests, Outside Service and Surveys, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

198. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

199. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-five thousand four hundred and ninety-six dollars and eighteen cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Refund Account for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

200. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

201. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-nine Million three hundred and forty-seven thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

202. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million four hundred and forty-three thousand two hundred and eighty-three dollars and thirty-three

cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

The several Resolutions having been read the second time, were concurred in.

Mr. Drury delivered to Mr. Speaker a Message from the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by himself; and the said Message was read by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:—

L. H. CLARKE.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Further Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the fiscal year ending October, 1921, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Toronto, 15th April, 1921.

(*Sessional Papers, No. 2.*)

Ordered, That the Message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the Estimates accompanying same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The House then adjourned at 1.35 a.m.

Friday, April 15th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 231), intituled "An Act to amend The School Laws." Mr. Grant.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 232), intituled "An Act to amend The Female Refuges Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 233), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act, 1917." Mr. Thompson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 234), intituled "An Act respecting the Extra-Mural Employment of Persons under Sentence." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 235), intituled "An Act respecting the Administration of Justice in the District of Temiskaming." Mr. Raney.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Tuesday next.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 116), To amend The Provincial Highways Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

The Order of the day for the third reading of Bill (No. 95), To amend The Dairy Standards Act, having been read,

Mr. Doherty moved,

That the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. Henry moved, in Amendment, seconded by Mr. Ferguson,

That all the words of the Motion after the first word "That" be omitted and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "The Bill be not now read the third time, but be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to add certain amendments."

And the Amendment, having been put, was lost on a Division.

The Motion for the third reading having been then again proposed, was carried, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 29), Respecting the Township of Etobicoke and The Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited.

Bill (No. 24), Respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 10), Respecting the City Gas Company of London.

Bill (No. 44), Respecting the County of Carleton.

Bill (No. 36), Respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 43), To annex certain lands to the Town of Ford City.

Bill (No. 52), Respecting the City of Kitchener.

Bill (No. 188), To incorporate Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

Mr. Gray asked the following Question:—

1. Has S. J. Martin, of Kemptville, been appointed to any position by the present Government. 2. If so, what is the position. 3. When was the appointment made. 4. What is the salary attached.

And the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. S. J. Martin was employed temporarily from March 18th to April 2nd. 2. Foreman in charge of tree-planting on the Ottawa-Prescott Highway. 3. Answered by 1. 4. \$4.50 *per day*.

Mr. Dewart asked the following Question:—

1. Were the proceeds of the loans of \$16,000,000, in December, 1920, and \$10,000,000 in February, 1921, amounting to approximately \$24,613,100, placed to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. 2. If so, what amounts of the said proceeds have been paid out up to March 10th, instant, for (a) Redemption of securities, specifying the date of redemption, amount, and character of the respective securities; (b) Payments on Hydro-Electric Commission account, specifying the date, amount, and particular application, if any, of the respective payments; (c) Payments on account of Highway development, specifying the date, amount and particular application of purpose, if any, of the respective payments; (d) Payments on other capital accounts, or for other general purposes of the Government. 3. What balance, if any, remained unexpended on March 10th of the proceeds of the said loans, and to the credit of what account is the same now deposited or credited.

And the Provincial Treasurer replied in the words and figures following:

1. Yes.

2 (a) None, but out of Consolidated Revenue Fund there was paid—

Treasury Bills, J.J., due Dec. 15th, 1920	\$5,000,000	00
Treasury Bills, G.G., due Feb. 3rd, 1921	333,000	00
Retirement of bonds and debentures, Jan.		
14th, Vr. 5478	142,053	00
Mar. 2nd, Vr. 9746	50,287	67
Mar. 7th, Vr. 9919	1,509	06
	—————	\$5,526,849 73

(b) None, but out of Consolidated Revenue Fund there was paid—

Hydro-Electric Power Commission—

Dec. 10th, Vr. 3007.....	\$1,000,000 00
Dec. 10th, Vr. 3011.....	1,000,000 00
Jan. 29th, Vr. 4370.....	1,000,000 00
Jan. 11th, Vr. 5452.....	1,000,000 00
Jan. 24th, Vr. 6543.....	1,000,000 00
Feb. 2nd, Vr. 7211.....	500,000 00
Feb. 9th, Vr. 7819.....	1,000,000 00
Feb. 26th, Vr. 8480.....	1,000,000 00
Feb. 26th, Vr. 9430.....	1,000,000 00
Mar. 8th, Vr. 10061.....	1,000,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$9,500,000 00

Queenston Development	6,950,000 00
Niagara System	850,000 00
Severn System	15,000 00
Eugenia System	55,000 00
Muskoka System	5,000 00
Waddell System	10,000 00
St. Lawrence System	35,000 00
Thunder Bay System	540,000 00
Central Ontario System	750,000 00
Nipissing System	20,000 00
Miscellaneous	200,000 00
Expenditure on account of Province...	70,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$9,500,000 00

(c) None, but out of Consolidated Revenue Fund there was paid—

Provincial Highway Construction—

Dec. 11th, Vr. 2778.....	\$500,000 00
Dec. 23rd, Vr. 4021.....	300,000 00
Jan. 5th, Vr. 4838.....	275,000 00
Jan. 21st, Vr. 6341.....	250,000 00
Feb. 2nd., Vr. 6923.....	250,000 00
Feb. 17th, Vr. 8484.....	250,000 00
Feb. 28th, Vr. 9435.....	250,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$2,075,000 00

County Highway Improvement—

Feb. 10th, Vr. 7726.....	\$84,349 32
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8686.....	122,222 44
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8689.....	153,954 19
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8690.....	57,149 73

Mar. 4th, Vr. 9829.....	47,938 31
Mar. 4th, Vr. 9830.....	101,257 56
Mar. 4th, Vr. 9831.....	102,466 26
Mar. 5th, Vr. 9010.....	336,527 09
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10427.....	84,945 64
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10428.....	85,428 59
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10429.....	113,793 95
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10430.....	67,207 97
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10431.....	80,698 80
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10432.....	100,612 64
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10433.....	46,966 10
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10434.....	63,714 72

\$1,649,238 31

Township Highway Improvement—

Feb. 14th, Vr. 7727.....	\$6,555 82
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8685.....	7,789 14
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8688.....	4,545 18
Feb. 21st, Vr. 8687.....	6,101 25
Feb. 21st, Vr. 9018.....	1,708 37
Feb. 21st, Vr. 9019.....	1,507 38
Feb. 22nd, Vr. 9021.....	3,051 03
Feb. 22nd, Vr. 9022.....	997 06
Feb. 22nd, Vr. 9023.....	670 16
Feb. 23rd, Vr. 9024.....	2,537 66
Feb. 23rd, Vr. 9025.....	861 30
Feb. 23rd, Vr. 9026.....	1,819 27
Feb. 23rd, Vr. 9020.....	1,516 87
Mar. 3rd, Vr. 9009.....	3,007 12
Mar. 7th, Vr. 9824.....	2,009 94
Mar. 7th, Vr. 9825.....	929 26
Mar. 8th, Vr. 9832.....	1,755 76
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10442.....	2,370 86
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10444.....	2,007 65
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10445.....	1,778 76
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10435.....	27,696 61
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10436.....	444 36
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10437.....	1,182 82
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10438.....	639 04
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10439.....	1,756 55
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10440.....	176 66
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10443.....	2,005 18
Mar. 10th, Vr. 10441.....	2,765 84

\$90,186 90

\$3,814,425 21

(d) None, but out of Consolidated Revenue Fund there
was paid\$9,308,628 27

3. In Consolidated Revenue Fund there was approximately
a balance of 7,677,670 05

Mr. Pinard asked the following Question—

1. What amount has been expended upon the Ottawa and Prescott Highway (1) Up to 31st December, 1920; (2) Since that date down to the 1st March, 1921. 2. How many miles have been completed. 3. What additional sum is estimated will be the cost to complete the said road. 4. When is the Government calculating that the road will be completed.

To which the Minister of Public Works replied in the words and figures following:—

1. (1) \$964,370.79; (2) \$86,616.49. 2. 30 miles. 3. \$792,491. 4. December 31st, 1923.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 67), Respecting Voters' Lists in Cities, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Tuesday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 203), To amend The School Attendance Act, 1919, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Tuesday next.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 210), To amend The Marriage Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Bill (No. 218), The Northern Light Railways Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

Ordered, That when this House adjourns To-day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the nineteenth instant, at Three of the Clock in the afternoon.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario, 1920.
(*Sessional Papers, No. 52.*)

Also—Report of the Civil Service Commissioner for Ontario, 1920.
(*Sessional Papers, No. 87.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

Tuesday, April 19th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Rollo, from the Standing Committee on Labour, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered Bill (No. 154), To amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act, and report the same without amendment.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 236), intituled "An Act respecting The Ontario Athletic Commission." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 237), intituled "An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act." Mr. Rollo.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 158), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 129), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 199), To amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 201), To amend The County Judges Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 198), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 207), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act, having been read,

Mr. Raney moved

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And after some time,

Mr. Tolmie moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Buckland,

That with a view to the consideration by a sub-committee of this House of the various Bills in amendment of The Ontario Temperance Act,

Be it resolved, That Bill (No. 207), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act be not now read a second time, but be referred to a Special Committee of this House consisting of the Members of this House who were appointed at the last Session of this Legislature to enquire as to the working and operation of The Ontario Temperance Act and the administration thereof, *viz.*, Messieurs Drury, Raney, Nixon, Watson, McCreary, Sandy, Lethbridge, Casselman, Hicks, Swayze, Heenan, Dewart, Marshall, Curry, Tolmie, Hay, Clarke, Pinard, Godfrey, Ross (Kingston), Henry, Ecclestone, Thompson, and Warren, with the addition of Messieurs Doherty and Ferguson, and to report to this House at the present Session.

And a Debate having ensued,

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Wednesday, 20th April, 1921.

The Debate continued,

And after some time

The Amendment, having been put, was lost on a Division.

The main Motion having been then again put, was carried, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House at the next sittings of the House To-day.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

226. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural and Horticultural Societies	904 00
227. To defray the expenses of the Live Stock Branch.....	11,050 00

229. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Veterinary College..	410 00
230. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous—Agriculture..	15,100 00
232. To defray the expenses of the Hospitals and Charities....	30,093 40

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

First Annual Report of The Mothers' Allowances Commission for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 88.*)

The House then adjourned at 2.35 a.m.

Wednesday, April 20th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Seventh Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill, and report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 153), An Act to amend The Public Schools Act, 1920.

Your Committee have also carefully considered the following Bill, and report the same without amendment:—

Bill (No. 164), An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 238), intituled “An Act respecting the Maintenance of Deserted Wives and Children.” Mr. McNamara.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 239), intituled “An Act to extend the Franchise to Women in Municipal Elections.” Mr. MacBride.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 240), intituled “An Act to amend The Timber Slide Companies Act.” Mr. McCrea.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Godfrey asked the following Question:—

1. Did the Attorney-General or any member of the Government agree to indemnify the Rev. J. O. L. Spracklin against the costs of the defence for his criminal trial. 2. Did the Attorney-General or any department of the Government receive any bill of such costs. 3. If so, what is the amount.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. No. 2. A bill has been rendered to the Reverend J. O. L. Spracklin which has been forwarded by him to the Board of License Commissioners with a request that the same be paid by them. 3. \$3,000.

Mr. Cameron asked the following Question:—

1. How long have private living rooms been furnished for Cabinet Ministers in the Parliament Buildings. 2. How many rooms were furnished and used by Cabinet Ministers prior to the present Government taking office. 3. Were any rooms occupied by others than Cabinet Ministers. 4. If so, by whom. 5. Has it been the custom for Cabinet Ministers to take furniture and other furnishings from these rooms when vacating their office. 6. Did any of the Cabinet Ministers of the late Government take any furniture or other articles from these rooms when retiring from office. 7. If so, who were they, and what were the articles taken. 8. Who gave them authority to take them.

To which the Minister of Public Works replied in the words following:—

1. Since the buildings were erected in the year 1893. 2. 7. 3. Yes. 4. The Honourable the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Housekeeper, the Government Whip. 5. No. 6. Yes. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General, the furniture from the room occupied by him as it was his own private property; the Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines, the window drapes and floor rugs from the room occupied by him. 8. The late Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Ireland asked the following Question:—

1. Has the Attorney-General, with a view to paying Commissioners Latchford and Riddell further sums of money for their services as Commissioners on the Timber Probe, secured an opinion from Counsel outside of his own department or from any of the legal staff of the Government, as to the authority of the Dominion Government to pass the Act of 1920 wherein it is provided that Supreme Court Judges acting as Commissioners are not permitted to receive pay for their services. 2. Is it the intention of the Government to make further payments to the said Commissioners.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words following:—

1. No. 2. This matter has not as yet been considered by the Government.

Mr. McCrea asked the following Question:—

1. Is Robert T. Harding now in the employ of the Attorney-General's Department; if so, in what capacity. 2. What is the rate of his remuneration.

To which the Attorney-General replied in the words following:—

1. Mr. Robert T. Harding is assisting Mr. Newton W. Rowell, K.C., in the action of the Attorney-General for Ontario *vs.* Chevlin-Clarke Company, Limited, *et al.* 2. No arrangement has been made as to his remuneration. His account will be taxed by the Department when received.

Mr. Ross (Kingston) asked the following Question:—

1. Is Newton W. Rowell, K.C., in the employ of the Attorney-General's Department; if so, in what capacity. 2. What is the rate of his remuneration.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. Mr. Newton W. Rowell, K.C., is acting as Counsel for the Government in the action of the Attorney-General for Ontario *vs.* Chevlin-Clarke Company, Limited, *et al.* 2. No arrangement has been made as to his remuneration. His account will be taxed by the Department when received.

Mr. O'Neill asked the following Question:—

1. What is the number of applications that have been made to the Attorney-General or any Minister or Member of the Government or the Board of License Commissioners for clemency and remission of fine or penalty imposed under The Ontario Temperance Act from the 1st day of March, 1920, to the 1st day of April, 1921. 2. What is the total number of such cases in which clemency was exercised in whole or in part in the said period. 3. What is the number of such cases in which clemency was recommended in whole or in part by the Board of License Commissioners and refused by the Attorney-General or the Executive Council in said period. 4. What is the number of such cases in which the Attorney-General has acted upon his own initiative in the said period.

To which the Attorney-General replied:—

1. 819. 2. 491. 3. None. 4. 4.

Mr. McNamara asked the following Question:—

1. Is J. C. Elliott, Esq., Barrister, of London, in the employ of the Government. 2. If so, what are his duties and what remuneration is he to receive.

And the Attorney-General replied:—

1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Crockett asked the following Question:—

1. How many cars were at the disposal of the Ministers on Nov. 1st, 1919. 2. How many cars were at their disposal on Nov. 1st, 1920. 3. Did the Public Works Department keep within its estimates regarding motor vehicles in fiscal year 1920. 4. Also in fiscal year 1919. 5. If not, how much did they

exceed said estimates during the fiscal year 1920. 6. What was the total amount spent during the fiscal year 1919 and also in 1920.

To which the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. Six. 2. Four. 3. Yes. 4. No. 5. Unexpended balance of appropriation, fiscal year 1920, \$3,382.74. 6. 1919, \$31,254.90; 1920, \$16,617.26.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 145), To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 180), To amend The Registry Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 199), To amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 205), Respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage, and after some time spent therein,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 210), To amend The Marriage Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 208), Respecting Professional Engineers.

Referred to a Select Committee to be hereafter named.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 191), To amend The Planning and Development Act, having been read,

Mr. Hill moved

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the negative.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 212), To amend The Municipal Drainage Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

204. To defray the expenses of the Legislation 84,615 00

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Thursday, 21st April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

208. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools,
Toronto 250 00

209. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools,
Ottawa 250 00

210. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, London. 250 00

211. To defray the expenses of the English-French Training
School, Sturgeon Falls 2,500 00

212. To defray the expenses of the English-French Training
School, Sandwich 100 00

213. To defray the expenses of the High Schools and Collegiate
Institutes 1,000 00

214. To defray the expenses of the Public Libraries, Art Schools,
Literary and Scientific Societies 850 00

216. To defray the expenses of the Technical Education. 4,000 00

217. To defray the expenses of the Northern Academy, Monteith 5,500 00

218. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Deaf,
Belleville 500 00

219. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Blind,
Brantford 500 00

220. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Education..	15,812 00
221. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Reformatory, Guelph	80,550 00
222. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Brick and Tile Plant, Mimico	5,000 00
223. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Reformatory Indus- tries	71,400 00
224. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Burwash..	3,000 00
225. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Public Institu- tions	2,726 00
247. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretary's Depart- ment, Miscellaneous	251,300 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Johnston (Simcoe) reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Final Report of Hugh L. Cooper & Co. *re* Queenston-Chippawa Development of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. (*Sessional Papers*, No. 89.)

The House then adjourned at 2.00 a.m.

Thursday, April 21st, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fourteenth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Fecunis, Limited.

Bill (No. 51), An Act respecting the division of the Township of Ferris, in the District of Nipissing.

Bill (No. 54), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 27), "An Act to incorporate a part of the Township of York as the Township of North York," on the ground that the Bill be not further proceeded with; and also, that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 31), "An Act respecting the Town of St. Mary's," the same having been withdrawn by the promoters thereof.

Your Committee recommend that notwithstanding Rule 51 of Your Honourable House, the time for receiving reports of Committees on Private Bills be extended to and inclusive of Thursday the Twenty-eighth day of April, instant.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 27), North York, and on Bill (No. 31), St. Mary's, the same being not further proceeded with.

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the Twenty-eighth day of April, instant.

Mr. Smith, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented their Second Report, which was read as follows:—

Your Committee recommend that the following Documents be printed:—

The Public Accounts. (*Sessional Papers, No. 1.*)

The Estimates. (*Sessional Papers, No. 2.*)

Report of Department of Lands and Forests. (*Sessional Papers, No. 3.*)

Report of Department of Mines. (*Sessional Papers, No. 4.*)

Report of Inspector of Division Courts. (*Sessional Papers No. 5.*)

Report of Inspector of Legal Offices. (*Sessional Papers, No. 6.*)

Report of Inspector of Registry Offices. (*Sessional Papers, No. 7.*)

Report of Municipal Auditor. (*Sessional Papers, No. 8.*)

Report of Queen Victoria Park Commissioners. (*Sessional Papers, No. 9.*)

Report of Inspector of Insurance. (*Sessional Papers, No. 10.*)

Report of Registrar of Friendly Societies. (*Sessional Papers, No. 11.*)

Report of Registrar of Loan Corporations. (*Sessional Papers, No. 12.*)

Report of Department of Public Works. (*Sessional Papers, No. 13.*)

Report of Game and Fish Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 14.*)

Report on Highway Improvement. (*Sessional Papers, No. 15.*)

Report of Bureau of Labour. (*Sessional Papers, No. 16.*)

Report of Department of Education. (*Sessional Papers, No. 17.*)

Report of University of Toronto. (*Sessional Papers, No. 18.*)

Report of Secretary and Registrar. (*Sessional Papers, No. 19.*)

Report of Registrar-General. (*Sessional Papers, No. 20.*)

Report of Board of Health. (*Sessional Papers, No. 21.*)

Report on Hospitals for the Insane. (*Sessional Papers, No. 22.*)

Report on Hospitals for Idiotic and Epileptic. (*Sessional Papers, No. 23.*)

- Report on the Feeble-Minded. (*Sessional Papers, No. 24.*)
- Report on Hospitals and Charities. (*Sessional Papers, No. 25.*)
- Report on Common Gaols and Prisons. (*Sessional Papers, No. 26.*)
- Report on Neglected and Dependent Children. (*Sessional Papers, No. 27.*)
- Report on Operation of the Liquor License Acts. (*Sessional Papers, No. 28.*)
- Report on Department of Agriculture. (*Sessional Papers, No. 29.*)
- Report of Agricultural College. (*Sessional Papers, No. 30.*)
- Report of Veterinary College. (*Sessional Papers, No. 31.*)
- Report of Experimental Union. (*Sessional Papers, No. 32.*)
- Report of Stallion Enrollment Board. (*Sessional Papers, No. 33.*)
- Report of Vegetable Growers' Association. (*Sessional Papers, No. 34.*)
- Report of Corn Growers' Association. (*Sessional Papers, No. 35.*)
- Report of Entomological Society. (*Sessional Papers, No. 36.*)
- Report of Beekeepers' Association. (*Sessional Papers, No. 37.*)
- Report of Dairymen's Associations. (*Sessional Papers, No. 38.*)
- Report of Live Stock Branch. (*Sessional Papers, No. 39.*)
- Report of Housing Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 40.*)
- Report of Women's Institutes. (*Sessional Papers, No. 41.*)
- Report of Agricultural Societies. (*Sessional Papers, No. 42.*)
- Report of Horticultural Societies. (*Sessional Papers, No. 43.*)
- Report of Fruit Growers' Association. (*Sessional Papers, No. 44.*)
- Report of Experimental Station at Vineland. (*Sessional Papers, No. 45.*)
- Report of Bureau of Industries. (*Sessional Papers, No. 46.*)
- Report of Bureau of Municipal Affairs. (*Sessional Papers, No. 47.*)

Report of T. and N. O. Railway Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 48.*)

Report of Hydro-Electric Power Commission. (*Sessional Paper, No. 49.*)
(*One half of the number of the copies of this report to be retained by the King's Printer.*)

Report of Railway and Municipal Board. (*Sessional Papers, No. 50.*)

Return from Records *re* Elections. (*Sessional Papers, No. 51.*)

Report from Provincial Archivist. (*Sessional Papers, No. 52.*)

Report of Provincial Auditor. (*Sessional Papers, No. 54.*)

Report of Workmen's Compensation Board. (*Sessional Papers, No. 55.*)

Judge Coatsworth's Report. (*Sessional Papers, No. 56.*)

Report of Board of Parole. (*Sessional Papers, No. 57.*)

Report of Rural Credits Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 58.*)

Report of Commission on Hydro-Electric Systems. (*Sessional Papers, No. 59.*)

Interim Report on Issue of Marriage Licenses. (*Sessional Papers, No. 62.*)

Interim Report on Police Magistrates. (*Sessional Papers, No. 63.*)

Report of Commission on University Finances. (*Sessional Papers, No. 65.*)

Interim Report on Timber Licenses. (*Sessional Papers, No. 67.*)

Report of Soldiers' Aid Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 69.*)

Report of Commission on Hydro Wages. (*Sessional Papers, No. 77.*)

Interim Report on Coroners. (*Sessional Papers, No. 80.*)

Report on Proportional Representation. (*Sessional Papers, No. 81.*)

Report *re* Hydro by Hugh L. Cooper. (*Sessional Papers, No. 85.*)

Report *re* Hydro by R. S. Lea. (*Sessional Papers, No. 86.*)

Report of Civil Service Commissioner. (*Sessional Papers, No. 87.*)

Report of Mothers' Allowance Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 88.*)

Your Committee recommend that Sessional Papers, Nos. 85 and 86 be printed in one volume.

Your Committee recommend that 2,500 copies of "Telephone Systems" be printed after being fully revised, so as to include all amendments to date.

Your Committee recommend that the following books be purchased and distributed to the Members:—

125 copies of "History of Brant County," F. Douglas Reville, at \$4 *per* copy.

116 copies of "Canadian Annual Review," at \$7 *per* copy.

116 copies of "Parliamentary Guide," Chambers, at \$3 *per* copy.

116 copies of "Heaton's Annual," at \$2 *per* copy.

500 copies of "Five Thousand Facts about Canada," Frank Yeigh, at 23 cents *per* copy.

115 copies of "Canadian Almanac," at \$2.35 *per* copy.

Your Committee recommend that the following Documents be not printed:

Report on State of Library. (*Sessional Papers, No. 53.*)

Distribution of Statutes. (*Sessional Papers, No. 60.*)

Regulations of Department of Education. (*Sessional Papers, No. 61.*)

Return *re* Timber Limits. (*Sessional Papers, No. 64.*)

Return *re* School Books. (*Sessional Papers, No. 66.*)

Return *re* Spruce Falls Company. (*Sessional Papers, No. 68.*)

Return *re* Issuers of Marriage Licenses. (*Sessional Papers, No. 70.*)

Return *re* Duties of Police Magistrates. (*Sessional Papers, No. 71.*)

Return *re* Superintendent of Ontario Provincial Police. (*Sessional Papers, No. 72.*)

Return *re* Board of Health. (*Sessional Papers, No. 73.*)

Return *re* Smith and Hanna. (*Sessional Papers, No. 74.*)

Return *re* Dismissal of L. R. Luke. (*Sessional Papers, No. 75.*)

Statement of Athletic Commission. (*Sessional Papers, No. 76.*)

Return, Increase Mining Taxes. (*Sessional Papers, No. 78.*)

Return *re* Mining Leases and Grants. (*Sessional Papers, No. 79.*)

Return *re* Mining Tax Act. (*Sessional Papers, No. 82.*)

Return *re* Game and Fish Department. (*Sessional Papers, No. 83.*)

Return *re* Convictions under O.T.A. (*Sessional Papers, No. 84.*)

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the foregoing Report.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 241), intituled “An Act respecting the Examining and Licensing of Electrical Contractors and Journeymen Electricians.” Mr. Swayze.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 242), intituled “The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.” Mr. Doherty.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1921, the following sums:—

205. To defray the expenses of the Sundry Civil and Criminal Justice	252,366 66
206. To defray the expenses of the Administration of Justice in Districts	140 00
245. To defray the expenses of the Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous	5,500 00
203. To defray the expenses of the Civil Government.....	43,476 02
207. To defray the expenses of the Public and Separate School Education	27,885 80
215. To defray the expenses of the Provincial and other Universities	1,515,344 00
228. To defray the expenses of the Fruit Branch	9,000 00
231. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College	30,050 00
233. To defray the expenses of the Government House, Maintenance and Repairs	800 00
234. To defray the expenses of the Parliament and Departmental Buildings, Maintenance and Repairs	3,500 00
235. To defray the expenses of the Osgoode Hall, Maintenance and Repairs	1,200 00
236. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous Maintenance and Repairs of Government Buildings	4,300 00
237. To defray the expenses of the Public Institutions—Buildings	70,000 00
238. To defray the expenses of the Educational Buildings.....	182,866 20
240. To defray the expenses of the Public Works	295,150 00
241. To defray the expenses of the Department of Labour.....	152,200 00
239. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College, Buildings	50,800 00

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, 22nd April, 1921.

The House continued to sit in Committee.

242. To defray the expenses of the Colonization Roads	650,681	75
243. To defray the expenses of the Department of Public Highways	11,447	60
244. To defray the expenses of the Game and Fisheries.....	12,056	50
246. To defray the expenses of the Treasury Department, Miscellaneous	22,954	68
248. To defray the expenses of the Outside Service and Surveys..	183,500	00
249. To defray the expenses of the Parks	5,000	00
250. To defray the expenses of the Department of Mines.....	26,500	00
251. To defray the expenses of the Refund Account.....	21,734	28
252. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous.....	11,103	43

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

Mr. Watson, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following further Resolutions:—

203. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-three thousand four hundred and seventy-six dollars and two cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Civil Government for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

204. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-four thousand six hundred and fifteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Legislation for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

205. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty-two thousand three hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-six cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Administration of Justice, Civil and Criminal, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

206. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and forty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Administration of Justice in Districts for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

207. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-seven thousand eight hundred and eighty-five dollars and eighty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public and Separate School Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

208. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Toronto, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

209. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

210. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

211. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Sturgeon Falls, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

212. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Training School, Sandwich, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

213. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of High Schools and Collegiate Institutes for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

214. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Libraries, Art Schools, Historical and Scientific Societies for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

215. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million five hundred and fifteen thousand three hundred and forty-four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial and other Universities for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

216. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Technical Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

217. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Northern Academy, Monteith, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

218. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

219. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

220. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand eight hundred and twelve dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Education for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

221. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty thousand five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Reformatory, Guelph, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

222. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Brick and Tile Plant, Mimico, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

223. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-one thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Reformatory Industries for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

224. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Burwash, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

225. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand seven hundred and twenty-six dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Public Institutions for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

226. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nine hundred and four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural and Horticultural Societies for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

227. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Live Stock Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

228. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nine thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Fruit Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

229. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and ten dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Veterinary College for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

230. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Agriculture for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

231. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

232. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty thousand and ninety-three dollars and forty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hospitals and Charities for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

233. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Government House, Maintenance, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

234. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings, Maintenance, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

235. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall, Maintenance, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

236. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Maintenance and Repairs of Government Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

237. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Institutions, Buildings, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

238. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eighty-two thousand eight hundred and sixty-six dollars and twenty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Educational Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

239. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College, Buildings, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

240. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-five thousand one hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Works for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

241. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and fifty-two thousand two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Labour for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

242. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six hundred and fifty thousand six hundred and eighty-one dollars and seventy-five cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization Roads for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

243. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand four hundred and forty-seven dollars and sixty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Highways for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

244. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand and fifty-six dollars and fifty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Game and Fisheries for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

245. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

246. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-two thousand nine hundred and fifty-four dollars and sixty-eight cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Treasury Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

247. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty-one thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Secretary's Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

248. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eighty-three thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Outside Service and Surveys for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

249. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parks for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

250. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-six thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

251. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-one thousand seven hundred and thirty-four dollars and twenty-eight cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Refund Account for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

252. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand one hundred and three dollars and forty-three cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1921.

The several Resolutions, having been again read, were concurred in.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Ordered, That the following Members compose the Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 208), Respecting Professional Engineers:— Messieurs Doherty, Biggs, Webster, Slack, Halcrow, Gray, Lewis, Calder, and McLeod.

Mr. Drury delivered to Mr. Speaker a Message from the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by himself; and the said Message was read by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:—

L. H. CLARKE.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the year ending 31st October, 1922, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Toronto, April 21st, 1921.

(*Sessional Papers*, No. 2.)

Ordered, That the Message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the Estimates accompanying same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The House then adjourned at 1.25 a.m.

Friday, April 22nd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Stringer, The Petition of the County Council of Haldimand.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 243), intituled "An Act to amend The Optometry Act." Mr. Ramsden.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 244), intituled "An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act." Mr. Henry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 245), intituled "An Act respecting Vocational Education." Mr. Grant.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 246), intituled "An Act to amend The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Marceau asked the following Question:—

1. What purchases of (a) Motor cars, and (b) Motor trucks have been made by or on behalf of the Government since November 13th, 1919; and upon what dates respectively. 2. In what cases were tenders called for. What were the respective tenders in each case, and the names of the tenderers. 3. What tenders were accepted in each case. 4. In case tenders were not called for, in what cases and why were they not called for.

And the Minister of Public Works replied in the words and figures following:—

1.—(a) Motor cars purchased—

Item 1—March 18th, 1920	1
Item 2—March 13th, 1920	1
Item 3—May 14th, 1920	20
Item 4—May 21st, 1920	1
Item 5—June 10th, 1920	4
Item 6—November, 1919	1
Item 7—January, 1920	1
Item 8—February, 1920	1
Item 9—March, 1920	3
Item 10—April, 1920	4
Item 11—May, 1920	8
Item 12—June, 1920	4
Item 13—July, 1920	5
Item 14—August, 1920	1
Item 15—October, 1920	1
Item 16—March, 1921	1
Item 17—April, 1921	2
Item 18—July 19th, 1920	17
Item 19—May 18th, 1920	1
Item 20—May 19th, 1920	1
Item 21—May 11th, 1920	1
Item 22—June 21st, 1920	1

(b) Motor trucks purchased—

Item 1—December 6th, 1919	1
Item 2—December 30th, 1919	12
Item 3—January 5th, 1920	1
Item 4—February 7th, 1920	3
Item 5—May 6th, 1920	6
Item 6—May 6th, 1920	1
Item 7—June 21st, 1920	1
Item 8—July 7th, 1920	1
Item 9—July 22nd, 1920	2
Item 9a—July 22nd, 1920	2
Item 10—August 24th, 1920	2
Item 11—August 21st, 1920	1
Item 12—September 28th, 1920	2
Item 13—September 28th, 1920	4
Item 14—November 1st, 1920	1
Item 15—November 6th, 1920	2
Item 16—July 15th, 1920	1

Item 17—May 18th, 1920	1
Item 18—May 18th, 1920	1
Item 19—July 13th, 1920	1
Item 20—July 24th, 1920	1
Item 21—October 4th, 1920	1
Item 22—October 23rd, 1920	1

2. Tenders were received for the following motor cars noted as Items 2, 3, and 18—

Item 2—W. C. Warburton	\$475 00	and old car.
Universal Car Co.	425 00	and old car.
Toronto Motor Car Co.	425 00	and old car.
A. D. Gorrie Co.	400 00	and old car.
Item 3—M. & H. Jerome	927 00	
Sparling and Reeson	927 80	
A. D. Gorrie & Co.	929 30	
Toronto Motor Car Co.	929 30	
Universal Car Co.	931 55	
W. C. Warburton	932 54	
Bradley & Love	932 79	
Riverdale Garage	934 30	
See and Smith	939 30	
Item 18—United Auto Sales, Ltd.	1,595 00	
Frank Barton, Ltd.	2,900 00	
G. E. Gooderham & Co.	1,140 00	
Toronto Motor Car Co., Ltd.	1,218 60	
Crang's Garage, Ltd.	1,336 63	
Premier Motor Sales, Ltd.	1,497 50	
M. & H. Jerome	1,217 26	

Tenders were called for motor trucks under the Items referred to as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 9a, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, as follows:—

Item 1—W. C. Warburton	\$962 00
Item 3—M. & H. Jerome	950 00
Toronto Motor Car Co.	960 00
Sparling & Reeson	966 30
A. D. Gorrie	992 00
Item 4—Sparling & Reeson	742 50
A. D. Gorrie & Co.	757 00
Toronto Motor Car Co.	808 00
M. & H. Jerome	810 00
W. C. Warburton	810 58

Item 5—	M. & H. Jerome	730 00	
	Universal Car Co.	740 00	
	Toronto Motor Car Co.	750 00	
	Sparling & Reeson	750 50	
	W. C. Warburton	752 00	
	Riverdale Garage Co.	763 00	
Item 6—	A. D. Gorrie & Co.	\$320 00	and old truck.
	W. C. Warburton	370 00	and old truck.
Item 7—	W. C. Warburton	475 30	and old truck.
Item 9—	National Truck	each 5,950 00	f.o.b. Toronto.
	Republic Truck	each 6,166 00	" Toronto.
	Stewart Truck	each 6,540 00	" Hamilton.
	Paige Truck	each 6,600 00	" Toronto.
	Adanae Truck	each 4,767 00	" Detroit.
	Tiffin Truck	each 6,836 00	" Toronto.
	Acason Truck	each 7,540 00	" Windsor.
	Packard Truck	each 7,592 81	" Windsor.
Item 9a—	F. W. D. Truck	each 7,695 00	" Kitchener.
	Leyland Truck	each 8,000 00	" Toronto.
	White Truck	each 8,125 00	" Toronto.
	Sterling Truck	each 8,300 00	any dest'n.
	Sentinel Truck	each 8,920 00	f.o.b. Mont'al.
Item 11—	W. C. Warburton	782 38	
Item 12—	M. & H. Jerome	924 20	
	Toronto Motor Car Co.	942 00	
	A. D. Gorrie	975 38	
	See and Smith	980 72	
Item 13—	M. & H. Jerome	649 00	
	A. D. Gorrie	674 58	
	W. C. Warburton	678 08	
	See and Smith	769 72	
Item 14—	M. & H. Jerome.....	448 00	& old chassis.
	W. C. Warburton & Co.	517 80	& old chassis.
	A. D. Gorrie	535 38	& old chassis.
Item 16—	H. E. Givan, Ltd.	8,100 00	
	The Crompton Car Co.	8,250 00	
	Packard-Ontario Motor Car.....	7,800 00	
	Republic Motors, Ltd.	4,365 00	
	Grace Motors, Ltd.	5,400 00	
	Reo Motor Sales Co.	6,250 00	
	The White Motor Car, Ltd.	5,128 85	

3. Motor cars—

- Item 2—W. C. Warburton.
- Item 3—M. & H. Jerome.
- Item 18—M. & H. Jerome.

Motor trucks—

- Item 1—W. C. Warburton.
- Item 3—M. & H. Jerome.
- Item 4—Tender for Sparling and Reeson—accepted for three Ford roadsters.
- Item 5—Tenders of M. & H. Jerome—accepted for six Ford roadsters.
- Item 6—Tender of A. D. Gorrie for Ford truck.
- Item 7—Tender of W. C. Warburton—accepted for Ford truck chassis and purchase of old chassis.
- Item 9—Lowest tender is National Truck—two purchased.
- Item 10—Next lowest, Canadian built, two purchased, F. W. D. trucks.
- Item 11—W. C. Warburton.
- Item 12—Tender of M. & H. Jerome for two Ford trucks complete.
- Item 13—Tender of M. & H. Jerome for four Ford roadsters with express bodies accepted.
- Item 14—Tender of M. & H. Jerome for Ford ton chassis and purchase of old chassis is accepted.
- Item 16—The White Motor Co., Limited.

4. Motor cars—

- Item 1—Old car exhibited to dealers and best offer accepted.
- Item 4—Demonstration car secured at reduced price.
- Item 5—Only one firm could supply cars when needed.
- Items 6-17 incl.—They were all Ford cars purchased locally in the district in which they were to be used at the time needed and at standard prices, and in practically every case a used car was turned in as part payment.
- Items 19-22 incl.—Standard list prices were paid.

Motor trucks—

- Items 2, 21, 22—Standard price.
- Item 8—Second-hand steam truck.
- Item 10—The contractor purchased trucks for paving contract which was later cancelled because of shortage of materials. This prevented work being done and trucks were taken over by the Government at standard price.
- Item 15—Quotations received satisfactory.

Items 17-18—Standard list prices were paid.

Items 19-20—Written proposals were submitted by the Toronto Motor Car Co. which supplies a special body required for the particular work under the direction of the bridge foreman. Ford trucks at standard price. The most satisfactory body determined the purchase.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 137), Respecting Reciprocal or Inter-Insurance, and after some time spent therein,

Mr. Thompson moved

That the Bill be not reported.

And the Motion having been put, was carried in the Committee by a standing vote, and it was

Ordered, That the Bill be not now reported.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 177), To provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 154), To amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 164), To amend The Line Fences Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 201), To amend The County Judges Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 218), The Northern Light Railways Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 198), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 207), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 161), To amend The Public Parks Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 229), To amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for year ending 31st October, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 29.*)

Also—Report of the Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 30.*)

Also—Report of the Entomological Society of Ontario, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 36.*)

Also—Report of the Beekeepers' Association, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 37.*)

Also—Report of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 38.*)

Also—Report of the Live Stock Branch of the Department of Agriculture, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 39.*)

Also—Report of the Women's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 41.*)

Also—Report of Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 44.*)

Also—Report of the Statistics Branch of the Department of Agriculture, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 46.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Monday, April 25th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the County Council of Haldimand, praying for certain amendments to The Highway Improvement Act, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Johnston (Simcoe), seconded by Mr. Halcrow,

Ordered, That the Rules relating to Private Bills be suspended and leave be given to introduce a Bill respecting the Town of Midland, and that the same be referred direct to the Standing Committee on Private Bills for consideration and report.

The following Bill was then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 247), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Midland." Mr. Johnston (Simcoe.)

Ordered, That the Bill be referred direct to the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 248), intituled "An Act respecting proof of death of Soldiers and Sailors while on Active Service." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 249), intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Companies Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 250), intituled "An Act to amend The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 183), To amend The Statute Labour Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 230), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act.

Referred to the Legal Committee.

Bill (No. 216), To amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 221), To amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 222), To amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 228), To amend The Ontario Public Service Superannuation Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 232), To amend The Female Refuges Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 234), Respecting the Extra-mural Employment of Persons under Sentence.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 235), Respecting the Administration of Justice in the District of Temiskaming.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 236), Respecting the Ontario Athletic Commission.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 226), To amend The Power Commission Act, having been read,

Mr. Raney moved

That the Bill be now read the second time,

And a Debate having arisen, it was, on the Motion of Mr. Webster,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Resolved, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolution respecting an amendment to The Current Rate of Interest Act.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That section 2 of The Current Rate of Interest Act be amended by inserting after the word "debentures" in the tenth line thereof, the words "heretofore or."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolution as follows:—

Resolved, That section 2 of The Current Rate of Interest Act be amended by inserting after the word "debentures" in the tenth line thereof, the words "heretofore or."

The Resolution having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 251), To amend The Current Rate of Interest Act.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Biggs,

Resolved, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting the raising of Money for the Public Service.

Mr. Drury acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, 1. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan a sum of money not exceeding Twenty Million Dollars (\$20,000,000) for all or any of the purposes following, that is to say: For the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account, for paying any floating indebtedness of Ontario, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature, which sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years at a rate not exceeding seven *per centum per annum*, and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario, and shall be chargeable thereupon.

2. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to such loan and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one *per centum per annum* on the amount of such debentures or stock as specified in subsection 2 of section 4 of The Provincial Loans Act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to certain Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. MacVicar reported the Resolutions as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan a sum of money not exceeding Twenty Million Dollars (\$20,000,000) for all or any of the purposes following, that is to say: For the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account, for paying any floating indebtedness of Ontario, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature, which sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years at a rate not exceeding seven *per centum*

per annum, and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario, and shall be chargeable thereupon.

2. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to such loan and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one *per centum per annum* on the amount of such debentures or stock as specified in subsection 2 of section 4 of The Provincial Loans Act.

The Resolutions having been read the second time, were agreed to, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Bill (No. 252), For raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The following Bills were then severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 251), intituled “An Act to amend The Current Rate of Interest Act.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 252), intituled “An Act for raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 253), intituled “An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1922, the following sums:—

- 1. To defray the expenses of the Office of the Lieutenant-Governor 8,450 00

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock, midnight,

Tuesday, 26th April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 6. To defray the expenses of the Department of Mines..... | 125,800 00 |
| 7. To defray the expenses of the Department of Public Works | 80,250 00 |

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Hicks reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The House then adjourned at 12.15 a.m.

Tuesday, April 26th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fifteenth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 215), An Act respecting The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 247), An Act respecting the Town of Midland.

Your Committee recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 16), "An Act to enable the Town of Hawkesbury to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Counties of Prescott and Russell," the same having been withdrawn by the promoters thereof.

Ordered, That the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 16), Town of Hawkesbury.

Mr. Mills, from the Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 186), Respecting Natural Gas, presented their Report, which was read' as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the Bill to them referred, and have prepared certain amendments thereto.

On Motion of Mr. Raney, seconded by Mr. Drury,

Ordered, That Bill (No. 114), Respecting Liens of Mechanics and Wage-Earners, Supply Men and others, and Bill (No. 123), Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies, be referred to a Select Committee to be composed as follows: Messieurs Sinclair, Marshall, Hill, Price, Curry, Homuth, Swayze, Rollo and Raney, said Committee to be empowered to sit during the Recess and report to the House at the next Session thereof.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has not concluded the business referred to it, be permitted to sit To-day during the Session of the House.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1922, the following sums:—

11. To defray the expenses of the Treasury Department.....	101,725 00
12. To defray the expenses of the Audit Office	49,000 00
14. To defray the expenses of the Department of Agriculture..	117,800 00
15. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous.....	25,175 00

17. To defray the expenses of the Supreme Court of Ontario..	104,650 00
18. To defray the expenses of the Sundry Civil and Criminal Justice	617,330 00
19. To defray the expenses of the Administration of Justice in Districts	259,095 00
20. To defray the expenses of Public and Separate School Educa- tion	3,128,865 00
21. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Toronto	123,867 00
22. To defray the expenses of the Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa	84,760 00
23. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, London.....	42,499 00
24. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Hamilton...	37,620 00
25. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Peterborough..	38,750 00
26. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, Stratford....	37,000 00
27. To defray the expenses of the Normal School, North Bay..	57,950 00
28. To defray the expenses of the English-French Professional Training Schools	60,755 00
29. To defray the expenses of the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes	222,500 00
30. To defray the expenses of the Departmental Library and Museum	17,600 00
31. To defray the expenses of the Public Libraries, Art Schools, Historical, Literary and Scientific Societies	119,700 00
32. To defray the expenses of Technical Education	891,150 00
33. To defray the expenses of Superannuated Teachers.....	70,150 00
34. To defray the expenses of the Provincial and other Univer- sities	781,720 00
35. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville	141,030 00

36. To defray the expenses of the Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford	95,634 00
37. To defray the expenses of the Northern Academy, Monteith. . .	44,980 00
38. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Education.	38,200 00
39. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Brockville. .	239,422 00
40. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Cobourg. . .	121,000 00
41. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton. . .	296,265 00
42. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Kingston. . .	195,305 00
43. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, London. . . .	282,887 00
44. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Mimico. . . .	202,480 00
45. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Orillia. . . .	205,927 00
46. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Penetang- uishene	119,140 00
47. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Toronto. . . .	197,667 00
48. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Whitby. . . .	356,594 00
49. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Hospital, Woodstock. .	83,306 00
50. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Reformatory, Guelph . .	127,550 00
51. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Reformatory Industries .	170,400 00
52. To defray the expenses of the Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Females	60,250 00
53. To defray the expenses of Industries, Andrew Mercer Re- formatory for Females	10,000 00
54. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Burwash. . . .	183,674 00
55. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Farm, Fort William .	24,020 00
56. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Public Institutions. .	73,925 00

57. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural and Horticultural Societies	185,850 00
58. To defray the expenses of the Live Stock Branch	108,900 00
59. To defray the expenses of the Institutes.	30,800 00
16. To defray the expenses of Legislation	320,250 00
60. To defray the expenses of the Dairy Branch.	158,000 00
61. To defray the expenses of the Fruit Branch.	77,800 00
62. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural Representatives Branch	142,000 00
63. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Veterinary College.	34,360 00
64. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Agriculture.	96,450 00
65. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College.	293,655 00
66. To defray the expenses of the Macdonald Institute and Hall	57,622 00
67. To defray the expenses of the Forestry	1,000 00
68. To defray the expenses of the Animal Husbandry, Farm and Experimental Feeding Department	36,210 00
69. To defray the expenses of the Field Experiments.	20,580 00
70. To defray the expenses of the Experimental Dairy Department	10,100 00
71. To defray the expenses of the Dairy School.	9,350 00
72. To defray the expenses of the Poultry Department.	22,208 00
73. To defray the expenses of the Horticultural Department.	21,598 00
74. To defray the expenses of the Apicultural Department.	4,950 00
75. To defray the expenses of Bacteriology	3,650 00
76. To defray the expenses of Botany.	3,670 00
77. To defray the expenses of Chemistry.	4,470 00

78. To defray the expenses of Entomology	4,500 00
79. To defray the expenses of English	500 00
80. To defray the expenses of Manual Training.....	2,100 00
81. To defray the expenses of Physics	7,470 00
82. To defray the expenses of Farm Economics.....	29,075 00
83. To defray the expenses of Colonization and Immigration...	163,100 00
84. To defray the expenses of Hospitals and Charities.....	789,300 00
85. To defray the expenses of the Government House.....	26,800 00
86. To defray the expenses of the Parliament and Departmental Buildings	345,111 35
87. To defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall.....	51,875 00
88. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Public Buildings..	61,600 00
89. To defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings	100,000 00
90. To defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall.....	7,000 00
91. To defray the expenses of Public Institutions.....	241,000 00
92. To defray the expenses of the Educational Buildings.....	190,250 00
93. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College Buildings	154,600 00

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock, mid-
night,

Wednesday, 27th April, 1921.

The House continued in Committee.

9. To defray the expenses of the Public Highways	220,125 00
10. To defray the expenses of the Game and Fisheries Depart- ment	56,425 00
98. To defray the expenses of the Colonization Roads.....	107,300 00

99. To defray the expenses of the Department of Public High-ways	1,163,020 00
94. To defray the expenses of Districts Buildings	217,600 00
95. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous	177,000 00
96. To defray the expenses of Public Works	180,833 33

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Agricultural and Experimental Union, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 32.*)

Also—Report of the Vegetable Growers' Association, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 34.*)

Also—Report of the Horticultural Societies, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 43.*)

Also—Supplement to Report of the Bureau of Archives, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 52.*)

The House then adjourned at 1.00 a.m.

Wednesday, April 27th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. McCrea, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presented their Third Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills and have prepared certain amendments thereto respectively:—

Bill (No. 142), To amend The School Sites Act.

Bill (No. 200), To amend The Division Courts Act.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Eighth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered Bills Nos. 72, 73, 84, 86, 91, 94, 106, 113, 121, 130, 131, 139, 141, 148, 157, 160 and 163, To amend The Municipal Act, and such of their provisions as have been approved of have been embodied in a Bill intituled "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921."

Your Committee have also carefully considered Bills Nos. 70, 83, 92, 103, 140 and 151 to amend The Assessment Act, and such of their provisions as have been approved of have been embodied in a Bill intituled "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921."

Mr. Curry, from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented their Report, which was read. (*Appendix No. 2.*)

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 254), intituled "An Act to amend The Election Laws." Mr. Drury.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 255), intituled "An Act to confirm a certain Agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corporation of the City of Guelph." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 256), intituled "An Act to amend The Motor Vehicles Act." Mr. Brackin.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 257), intituled "An Act respecting Fair Rents." Mr. Ramsden.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 258), intituled "An Act to authorize the purchase and operation of certain Radial Railways by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the City of Toronto." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 259), intituled "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921." Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 260), intituled "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921. Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 74), The Reforestation Act.

Bill (No. 75), To provide for Development Work in Northern and North-western Ontario.

Bill (No. 194), Respecting the Office of King's Printer.

Bill (No. 202), To amend The Ontario Telephone Act.

Bill (No. 96), Respecting Farm Loans in Ontario.

Bill (No. 97), For the Promotion of Agricultural Development.

Bill (No. 98), To finance Agricultural Development.

Bill (No. 204), To amend The Community Halls Act.

Bill (No. 158), To amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill (No. 145), To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

Bill (No. 218), The Northern Light Railways Act.

Bill (No. 164), To amend The Line Fences Act.

Bill (No. 183), To amend The Statute Labour Act.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 67), Respecting Voters' Lists in Cities, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

Mr. Lewis asked the following Question:—

1. Did the Department of Lands and Forests have an estimate of the timber on the six berths, *viz.*, Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 disposed of in the sale dated January 31st, 1920, to E. W. Backus or the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company. 2. If so, what was the estimate.

And the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. The blocks referred to are mainly portions of berths formerly under license cut over and abandoned which contain only remnants of timber left by former licensees. The probable amount of timber involved did not warrant the expense of a cruise on which to base an estimate. 2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Hill asked the following Question:—

1. What steps are being taken by the Government to secure reliable data with regard to the employments which offer openings for children leaving school at the age of 16. 2. What action does the Government contemplate taking so as to ascertain the kind of training that will be necessary to enable children to qualify for such openings. 3. Has consideration been given by the Government as to the advisability of establishing junior employment offices in the larger centres of industry as a means of securing this employment information and of furnishing the necessary vocational guidance in order that the gulf between school and employment may be successfully bridged. 4. Having in mind that under the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, the Dominion Government stands committed to share in the maintenance expense of any such offices, how soon does the Ontario Legislature intend to establish these Junior Employment Offices.

And the Minister of Education replied in the words following:—

1. The Government's inquiries have been concerned with employment opportunities for adolescents from 14 to 18 years of age, as such opportunities have a direct bearing upon the planning of suitable part-time and full-time instruction under The Adolescent School Attendance Act. Vocational education surveys have been made by the officers of the Technical Branch of

the Department in Chatham, the Border Cities, Brantford, Fort William, Peterborough, Guelph, Galt, Belleville, St. Thomas and St. Catharines. The executive officers of the business and industrial establishments, by direct reference to pay-rolls when necessary, supplied the officials not only with information regarding the number of boys and girls employed, but also indicated the nature of the work they were doing. By visits through the plants the officials were able to see the boys and girls at work. The reports on these surveys have been completed and are forwarded to the Boards of Education concerned. The report on the Peterborough survey has been printed in my Annual Report for 1920, which is now ready for distribution. When a city, with a view to the enforcement of The Adolescent School Attendance Act, undertakes to make a school census, the officers of the Department co-operate with a view to having the census made in such a way as to give definite information regarding the employment of each adolescent. The Vocational Education Survey and the School Census of St. Catharines were completed at the same time. The result is that St. Catharines now knows the kind of job and the name and address of the employer of each one of its 528 employed adolescents.

2. The Government has been acting for over a year in this matter. When making the vocational education surveys, two of the main subjects of consideration between the officials of the Technical Branch and the executive and technical officers of the commercial and industrial establishments have been (a) What preparatory instruction will be most helpful before employment? (b) What supplementary and up-grading instruction, in the form of part-time and evening class work, will be most helpful during employment, especially during the earlier years? In each survey report, specific suggestions are made on the basis of the answers and discussions of these questions. The problems of determining and arranging for such training in a manner most suitable for all concerned were also a matter of consideration between the officials and the officers of the local Trades and Labour Councils in the respective communities concerned. In each centre in the case of both the employers and employees a sympathetic attitude and a willingness to co-operate were manifested. These inquiries have revealed the general nature of the special courses of instruction needed in the centres surveyed and in other centres having a similar commercial and industrial basis. Further steps are necessary, however, before the most effective detailed work can be done in giving each particular course of instruction. A careful analysis of the jobs in which the boys and girls are expected to make good is necessary to determine in detail the manipulative and operative skills and the related knowledge needed for success. It must then be ascertained what can be given to best advantage in the schools and what by direct experience in the industry. To determine with definiteness the up-grading training during employment, an intensive study of each of our industries from bottom to top is needed. The officers of the Technical Branch have made a good beginning in the direct study of these problems. They are co-operating also with the staffs of the vocational schools in the study of the same problems. The Department has in view the issuing of circular letters

or bulletins giving in greater detail suggestions respecting the organization of courses. The officers of the Technical Branch will be ready at all times to lend assistance to Boards of Education in forming or carrying out plans.

3. The Government has given some consideration to the advisability of establishing juvenile employment offices in the larger centres, and in order to ascertain the need of such an undertaking, a study has been made of a number of industries to determine how far it is possible to employ juvenile labour in them as well as to determine the occupational opportunities in them for boys and girls. Among the industries included in this survey are boots and shoes, saddlery and harnessing, textiles, millinery and dressmaking, department stores, printing, biscuits and confectionery, and furniture. The Department of Education has given careful consideration to the problem of vocational guidance and of determining the training most suitable for those who are to enter commercial and industrial pursuits. Provision is being made this Session to authorize Boards of Education to appoint vocational guidance officers. Provision is also being made this Session to authorize Advisory Committees to employ on the staffs of the vocational schools officers to be known as co-ordinators. The chief duty of the co-ordinator will be to assist the Principal in keeping the work of the school, from the standpoint of the training being given, related in the most advantageous way to the technical requirements of business and industry. Such an officer will be a liaison officer, as it were, between the school and the fields into which the graduates of the school are to go. He will function necessarily also as a follow-up officer to the extent needed for the graduates of the school with which he is associated. The vocational guidance officers and co-ordinators will co-operate with such employment offices as may be established in ways that are found to be most advantageous.

4. When the need for juvenile employment offices is established steps will immediately be taken to create them.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 154). To amend the Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered. That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 153), To amend The Public Schools Act, 1920, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered. That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 205), Respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 198), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 216), To amend The Crown Attorneys Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 221), To amend The Mothers' Allowances Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 222), To amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgage Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 234), Respecting the Extra-mural Employment of persons under sentence, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 228), To amend The Ontario Public Service Superannuation Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered. That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 186), Respecting Natural Gas, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had made some progress and had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

The Order of the day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 79), To amend The Mining Tax Act, having been read

The Debate was resumed.

And after some time the motion for the second reading having been again put, was carried, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time :

Bill (No. 6), Respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 30), Respecting Fecunis, Limited.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 51), Respecting the division of the Township of Ferris in the District of Nipissing.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 54), Respecting the Township of York.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 215), Respecting the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 247), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 211), To amend The University Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 217), To amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 231), To amend The School Laws.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 242), The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 237), To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 245), Respecting Vocational Education.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 213), To amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 227), Respecting the Practice of Architecture.

Referred to the same Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 208), Respecting Professional Engineers.

Bill (No. 240), To amend The Timber Slide Companies Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 241), Respecting the Examination and Licensing of Electrical Contractors and Journeymen Electricians.

Referred to the same Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 208), Respecting Professional Engineers.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 59), Respecting the Lake of the Woods Control Board, having been read,

Mr. Drury moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And a Debate having ensued,

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock, mid-night,

Thursday, April 28th, 1921.

The debate continued.

And after some time, it was

Ordered, That the Order for the second reading be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 101), To amend The Marriage Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 192), To amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 214), To amend The Notaries Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 58), Respecting Construction of Certain Works on Lakes and Streams in Ontario, having been read,

Ordered. That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 206), To provide for the construction of Township Roads by Special Assessment, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 246), To amend The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 169). The Workmen's Compensation Act, having been read,

Ordered. That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 232), To amend The Female Refuges Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1922, the following sums:—

3. To defray the expenses of the Attorney-General's Department	156,350 00
5. To defray the expenses of the Department of Lands and Forests	218,700 00
8. To defray the expenses of the Department of Labour	377,000 00
13. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretary's Department	256,850 00
97. To defray the expenses of the Department of Labour	1,452,500 00
2. To defray the expenses of the Department of Prime Minister and President of the Council	32,250 00
100. To defray the expenses of the Game and Fisheries	466,400 00
103. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretary's Department, Miscellaneous	4,150 00
104. To defray the expenses of Outside Service and Surveys	1,283,050 00
105. To defray the expenses of the Parks	105,000 00
106. To defray the expenses of the Department of Mines	128,000 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. MacVicar reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also. That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-day.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-day.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Doherty,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Hill be added to the Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 208), Respecting Professional Engineers.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Secretary and Registrar of the Province for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 19.*)

Also—Report of the Department of Public Highways for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 15.*)

Also—Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 55.*)

Also—Return to an Order of the House of the 25th February, 1921, That there be laid before this House a Return showing:—1. How many miles are included in the Ottawa-Prescott Highway. 2. How many miles of this Highway were completely graded at the end of the year 1920. 3. How much grading still remains to be done. 4. What was the average cost *per* mile of the grading completed. 5. What amount was spent during the year 1920 on equipment for the Ottawa-Prescott Highway. 6. How many men were employed in each of the months of 1920. 7. Has the Government purchased any gravel pits or stone quarries along or in the vicinity of the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and if so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid for each; and (c) What was the area of each. 8. Has the Government rented any gravel pits or stone quarries along or in the vicinity of the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and if so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid for each; and (c) What was the area of each. 9. Did the Government purchase any gravel or stone for the right-of-way of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway, and if so (a) From whom; (b) What was paid *per* cubic yard; and (c) What was the total amount paid each man. 10. How many culverts were built during the year 1920. 11. How many still remain to be completed. 12. How many culverts were built (a) By day labour; (b) By contract. 13. If any were built by the latter (a) Who were the contractors; (b) What were the unit prices paid; (c) What lump sums were paid to each contractor. 14. What was the cost *per* cubic yard of the said culverts in place built by day labour. 15. What was the cost *per* cubic yard of the said culverts in place built by contract. 16. What was the total amount spent on the Ottawa-Prescott Highway to 31st December, 1920. 17. Have the plans of the said Highway been filed in the Federal Department of Railways pursuant to the Canada Highways Act, and if so, when. 18. Has a subsidy agreement been signed with the Dominion Government pursuant to the Canada Highways Act. 19. If so, what is the date of the agreement. 20. Has the Government received any payments on account of Dominion Government subsidy, and if so, the dates and amounts of the payments. 21. What wages were paid during 1920, on the Ottawa-Prescott Highway (a) For unskilled labour; (b) For teams with driver. 22. How many hours a day did the men employed on the road during 1920 work. 23. Who was the engineer in charge of the road during 1920, and what was his salary. 24. Has the Government settled with all the parties from whom the right-of-way was acquired. 25. If the answer to 24 is in the negative, what parties still remain to be settled with. (*Sessional Paper, No. 90.*)

The House then adjourned at 1.35 a.m.

Thursday, April 28th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Raney, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Sixteenth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 8), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Your Committee recommend that no extra fees should be charged under the Rules by reason of any extension of the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills.

Ordered, That no extra fees be charged by reason of any extension of time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 261), intituled "An Act respecting Public Improvements and Services in certain Suburban Areas." Mr. Henry.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 262), intituled "An Act to make more equal provision for the cost of Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario." Mr. Carmichael.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 159), To amend The Police Magistrates Act.

Bill (No. 172), To amend The Ontario Reforestation Act.

Bill (No. 180), To amend The Registry Act.

Bill (No. 199), To amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act.

Bill (No. 154), To amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act.

Bill (No. 205), Respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage.

Bill (No. 198), To amend The Ontario Insurance Act.

Bill (No. 216), To amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill (No. 221), To amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Bill (No. 222), To amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgage Act.

Bill (No. 228), To amend The Ontario Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill (No. 234), Respecting the Extra-mural Employment of Persons under Sentence.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the under-mentioned Committee appointed last Session to consider and report respecting a suitable War Memorial for Ontario, be hereby re-appointed to continue its work as outlined in its Report adopted by this House on the 23rd of March last, with power to sit during Recess and to report further to this House at its next Session, *viz.*, Messieurs Carmichael, Cooper (Toronto), Ross (Kingston), McNamara, Fenton, Stover and Thompson.

On Motion of Mr. Raney, seconded by Mr. Drury,

Ordered, That the following Members compose a Select Committee to consider the report and recommendations of the Ontario Insurance Commission (the Hon. Mr. Justice Masten), a proposed revision and consolidation of Ontario insurance law to be submitted by the Department of Insurance, any other suggested amendments, and generally to consider and recommend to the House what, if any, amendments should be made to the law relating to insurance, and that the Committee be empowered to sit during the Recess and report to the House at the next Session thereof:—Messieurs Drury, Raney, Smith, Curry, Rollo, Sinclair, Hay, Ferguson, Henry, and Pinard.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 187), Respecting Long Point Park, and after some time spent therein. Mr.

Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 186). Respecting Natural Gas, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 217), To amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 220). To amend The Ontario Temperance Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 231). To amend the School Laws, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported. That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 237), To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 242), The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 245), Respecting Vocational Education, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported that the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 63), To amend The Trustee Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 142), To amend The School Sites Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 200), To amend The Division Courts Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 213), To amend The Municipal Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 240), To amend The Timber Slide Companies Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 235), Respecting the Administration of Justice in the District of Temiskaming, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 219), Respecting the purchase, by the City of Toronto, of the Assets of certain Companies.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 244), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act.

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 226), To amend The Power Commission Act, having been read,

The Debate was resumed.

And after some time,

The Motion for the second reading having been again put, was carried, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 233), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act, 1917, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1922, the following sums:—

4. To defray the expenses of the Education Department.....	79,875 00
102. To defray the expenses of the Treasury Department, Miscellaneous	446,469 00

101. To defray the expenses of the Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous	408,500 00
107. To defray the expenses of the Refunds, Education.....	1,500 00
108. To defray the expenses of the Refunds, Lands and Forests..	25,000 00
109. To defray the expenses of the Refunds, Mines.....	2,500 00
110. To defray the expenses of the Refunds, Succession Duty....	88,000 00
111. To defray the expenses of the Refunds, Miscellaneous.....	37,000 00
112. To defray the expenses of Miscellaneous.....	83,000 00
113. To defray the expenses of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario	6,943,199 00
114. To defray the expenses of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway	190,000 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions.

Ordered. That the Report be received To-day.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 248), Respecting the Proof of Death of Soldiers and Sailors while on Active Service.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 249), To amend The Ontario Companies Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 250), To amend The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 251), To amend The Current Rate of Interest Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 252), For raising money on the Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 253), To amend The Provincial Loans Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 254), To amend The Election Laws.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 257), Respecting Fair Rents.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 255), To confirm a certain Agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corporation of the City of Guelph.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 258), To authorize the purchase and operation of certain Radial Railways by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the City of Toronto.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 259), "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921."

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 260), "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921."

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 149), To amend The Assessment Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Webster, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following Resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand four hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Office of the Lieutenant-Governor for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

2. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Prime Minister and President of the Council for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

3. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and fifty-six thousand three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Attorney-General's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

4. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-nine thousand eight hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Education Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

5. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eighteen thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Lands and Forests for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

6. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-five thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

7. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

8. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Labour for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

9. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and twenty thousand one hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Highways for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

10. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-six thousand four hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Game and Fisheries Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

11. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and one thousand seven hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Treasury Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

12. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-nine thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Audit Office for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

13. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty-six thousand eight hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Secretary's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

14. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seventeen thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

15. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-five thousand one hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

16. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and twenty thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Legislation for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

17. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and four thousand six hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Supreme Court of Ontario for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

18. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six hundred and seventeen thousand three hundred and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sundry Civil and Criminal Justice for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

19. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifty-nine thousand and ninety-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Administration of Justice in Districts for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

20. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three million one hundred and twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and sixty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public and Separate School Education for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

21. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-three thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Toronto, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

22. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-four thousand seven hundred and sixty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal and Model Schools, Ottawa, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

23. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-two thousand four hundred and ninety dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

24. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-seven thousand six hundred and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

25. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Peterborough, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

26. *Resolved* That a sum not exceeding Thirty-seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, Stratford, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

27. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-seven thousand nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Normal School, North Bay, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

28. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty thousand seven hundred and fifty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English-French Professional Training Schools for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

29. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and twenty-two thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of High Schools and Collegiate Institutes for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

30. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventeen thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Departmental Library and Museum for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

31. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and nineteen thousand seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Libraries, Art Schools, Historical, Literary and Scientific Societies for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

32. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and ninety-one thousand one hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Technical Education for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

33. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy thousand one hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Superannuated Teachers for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

34. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven hundred and eighty-one thousand seven hundred and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial and other Universities for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

35. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and forty-one thousand and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario School for the Deaf, Belleville, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

36. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-five thousand six hundred and thirty-four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario School for the Blind, Brantford, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

37. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-four thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Northern Academy, Monteith, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

38. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Education for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

39. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and thirty-nine thousand four hundred and twenty-two dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Brockville, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

40. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-one thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Cobourg, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

41. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-six thousand two hundred and sixty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

42. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ninety-five thousand three hundred and five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Kingston, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

43. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eighty-two thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, London, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

44. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and two thousand four hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Mimico, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

45. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and five thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Orillia, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

46. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and nineteen thousand one hundred and forty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Penetanguishene, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

47. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ninety-seven thousand six hundred and sixty-seven dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Toronto, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

48. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and fifty-six thousand five hundred and ninety-four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Whitby, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

49. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-three thousand three hundred and six dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Hospital, Woodstock, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

50. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-seven thousand five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Reformatory, Guelph, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

51. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seventy thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Reformatory, Industries, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

52. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Females for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

53. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ten thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industries, Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Females, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

54. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eighty-three thousand six hundred and seventy-four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Burwash, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

55. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-four thousand and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Farm, Fort William, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

56. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-three thousand nine hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous, Public Institutions, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

57. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eighty-five thousand eight hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural and Horticultural Societies for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

58. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eight thousand nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Live Stock Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

59. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Institutes for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

60. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Dairy Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

61. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-seven thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Fruit Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

62. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and forty-two thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural Representatives for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

63. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-four thousand three hundred and sixty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of The Ontario Veterinary College for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

64. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-six thousand four hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous, Agriculture, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

65. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-three thousand six hundred and fifty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

66. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-seven thousand six hundred and twenty-two dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Macdonald Institute and Hall for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

67. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Forestry for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

68. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-six thousand two hundred and ten dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Animal Husbandry, Farm and Experimental Feeding Department, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

69. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand five hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Field Experiments for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

70. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ten thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Experimental Dairy Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

71. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nine thousand three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Dairy School for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

72. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-two thousand two hundred and eight dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Poultry Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

73. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-one thousand five hundred and ninety-eight dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Horticultural Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

74. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Apiculture Department for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

75. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand six hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Bacteriology for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

76. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand six hundred and seventy dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Botany for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

77. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand four hundred and seventy dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Chemistry for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

78. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Entomology for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

79. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of English for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

80. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Manual Training for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

81. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand four hundred and seventy dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Physics for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

82. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-nine thousand and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Farm Economics for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

83. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and sixty-three thousand one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization and Immigration for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

84. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven hundred and eighty-nine thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hospitals and Charities for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

85. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-six thousand eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Government House Maintenance for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

86. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and forty-five thousand one hundred and eleven dollars and thirty-five cents be granted to

His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

87. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

88. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-one thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous, Maintenance and Repairs for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

89. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

90. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

91. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and forty-one thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Institutions Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

92. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ninety thousand two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Educational Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

93. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and fifty-four thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

94. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and seventeen thousand six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Buildings, Districts, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

95. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

96. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eighty thousand eight hundred and thirty-three dollars and thirty-three cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Works for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

97. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million four hundred and sixty-two thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Labour for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

98. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seven thousand three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization Roads for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

99. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million one hundred and sixty-three thousand and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Highways for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

100. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and sixty-six thousand four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Game and Fisheries for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

101. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and eight thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Attorney-General's Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

102. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and forty-six thousand four hundred and sixty-nine dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Treasury Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

103. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand one hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Secretary's Department, Miscellaneous, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

104. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million two hundred and eighty-three thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Outside Service and Surveys for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

105. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parks for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

106. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

107. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Education, Refund Account, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

108. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Lands and Forests, Refund Account, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

109. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two thousand five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mines, Refund Account, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

110. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-eight thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Succession Duty, Refund Account, for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

111. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous Refunds for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

112. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-three thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

113. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six million nine hundred and forty-three thousand one hundred and ninety-nine dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

114. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ninety thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1922.

The several Resolutions, having been read the second time, were concurred in.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province a sum not exceeding Sixty-eight millions two hundred and nine thousand nine hundred and sixty-five dollars and forty-three cents to meet the Supply to that extent granted to His Majesty.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be received forthwith.

Mr. Webster, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a Resolution which was read as follows:—

Resolved, That there be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province a sum not exceeding Sixty-eight millions two hundred and nine thousand nine hundred and sixty-five dollars and forty-three cents to meet the Supply to that extent granted to His Majesty.

The Resolution, having been read a second time, was agreed to.

The following Bill was then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 263), intituled “An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money to defray the expenses of Civil Government for the year ending 31st October, One thousand nine hundred and twenty-one, and for the year ending 31st day of October, One thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, and for other purposes therein mentioned.” Mr. Smith.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time forthwith.

The Bill was then read a second time.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. Watson and Mr. MacBride be added to the Select Committees on Bills No. 123 and 208 respecting Co-operative Credit Societies, and Professional Engineers.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. MacBride and Mr. Ramsden be added to the War Memorial Committee.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Smith,

Ordered, That when this House adjourns To-day, it do stand adjourned until Eleven of the Clock in the forenoon of To-morrow the Twenty-ninth day of April, instant. Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair at One of the Clock, without the question being put.

The House then adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Friday, April 29th, 1921.

PRAYERS.

11.00 O'CLOCK, A.M.

Mr. Nixon, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their Ninth Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills, and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 110), An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.

Bill (No. 156), An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Mr. MacVicar, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered Bill (No. 155), An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act, and begs leave to report the same with amendment.

Bill (No. 244), An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act, and begs leave to report the same without amendment.

Mr. Bragg, from the Select Committee appointed under a Resolution of the House, to enquire into and report upon the conditions under which apples are marketed, presented their Report, which was read as follows:—

The Committee realized in the early stages of the enquiry that other natural perishable products, notably cheese, are interwoven and directly connected with the disadvantages under which apples are marketed, so the Committee incidentally accepted information on the broader basis. Unfortunately the time at the disposal of the Members of the Committee was insufficient to more than touch the fringe of the subject. But enough unquestionable evidence was submitted to prove that the conditions under which the natural products of Ontario are marketed, both overseas and in Canada, render it absolutely necessary that these conditions shall be changed if this province is to retain its prominent place in the world's market. Your Committee therefore recommends that it shall continue this investigation during the interregnum between this Session and the next meeting of this House in order that a full report may be presented.

Ordered. That the Report of the Special Committee to enquire into the overseas apple trade be adopted, and the Committee be authorized to continue its investigations on the lines recommended in the report.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the names of Mr. Tolmie, Mr. Ross (Kingston), and Mr. Watson be added to the Select Committee, appointed yesterday, relating to the Law of Insurance.

On Motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Mageau be added to the Select Committee appointed on Bills (No. 123) and (No. 114), Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies, and Mechanics' Liens.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 134), Respecting the Taxation of Real Estate Transfers.

Bill (No. 109), For the Protection of Children of Unmarried Parents.

Bill (No. 173), To amend The Trades and Labour Branch Act.

Bill (No. 185), The Public Lands Act.

Bill (No. 201), To amend The County Judges Act.

Bill (No. 177), To Provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children.

Bill (No. 153), To amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill (No. 231), To amend The School Laws.

Bill (No. 142), To amend The School Sites Act.

Bill (No. 200), To amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill (No. 240), To amend The Timber Slide Companies Act.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 136), To amend The Corporations Tax Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 63), To amend The Trustee Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Heenan reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

Mr. Curry asked the following Question:—

1. What was the date or dates of the original concession of the pulpwood limits now held by the Great Lakes Paper Company on the Pic and Sturgeon Rivers, and to whom were such concessions originally granted. 2. What were the conditions of the granting of the limits. 3. Have these conditions been complied with. 4. What, if any, arrangement was there between the licensees and the Government or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission as to electrical power for the operation of their mills. If there was such an arrangement, was it legally binding on the Company. 5. Was there any extension of time to the concessionaires for the development of the limits and the erection of their mills. 6. If so, was the extension of time evidenced by a formal document. 7. Was the Hydro-Electric Power Commission a party to the extension agreement, and if not, was it given an opportunity of being a party. 8. Why was there not a provision in the document that the licensees should take their power from the Nipigon development of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. If not, why not. 9. Who executed the extension document (1) On behalf of the concessionaires; (2) On behalf of the Government. 10. Was the Hydro-Electric development at the Nipigon made in the expectation that the Great Lakes Paper Company would take Hydro-Electric power for its purposes. 11. Did the Hydro-Electric Power Commission have any binding assurance from

the concessionaires that they would take power from the Hydro-Electric Power Commission before the Commission began the construction of its Nipigon Power Works. 12. How much money approximately has been expended by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission on these works to this date. How much will it cost to complete them. 13. What amount of power is now being developed by the Nipigon Power Works. 14. How much is being actually sold. 15. Is the Nipigon system self-supporting. If not, what is the estimated deficit for the current year. 16. Is power now available for the use of the Great Lakes Power Company. 17. What is the existing relationship between the Great Lakes Paper Company and the Government in the matter of power.

To which the Minister of Lands and Forests replied in the words and figures following:—

1. Pic Concession—Tenders closed December 1st, 1916; concession awarded Col. J. J. Carrick, December 12, 1916. Black Sturgeon Concession—Tenders closed February 1st, 1917; concession awarded S. A. Marks, February 6th, 1917. 2. Substantially the conditions to be performed by the purchaser are as follows:—(1) Construct with all convenient dispatch a pulp mill on the limits to cost at least \$2,000,000, and operate same so that the daily output would be at least 300 tons of pulp and so that at least 600 hands on the average would be kept employed at least 10 months of each year; (2) Of the said \$2,000,000, not less than \$400,000 was to be expended within one year, not less than \$700,000 was to be expended within the second year and the balance within three years; (3) Erect a paper mill within such time and at such place as directed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, such mill to have a capacity of at least 200 tons of paper a day, and to operate same so that the daily output would not be less than 150 tons of paper. A copy of the agreement of purchase is attached, from which such conditions can be obtained in full. 3. No. 4. There was considerable negotiation between Mr. Carrick, the licensee, and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, for power for his mill. A draft contract was sent him but was not signed. The Government had an opinion that a binding agreement had been made by the correspondence and the action of Attorney-General for Ontario v. Great Lakes Paper Company, Limited, was brought to enforce same. This action, however, was dismissed. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. 7. No; the Hydro-Electric Power Commission was not given an opportunity of being a party. 8. This agreement was made by the former Government. This Government is not aware why such a provision was not included in the agreement. 9. (1) J. J. Carrick; (2) The Honourable G. H. Ferguson. 10. Yes. 11. No; there was a draft agreement submitted and practically settled between the Great Lakes representative and the Commission, but not executed. The Company afterwards refused to sign. 12. (1) Expended to date, approximately four to four and one-half millions of dollars; (2) It will cost to complete approximately one and one-quarter to one and one-half millions of dollars more. 13. Machinery to develop 12,500 h.p. has been installed, which has a maximum

development of 15,000 h.p. 14. 10,000 to 11,000 h.p. 15. Yes; it is a service at cost proposition. 16. Yes. 17. The decision of the Court is that there is none.

ORIGINAL AGREEMENT.

This Agreement, made in triplicate this 9th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen.

Between:

His Majesty, represented by the Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for the Province of Ontario, hereinafter called the Government, of the First Part;

and

John J. Carrick, of the City of Port Arthur, in the District of Thunder Bay, Esquire, hereinafter called the Grantee, of the Second Part.

Whereas, by advertisement duly published, the Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for Ontario called for tenders to be received by him up to and including the first day of December, 1916, for the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on a certain area, situate on the Pic River and other territory adjacent thereto, in the Thunder Bay District, hereinafter more particularly described;

And whereas, on the said first day of December, A.D. 1916, the said Minister received from the Grantee a tender for the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on the said area, which said tender has been approved and accepted;

And whereas, by advertisement duly published the Honourable the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for Ontario called for tenders to be received by him up to and including the first day of February, A.D. 1917, for the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on a certain area situate on the Black Sturgeon River and other territory adjacent thereto, in the District of Thunder Bay, hereinafter more particularly described;

And whereas on the first day of February, A.D. 1917, the said Minister received from one S. A. Marks a tender for the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on the said area which said tender has been approved and accepted;

And whereas the said S. A. Marks, by assignment in writing bearing date the 8th day of May, A.D. 1917, has assigned, transferred and set over all his rights to the said tender and the acceptance thereof, to the Grantee;

And whereas the grants of the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber upon said areas were by said advertisement for tenders and by the tenders of the said Grantee and the said Marks based upon and subject to certain terms, conditions and stipulations;

And whereas this agreement is entered into for the purpose of insuring the performance by the Grantee of the obligations contained in the said tenders and acceptances thereof as hereinafter defined and of securing to the Grantee a supply of pulp wood for the purpose of the mill or mills to be established, maintained, conducted and carried on at a place or places within the limits of the lands hereinafter mentioned or such other place or places approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council;

Now therefore this indenture witnesseth, and it is agreed by and between the Grantee and the Government as follows, that is to say:—

1. The Grantee shall, with all convenient despatch, proceed with the construction of a pulp mill within the limits of the territory hereinafter described, or at some other place approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and will thoroughly equip the same so that the expenditure in connection with the erection, equipment and machinery of the said pulp mill and of such other mills, buildings, developments and structures as are necessary to the undertaking will be at least two million dollars (\$2,000,000) and will operate the same so that the daily output thereof shall not be less than three hundred (300) tons of pulp and so that at least six hundred (600) hands on an average shall be kept employed in connection therewith for at least ten months in each and every year.

2. Of the said sum of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) not less than four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000) shall be expended within one year from the date hereof and not less than seven hundred thousand dollars (\$700,000) during the second year and the remainder of the said sum within three years from the date hereof, it being distinctly understood that the erection of such pulp mill or mills and paper mill as hereinafter set out, and the employment of hands as aforesaid shall form part of the consideration for the price of the pulp wood and the pine timber and that the cutting of the said pulp wood and pine timber may begin as soon as and when four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000) shall have been expended on the erection of the said mill or mills and equipment thereof.

3. The Grantee shall erect a paper mill within such time and at such place as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may direct, having a capacity of at least two hundred tons (200 tons) of paper per day, and after the erection thereof shall operate the same continuously for the period of this agreement so that the daily output of the said mill shall not be less than one hundred and fifty tons (150 tons) of paper.

4. In consideration of the said expenditure and of the contracts and engagements entered into on the part of the Grantee and the Government will and doth for the rates and prices hereinafter set forth and provided and subject to such terms, conditions and regulations as to the locality and the manner of cutting, measuring, removing and driving the same as may from time to time be imposed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and subject also as is hereinafter set forth and contained, grant to the Grantee the right to cut and remove all spruce, balsam, banksian or jack pine, poplar and white wood trees, seven inches and upwards in diameter, two feet from the ground, to be used only in and for the purpose of supplying the mill or mills to be erected, for a period of twenty-one (21) years, and also all red and white pine trees ten inches and upwards in diameter, two feet from the ground, from unoccupied, unsold and unlocated lands of the Crown as follows:—

Firstly,—Commencing at the southwest angle of the Township of Pic, where the south boundary of said township intersects the high water line on the shores of Lake Superior; thence east along the said south boundary of the Township of Pic five miles thirty-one chains to the southeast angle of said township; thence north along the east boundary of said township two miles thirty-four chains more or less to the southwest angle of township seventy-four, along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; thence east eight miles more or less to the southeast angle of the last mentioned township, as established and shown on plan of survey by O.L.S., E. Stewart, dated December 15th, 1894, of record in the Department of Lands, Forests and Mines; thence north astronomically thirty-six miles; thence west astronomically forty-six miles; thence south astronomically twenty-four miles more or less to the high water mark on the shore of Lake Superior; thence in a general direction easterly and southeasterly following all the windings of the shore line of Lake Superior to the point of commencement; and

Secondly,—Commencing at the southwest angle of the Township of Booth; thence west astronomically thirty-six miles fifty chains more or less to a point due south of the southwest angle of the Nipigon Forest Reserve; thence north astronomically seven miles to the southwest angle of the said Forest Reserve; thence continuing north astronomically along the west limit of the said Nipigon Forest Reserve twenty-one miles; thence east astronomically twenty-four miles more or less to the water's edge of McIntyre Bay of Lake Nipigon; thence southeasterly along the shore of said McIntyre Bay to the northwest angle of the Township of Innes; thence south astronomically along the west boundary of said Township of Innes, six miles sixty-seven chains seventy-four links to the southwest angle thereof; thence east along the south limit of the said township six miles to the southeast angle thereof; thence continuing east astronomically six miles more or less to a point due north of the northwest angle of the Township of Purdom; thence south astronomically, and along the west boundaries of the Townships of Purdom and Booth twenty miles more or less to the point of commencement.

Reserving and excepting nevertheless from the above described areas all lands under the waters of all rivers, lakes and streams within the said described areas; also all lands heretofore patented, licensed, leased, located or applied for in respect of which such proceedings have been taken or shall hereafter be taken as in the opinion of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines entitles the applicant or applicants to a lease or patent for such lands together with the right of the Crown to sell, lease, locate or otherwise dispose of any lands included in the hereinbefore described area on the same terms and conditions for settlement, mining or other purposes as ordinary Crown lands situated elsewhere.

5. (a) The Grantee as to the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on the Pic River area as firstly above described shall pay a bonus of fifty cents per cord on all pulp wood cut, together with dues of forty cents per cord for spruce and twenty cents per cord for all other pulp woods herein mentioned, and a bonus of twelve dollars per thousand feet board measure for white pine cut, and six dollars per thousand feet board measure for red pine cut, together with dues of two dollars per thousand feet board measure for white and red pine cut, or such other rates or dues as may from time to time be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for such pulp wood and pine, but in no case shall the price so to be fixed be at higher figures than the price at which the general public shall be permitted to cut on other portions of the Crown domain similarly situated.

(b) The Grantee as to the right to cut pulp wood and pine timber on the Black Sturgeon River shall pay a bonus of seventy cents per cord for all pulp wood cut, together with dues of forty cents per cord for spruce and twenty cents per cord for all other pulp woods herein mentioned, and a bonus of seven dollars (\$7) per thousand feet board measure for white pine cut, and five dollars (\$5) per thousand feet board measure for red pine cut, together with dues of two dollars (\$2) per thousand feet board measure for white and red pine cut, or such other rates or dues as may from time to time be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for such pulp wood and pine, but in no case shall the price so to be fixed be at a higher figure than the price at which the general public shall be permitted to cut on other portions of the Crown domain similarly situated.

6. The wood and timber shall be cut upon such portions of the said territory and in such manner as the Minister may direct, and such precautions shall be taken and means employed to prevent injury or destruction by fire of the said territory, and at such cost to the Grantee as the Minister or Statutes having reference thereto may require.

7. It is distinctly understood and agreed that only the right to cut wood and timber as aforesaid is sold to the Grantee and not the soil or any part thereof, nor is any interest in the soil so sold except in so far as may be

necessary to cut and remove the woods and timber as aforesaid, subject to such terms, conditions and regulations as to the cutting, measuring, removing and driving the same as may from time to time be imposed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and the wood and timber when so cut shall (subject to the payment of the price thereof) become the absolute property of the Grantee.

8. The Government shall retain the right to sell, lease, locate or otherwise dispose of any lands included in the said territory on the same terms and conditions for settlement, mining or other purposes as ordinary Crown lands situated elsewhere, and this agreement is not to impede or retard settlement or mining operations and nothing herein contained shall limit or affect the right of the Department of Lands, Forests and Mines to sell, lease, locate or otherwise dispose of lands in the aforesaid territory for settlement, mining or other purposes.

9. Nothing herein contained or to be done hereunder or by virtue hereof shall entitle the Grantee to a monopoly in the use of any rivers, streams or lakes or tributaries thereof in the said territory but the same shall be and continue open for the use of the public in accordance with the law in that behalf, and in the event of the works of the Grantee in any way interfering with the driving of logs or timber down the said rivers, streams, or lakes or tributaries thereof, the Minister shall have full power to determine from time to time the provision necessary to overcome such interference and thereupon the said Grantee as and when directed will make provision accordingly.

10. It is distinctly understood and agreed that nothing herein contained shall, without the consent in writing of the Minister, be deemed to confer any right to cut or remove timber from any territory or areas already under license or permit from the Crown.

11. All pulp wood cut on the said territory shall be used for and manufactured at the said mill and all pine timber cut thereon shall be manufactured into lumber in accordance with the provisions of the Crown Timber Act, R.S.O., 1914, cap. 29, or amendments or other Statute relating thereto.

12. It is further understood and agreed that the Government does not guarantee any particular quantity of pulp wood but the Grantee shall at all time during the term of this agreement or any renewals thereof, be entitled to obtain from the said lands all pulp wood necessary for the supply of the said pulp and paper mills so far as the same can be found available within the limits of the territory herein described.

13. Proper sworn returns of the quantity of wood and pine cut each season shall be made to the Government in conformity with the Crown Timber Regulations, and payment shall be made therefor not later than the 1st day of October in each year, and the Government shall have all the rights and powers

in respect of enforcing such payments as are now provided for in the case of timber cut under timber license.

14. In the event of the failure on the part of the Grantee to erect the said pulp and paper mills and expend the moneys thereon hereinbefore stated, or in default of the said Grantee keeping the said pulp and paper mills running after the erection thereof and keeping the required number of hands employed as aforesaid, or upon default of compliance with any of the terms, requirements, provisions or conditions as aforesaid, the Government may revoke the right, license or permit to cut the said pulp wood or pine timber, and all moneys paid as a deposit or bonus herein shall be forfeited to the Crown as liquidated damages.

Provided that thirty (30) days' notice in writing shall be given by registered letter to the Grantee at his last place of abode before any such revocation in order that he may have an opportunity of being heard should he so desire.

15. The Grantee shall and will not at any time or in any place deposit, empty, run or turn into, or permit to be placed, deposited, emptied, run or turned into any river, stream, or other waters whatsoever, refuse, sawdust, chemicals or matter of any other kind which will have the effect of destroying, harming or driving away the fish in such river, stream or water.

16. All water powers and privileges on said territory, and the right of the Crown to raise, hold, lower and maintain the waters in the various streams or lakes on said territory at such height and in such condition as may be found necessary and expedient for the development of such water-powers, are reserved to the Crown.

17. The Minister shall have the right to inspect the timber operations on the said territory at any time he may deem it advisable or in the public interest, and if upon such inspection it appears and he so decides that any merchantable or valuable timber which should be cut remains uncut or is being destroyed, the Minister shall have the right to cause an estimate to be made of the said timber and charge the Grantee with the same rate of dues and bonus as if the same had been actually removed by the said Grantee. The cutting and removing of the timber on the said territory, or any part thereof, shall not be deemed to have been completed until such time as it has been examined and passed upon by an officer of the Crown nor until such operations have been declared satisfactory by the Minister.

18. And lastly, it is hereby agreed that if upon the termination of the said period of twenty-one years (21 years) the Grantee shall have fully performed the terms and conditions hereinbefore set forth to the satisfaction of the Government, he shall be entitled to a renewal hereof for a further term of twenty-one years (21 years) upon such terms and conditions as may then be fixed by the Government.

19. The word "Minister" herein shall mean the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for the Province of Ontario.

20. This agreement shall be binding upon and enure to the benefit of the Grantee, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns.

In witness whereof the said Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for the Province of Ontario and the Party of the Second Part, have hereunto set their hands and seals.

Signed, sealed and delivered,
in the presence of
(Sgd.) ALBERT GRIGG.

(Sgd.) W. H. HEARST.
(Sgd.) J. J. CARRICK.

Mr. Curry asked the following Question:—

1. What were the different works and services that were acquired by the Government of Ontario on the purchase of what is known as the Central Ontario Power System. 2. What was the date of the transaction. 3. What was the purchase price. 4. How was it paid or payable. 5. What interest did the debentures issued as part of the purchase price carry and when do they mature. 6. On whose recommendation was the purchase made. What Minister signed the agreement on behalf of the Government. 7. Was the opinion of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission asked and did the Hydro-Electric Power Commission approve of the purchase. Did the Commission disapprove of any of the terms of the purchase. If so, of what terms. Is there any documentary evidence of approval or disapproval by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 8. How much money has been advanced by the Province to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission since the purchase for improving the system. 9. What is the present total investment of the Province. 10. What amount was included in the purchase price for water rights, franchises and other assets of an intangible and non-income returning nature. 11. What is the actual value of these water rights, assets, and other intangible assets. 12. What has been the financial results of the operation of the system year by year since the purchase down to the 31st October, 1920. 13. Has any allowance been made for sinking fund. 14. Has any arrangement been made for repayment of the moneys advanced by the Province. 15. Was any legislation proposed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for submission to the Legislature at this present session. If so, what was the purport and object of such legislation. 16. Does the Government intend to bring down such legislation. 17. What objections, if any, were urged by the Government to the legislation proposed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 18. Does the Government propose to bring down any legislation on the subject this Session. 19. Is the Central Ontario Power System now in the view of the Government on a sound financial footing. 20. Will the renewal of the outstanding debentures, when they

mature, entail an extra annual charge on the system. If so, to what amount. 21. What is the present amount of the outstanding debentures issued by the Province on account of this system. 22. Are the rates payable for power by the customers of the system fixed by long term contracts. If so, what are the terms. 23. If so, do these contracts provide for payment of an adequate price for power. 24. Has the Government under consideration any plan for putting the system on a better business basis.

And the Attorney-General replied in the words and figures following:—

1. The Central Ontario System is divided into two sections. One is known as the Central Ontario section, which controls and generates power at several points on the Trent River, transmits such power over lines which it owns and distributes it to local public utility plants—also owned by the System—in a number of municipalities including Belleville, Brighton, Cobourg, Deseronto, Lindsay, Napanee, Oshawa, Port Hope, Peterboro, Trenton and Tweed; it also sells power to a number of other municipalities and customers. The System owns gas works at Cobourg, Oshawa, Napanee and Peterboro; water works at Cobourg and Trenton (since sold), and the Peterboro Street Railway. In addition, it operates a pulp mill at Campbellford and owns the Bruton Township timber limits purchased by the Province to provide a supply of wood for the pulp mill. The Northern Ontario section has a power development at Nipissing near North Bay, and supplies power to local public utility undertakings owned by the System in North Bay, Powassan, Nipissing and Callandar. 2. Tenth March, 1916. 3. \$8,350,000. 4. In debentures of the Province. 5. Four per cent. per annum, maturing first March, 1926. 6. The recommendation to Council was made by the then Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines—Hon. G. H. Ferguson—who also signed the agreement on behalf of the Government. 7. The Commission recommended the purchase at \$8,350,000, to be paid in Government 4 per cent. 40-year bonds, sinking fund deferred for the first 10 years. So far as the Government is aware there is no documentary evidence as to the attitude of the Commission. 8. Up to March, 1920, \$1,683,398. This information is contained in a report of F. C. Clarkson of March, 1920. If there have been further advances they have been through the Hydro-Electric Power Commission and the Government has no statement as to same. 9. Up to March, 1920, \$10,258,398, including \$225,000 to purchase the timber limit which was required for the supply of wood for the pulp mill. 10. \$2,677,342. 11. The Power Commission states that it cannot fix the valuation at the present time. 12. (a) Interest costs, expenses of operation and provision for reserve in respect to plant renewal exceeded the income of the System for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1917, by \$24,218.75; (b) Income exceeded interest costs, expenses of operation and provision for reserve in respect to plant renewal of the System for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1918, by \$16,500; (c) Interest costs, expenses of operation and provision for reserve in respect to plant renewal exceeded the income of the System for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1919, by

\$183,670.64; (d) Income exceeded interest costs, expenses of operation and provision for reserve in respect to plant renewal for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1920, by \$23,858.44, after making full provision for water rentals due Federal Government accrued since 1916. 13. No, except with regard to the Bruton Township purchase price—30 year 4 per cent. basis—\$5,400 per year—\$19,981.05 collected to 31st October, 1920. 14. No. 15. Yes; the Bill provided that the Commission might, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, sell outright to any municipality any local system for the distribution of electric light and power, or gas or water or the local street railway, and that such municipality was to pay for the works taken over by an issue of debentures. The debentures were to be handed over to the Commission, and the Commission might sell same and employ the proceeds towards the extension, improvement and operation of the properties remaining in its possession, or pay the same to, or deposit the debentures with the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. With regard to the power plants and transmission lines, the Bill provided that these could be dealt with between the municipalities and the Commission in the same way in which the Niagara System is dealt with. The Municipalities might enter into contracts with the Power Commission for a supply of power, and practically come under the provisions of the Hydro-Electric Power Act with regard to the Niagara System. The Bill then provided that the Province might sell and the Commission purchase these power plants and transmission lines and that the Commission should issue and the Province accept bonds of the Commission for the purchase price, payable in forty years from the date of purchase. The Bill also provided that the Power Commission and a municipal corporation might set aside any agreement or franchise entered into between a corporation and any of the companies whose assets are now owned by the Commission notwithstanding that such agreement or franchise was formerly approved by the ratepayers or confirmed by any Statute. 16. No. 17. First—With regard to any local system for the distribution of electric light and power or gas or water or the local street railway, that the debentures should be handed over to the Province direct, and that none of the proceeds should be applied towards the extension, improvement or operation of other properties remaining in the possession of the Commission. If monies were required for the latter purpose that they should be advanced by the Province direct to the Commission. Second—With regard to the power plants and transmission lines it was thought that the simple way would be merely for the municipalities concerned to enter into the same arrangement in every respect as that entered into by the municipalities in the Niagara System. It was considered that there was no necessity for the Commission purchasing these power plants and transmission lines from the Province, and issuing its bonds and handing them over to the Province. Third—It was considered that the Central Ontario Power Act, 1916, gave all the power necessary to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to sell the System, or any part thereof, to any municipality or municipalities which desired to purchase or assume same. Fourth—It was considered that if the System or any part of it had to be sold at a loss that the proper way to meet such loss was for the Province to fix the purchase price at

the proper amount, and write off such loss. 18. No. 19. Probably not. It is represented to the Government that it is doubtful whether the water rights, franchises and other assets of an intangible nature, for which \$2,677,342 was paid, have any real value. 20. Yes. It is impossible to state to what amount at present, but the extra annual charge will be whatever rate of interest has to be paid for the renewal of the outstanding debentures over four per cent. 21. \$8,350,000, exclusive of advances made for improving the System, etc. 22. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission states that some of the contracts are for long terms, and others are for short terms. 23. The Commission states that some contracts do, and some do not. 24. The matter will have the consideration of the Government.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 243), To amend The Optometry Act, 1919, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 256), To amend The Motor Vehicles Act, having been read,

Mr. Brackin moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for a Return of correspondence *re* payment of Counsel Fee to Peter White, K.C., having been read, it was

Ordered, That the Order be discharged and the Motion withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 257), Respecting Fair Rents, and after some time spent therein, the Committee rose.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for a Report of the officer conducting a scale of logs at Lumber Mills in Ontario, having been read,

The Debate was resumed.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

The Debate continued,

And after some time

Mr. Drury moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Raney,

That the following words be added to the Motion, "together with the data on which the Report was based and all correspondence in connection therewith,"

And the Amendment, having been put, was carried, and it was

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of the Report of the officer, or person, who has been conducting a scale of the logs and mill-cut at twenty-six lumber mills of Ontario throughout the sawing season of 1920, and which the Minister of Lands and Forests has reported to the House is now in his possession, together with the data on which the Report was based and all correspondence in connection therewith.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be permitted to sit concurrently with the Sittings of the House, for the purpose of completing unfinished business.

On Motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney, it was

Resolved, That this House endorses the representation made by all the Veteran Organizations in the City of Toronto that, in view of the serious unemployment situation in the City and the menace arising from unusual unrest in some quarters, it is desirable that the Dominion Government make provision forthwith for ex-service men and women to meet the exceptional situation by re-instating the D.S.C.R. relief measures, and by placing on army pay and allowances all *bona fide* unemployed ex-service men until absorbed in employment through Government Employment Bureaus, or otherwise and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada.

the Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Minister of Labour, and the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Soldiers' Re-establishment.

On Motion of Mr. Grant, seconded by Mr. Smith,

Ordered, That a Committee of the House, composed of Messieurs Marshall, Cooke, Stringer, and Swayze, be appointed to advise, discuss and confer with the officials of the Department of Education, on Educational matters, especially in view of the coming into effect of The Adolescent School Attendance Act, during the coming Recess.

Mr. Stevenson asked the following Question:—

1. Have any negotiations, or arrangements, been made by the Niagara Falls, N.Y., Power Company with the Hydro Commission or the Ontario Government as to development of power at the Falls. 2. What are they. 3. Will the proposed development of power by the above Company exceed the allowance of water (feet per sec.) allowed by the International Treaty for power development. 4. If so, as in (3) by how much. 5. If so, as in (3), what arrangements as to water allowance has been considered by the Hydro Power Commission or the Ontario Government to increase the amount of water taken from the Niagara River. 6. On which side of the international line will the power be available.

And the Provincial Secretary replied as follows:—

1. No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 answered by reply to Question 1.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 239), To extend the Franchise to Women in Municipal Elections, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 223), Concerning the Employment of Women during the Night, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 224), Concerning the Night Work of Young Persons employed in Industry, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 225), Fixing the Minimum Wage for Admission to Industrial Employment, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 238), Respecting Maintenance of Deserted Wives and Children, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 82), The Maximum Work Hour Day Act, having been read,

The Motion was declared to be lost.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side.

Bill (No. 6), Respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill (No. 30), Respecting Fecunis, Limited.

Bill (No. 51), Respecting the division of the Township of Ferris in the District of Nipissing.

Bill (No. 54), Respecting the Township of York.

Bill (No. 215), Respecting the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited.

Bill (No. 247), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-day.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 8), Respecting the City of Toronto.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 110), To amend The Cemeteries Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 156), To amend The Local Improvement Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 155), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 244), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act, and after some time spent

therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 79), To amend The Mining Tax Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 236), Respecting The Ontario Athletic Commission, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, that the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 248), Respecting Proof of Death of Soldiers and Sailors while on Active Service, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 251), To amend The Current Rate of Interest Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 250), To amend The Mortmain and Charitable Institutions Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 252), For Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 253), To amend The Provincial Loans Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 219), Respecting the purchase, by the City of Toronto, of the Assets of certain Companies, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Department of Labour of the Province of Ontario for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers*, No. 16.)

Also—Report on Neglected and Dependent Children of Ontario, for the year 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 27.*)

Also—Report of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities upon Hospitals and Charitable Institutions of Ontario, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 25.*)

Also—Copies of Orders-in-Council designating, pursuant to section 14 of The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act, Hospitals, Refuges, Orphanages and Infants' Homes, to which aid be granted. (*Sessional Papers, No. 93.*)

Report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 3.*)

Also—Report *re* Housing of the Bureau of Municipal Affairs, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 40.*)

Also—Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, 1920. (*Sessional Papers, No. 9.*)

Also—Report of the Commission to inquire into and report upon the truth or falsity of the charges made against David Hastings, Police Magistrate, Dunnville. (*Sessional Papers, No. 94.*)

Also—Return to an Order of March 4th, 1921, that there be laid before this House a Return showing:—1. What places in the City of Toronto are employed for Government use outside the Legislative Building. 2. For what Department, Commission or Board are they being used. 3. What are the terms of rental or lease. 4. How much has been expended on improvements on each place to date. 5. On what dates was possession taken under the different leases. 6. How many employees are at work in each of the respective buildings so leased. (*Sessional Papers, No. 91.*)

Also—Return to an Order of February 21st, 1921, that there be laid before this House a Return of copies of all papers and correspondence between the Government or any Member thereof or any official on behalf of the Government and any other Corporation or person relating to: (a) Loan "R.R." sold to syndicate composed of the Dominion Securities and others; (b) Loan for \$16,000,000 at 6 *per cent.*, repayable in fifteen years for which the price of 92.34 was realized; (c) The loan "S.S." sold to the syndicate composed of Aemilius Jarvis and others; (d) The loan for \$10,000,000 at 6 *per cent.*, repayable in twenty years for which the price of 96.787 was realized. (*Sessional Papers, No. 92.*)

8.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

Mr. Brackin, from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, presented their Report, which was read. (*Appendix No. 3.*)

Mr. Brackin then moved,

That the Report be adopted.

Mr. Dewart moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. O'Neil, That the Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be not now adopted, but be referred back to the said Committee, with instructions to consider whether the witness, R. W. E. Burnaby, should be summoned to appear before the Bar of the House to explain his refusal to answer any question or questions put to him, as to which the Chairman of the said Committee ruled that the said Burnaby should answer, and that the said Committee have power to sit during the recess.

And the Amendment, having been submitted, was lost on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Black.	Dewart.	Henry.	Murdoch.
Brackin.	Ferguson.	Lang.	O'Neill.
Cooke.	Fowler.	Lennox.	Ramsden.
Cooper.	Gray.	Lewis.	Stover.
(Toronto.)	Halcrow.	McCrea.	Thompson.
Crawford.	Hall.	Marceau.	Tolmie—26.
Curry.	Hay.	Marshall.	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Biggs.	Fox.	McCreary.	Sandy.
Cameron.	Freeborn.	McDonald.	Sewell.
Casselmann.	Grant.	Mills.	Slack.
Cridland.	Heenan.	Nixon.	Smith.
Cunningham.	Hicks.	Oke.	Stringer.
Denyes.	Homuth.	Raney.	Warren.
Doherty.	Leeson.	Rollo.	Webster.
Drury.	Lethbridge.	Ross.	Widdifield—32.

(Glengarry..)

PAIRS.

None.

The Motion for the adoption of the Report, having been then again put, was carried, and the Report was accordingly adopted.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 211), To amend The Universities Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 176), To amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 249), To amend The Ontario Companies Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 255), To confirm a certain Agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corporation of the City of Guelph, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 258), To authorize the purchase and operation of certain Radial Railways by the

Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the City of Toronto, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 259), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 260), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 195), To regulate the sale and installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario.

Bill (No. 209), To amend the Ontario Parole Board.

Bill (No. 203), To amend The School Attendance Act.

Bill (No. 129), To amend The Mining Act of Ontario.

Bill (No. 207), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act.

Bill (No. 187), Respecting Long Point Park.

Bill (No. 186), Respecting Natural Gas.

Bill (No. 217), To amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act.

Bill (No. 235), Respecting the Administration of Justice in the District of Temiskaming.

Bill (No. 220), To amend The Ontario Temperance Act.

Bill (No. 237), To amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

Bill (No. 242), The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.

Bill (No. 213), To amend The Municipal Act.

Bill (No. 245), Respecting Vocational Education.

Bill (No. 42), To incorporate the Town of River Side.

Bill (No. 6), Respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill (No. 30), Respecting Ferris, Limited.

Bill (No. 51), Respecting the division of the Township of Ferris in the district of Nipissing.

Bill (No. 54), Respecting the Township of York.

Bill (No. 215), Respecting the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited.

Bill (No. 247), Respecting the Town of Midland.

Bill (No. 110), To amend The Cemeteries Act.

Bill (No. 156), To amend The Local Improvement Act.

Bill (No. 155), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act.

Bill (No. 244), To amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act.

Bill (No. 79), To amend The Mining Tax Act.

Bill (No. 236), Respecting the Ontario Athletic Commission.

Bill (No. 219), Respecting the purchase, by the City of Toronto, of the assets of certain companies.

Bill (No. 248), Respecting proofs of Death of Soldiers and Sailors while on active service.

Bill (No. 249), To amend The Ontario Companies Act.

Bill (No. 250), To amend The Mortmain and Charitable Institutions Uses Act.

Bill (No. 251), To amend The Current Rate of Interest Act.

Bill (No. 253), To amend The Provincial Loans Act.

Bill (No. 255), To confirm a certain Agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corporation of the City of Guelph.

Bill (No. 258), To authorize the purchase and operation of certain Radial Railways by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the City of Toronto.

Bill (No. 259), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921.

Bill (No. 260), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 210), To amend The Marriage Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 252), For raising money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

And the House, having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock Midnight,

Saturday, 30th April, 1921,

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 262), To make more equal provision for the cost of Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Watson reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill, with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 254), To amend The Election Laws, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 226), To amend the Power Commission Act, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The Amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 8), Respecting the City of Toronto, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 261), Respecting Public Improvements and services in certain Suburban Areas.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Webster reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered. That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Prime Minis-

ter, or any Member of the Government, and E. W. Backus, or any other company, firms or person, together with all estimates, reports, advertisements, conditions of sale, tenders, agreements, maps, documents, and papers of every kind and nature relating to:—1. The Lake of the Woods pulp concession; 2. The White Dog Rapids Water Power, or any other water power in the District of Kenora; 3. The recent sale of pulp wood and timber on the English River concession.

On motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Thompson,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence, reports, and documents, relating to the dismissal of Magistrate Hastings, of Dunnville.

Mr. Hall moved, seconded by Mr. Clarke,

That this House favours the proposal made to the Government by a deputation from Parry Sound and District and of the Associated Boards of Trade and Commerce of Ontario, petitioning that the T. & N. O. Railway be extended westerly from North Bay to Parry Sound. That this House has faith in the almost unlimited natural resources lying between these two towns and in the potential revenue producing value to the Province, of the minerals, timber and agricultural products of this valuable area. This House believes that the Government would be justified in extending an arm of the railroad to Parry Sound for the development of this part of the country, inasmuch as a unsaving of nearly three dollars (\$3.00) per ton for freight from the U.S.A. border to North Bay would be effected, and in addition by the transportation of heavy mining machinery, etc., could be made by water to Parry Sound at much cheaper rates than at present obtained over existing railways—and at the same time would furnish traffic for the proposed extension of the T. & N. O. Railway. This House therefore urges upon the Government the advisability of proceeding with all practicable speed to construct a branch of the said railway from North Bay to Parry Sound, and urges that a vote be placed in the estimates to provided for the necessary initial surveys and work in connection therewith.

And the Motion, having been put, was declared to be lost.

On motion of Mr. Rollo, seconded by Mr. Mills, it was

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that at the earliest possible date a conference should be arranged between representatives

of the Dominion Government and the Governments of the various Provinces in Canada, for the purpose of considering the advisability and practicability of legislation covering unemployment insurance, old age pensions, eight hour day, and other matters affecting labour conditions which were dealt with by the Peace Conference at Versailles; the conference to consider what legislation is desirable and practicable upon the various subjects submitted to it and the question as to the enactment of such legislation by the Dominion and the Provinces; that, in the event of the conference deciding that any of the questions submitted are provincial in their scope, that the Labour Department of Ontario be authorized to make an investigation and report to this House with a view to enacting legislation in this Province covering these questions.

On motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Ferguson,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence, papers, plans, reports and documents between the Minister of Highways, or any member of the Government, or any official thereof, and the Federal Government and any Minister or official thereof, with reference to contribution under The Canada Roads Act towards the construction of high-ways in Ontario.

On motion of Mr. Brackin, seconded by Mr. Webster, it was

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House a special Committee of the House should be appointed to consider the whole question of the Dower Law of this Province, to make such investigation and inquiries and hold such hearings during the recess as the Committee may determine, with a view to preparing, if it shall deem advisable, a Bill to be introduced at the next Session dealing comprehensively with the whole subject of a wife's interest in her husband's property.

Referred to the Select Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 114), Respecting Mechanics' Liens.

On motion of Mr. Fowler, seconded by Mr. Gray, it was

Resolved, That whereas the Province of Ontario has under its care the training and education of the youth of the Province which has for its object the development of the highest type of citizenship and the maintenance of British connections. And whereas certain American magazines and newspapers known as "The Hearst Publications" are permitted to circulate in Canada. And whereas these publications are anti-British in tone and attitude and subversive of the ideals of Canadian citizenship and our connection with

the British Empire, this House believes that they should be excluded from circulation in Canada. Therefore be it resolved that this House memorialize the Government of Canada to prevent the entry of the Hearst Publications into Canada.

On motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Ferguson,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return of copies of all correspondence between R. T. Harding and the Honourable the Attorney-General or any other Minister of the Crown, or any officer of the Government since March 1st, 1921, with reference to a certain account for \$500 rendered James Hourigan & Co. by the said R. T. Harding, and also copies of all letters from Crown Timber Agent Wylie since 1st June, 1920, referring to the settlement with James Hourigan & Co. for \$12,600.

Mr. Heenan moved, seconded by Mr. Homuth,

That whereas it would enable the Members of this Assembly to acquire much knowledge of conditions in the other Provinces of Canada if facilities were given them to travel from time to time in the other provinces; and whereas the acquisition of this knowledge would be of great value to the Members in the preparation and discussions of measures for and in this Assembly; and whereas owing to the expense entailed the members are unable to visit the other provinces as frequently as is desirable; Therefore be it resolved that the Dominion Parliament be asked to so amend The Federal Railways Act that members of this Legislature be given free transportation on National Railways through all parts of Canada.

And the motion, having been put, was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

On motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

Ordered, That the full Sessional Indemnity be paid to those Members of this House absent on account of illness, or other unavoidable cause.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Raney,

Ordered, That when this House adjourns To-day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the third day of May, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned at 4.50 a.m.

Tuesday, May 3rd, 1921.

PRAYERS.

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker then addressed His Honour as follows:—

May it please Your Honour,

The Legislative Assembly of the Province, having at its present Sittings passed certain Bills to which, on behalf and in the name of the said Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.*

The Clerk Assistant then read the Titles of the Acts that had been passed as follows:—

An Act respecting the Preparation of Voters' Lists in Cities.

An Act to amend The Ontario Public Service Superannuation Act.

An Act respecting the Office of King's Printer.

An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act.

An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

An Act to amend The Current Rate of Interest Act.

An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

An Act respecting the Taxation of Real Estate Transfers.

An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

An Act to amend The Mining Act of Ontario.

An Act respecting Natural Gas.

An Act to provide for Development Work in Northern and Northwestern Ontario.

*See date of April 8th for assent to other Acts

The Reforestation Act, 1921.

An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

An Act to make more equal provision for the Cost of Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario.

An Act to confirm a certain Agreement between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Corporation of the City of Guelph.

An Act respecting the Purchase by the City of Toronto of the Assets of Certain Companies.

An Act to authorize the Purchase and Operation of Certain Radial Railways by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the City of Toronto.

An Act to amend The Provincial Highway Act.

An Act respecting Provincial Aid to Drainage.

An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

An Act to Finance Agricultural Development.

An Act for the Promotion of Agricultural Development.

An Act respecting Short-Term Farm Loans in Ontario.

An Act to amend The Burlington Beach Act.

An Act respecting Long Point Park.

An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

An Act respecting the Administration of Justice in the District of Temiskaming.

An Act respecting Proof of Death of Soldiers and Sailors while on Active Service.

An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

An Act to amend The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act.

- An Act to amend The Ontario Public Trustee Act.
- An Act to amend The Trustee Act.
- An Act to amend The Registry Act.
- An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgage Act.
- An Act to amend The Marriage Act.
- An Act to provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children.
- An Act for the protection of the Children of Unmarried Parents.
- An Act to amend The Stationary and Hoisting Engineers Act.
- An Act respecting Provincial Auctioneers.
- An Act to amend The Ontario Companies Act.
- An Act to amend The Timber Slide Companies Act.
- An Act to amend The Ontario Insurance Act.
- An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.
- An Act to amend The Ontario Telephone Act.
- The Municipal Amendment Act, 1921.
- An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.
- An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.
- An Act respecting Public Improvements and Services in Certain Sub-urban Areas.
- The Assessment Amendment Act, 1921.
- An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920.
- An Act to amend The Statute Labour Act.
- An Act to amend The Community Halls Act.
- An Act to amend The Public Parks Act.

- An Act to amend The Ontario Temperance Act.
- An Act to amend The Public Health Act.
- An Act to amend The Dairy Standards Act.
- An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.
- An Act to amend The Trades and Labour Branch Act.
- An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.
- An Act respecting the Two-Platoon System for the Employees of Permanent Fire Departments.
- An Act to amend The Counties Reforestation Act.
- An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Sheep Protection Act.
- An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.
- An Act to regulate the Sale and Installation of Lightning Rods for the Province of Ontario.
- An Act to provide Compensation for Damage caused by Sulphur Fumes.
- An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.
- An Act to amend The Ontario Game and Fisheries Act.
- An Act respecting The Ontario Athletic Commission.
- An Act to amend The School Laws.
- An Act respecting Vocational Education.
- An Act to amend The School Sites Act.
- An Act to amend The Ontario Parole Act, 1917.
- An Act respecting the Extra-Mural Employment of Persons under Sentence.
- An Act respecting the County of Carleton.
- An Act respecting the City Gas Company of London.

An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke and the Weston Golf and Country Club, Limited.

An Act respecting the Division of the Township of Ferris, in the District of Nipissing.

An Act to annex certain land to the Town of Ford City.

An Act respecting the Town of Kincardine.

An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

An Act respecting the City of London.

An Act respecting the Trafalgar Agricultural Society and the Corporation of the Town of Oakville.

An Act to confirm By-law No. 744 of the Town of Orillia.

An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

An Act to incorporate the Town of River Side.

An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

An Act respecting the Township of York.

An Act respecting the Northern Light Railways Company.

An Act respecting Fecunis, Limited.

An Act respecting the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited.

An Act to incorporate Niagara Peninsula Growers, Limited.

To these Acts the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the following words:—

“In His Majesty’s name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Acts.”

Mr. Speaker then said:

May it please Your Honour:—

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and faithful Subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to His Majesty's person and Government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance a Bill intituled "An Act for granting His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st day of October, 1921, and for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st day of October, 1922, and for other purposes therein mentioned."

To this Act the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the following words:—

"His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank His Majesty's dutiful and loyal Subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this Act in His Majesty's name."

His Honour was then pleased to deliver the following Speech:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

In bringing your legislative labours to a close I desire to thank you for the careful attention you have given to the many matters of public interest and importance that have come before you, and to express the hope that the legislation enacted will advance the welfare and the prosperity of the Province as a whole.

Your deliberations have been marked by the spirit of confidence which makes for the strength and success of the community. My Government has been authorized to proceed energetically with the public undertakings, some of which are of considerable magnitude. It is satisfactory to know that the Province is thus making revenue-producing investments which will contribute to the general prosperity of the years to come.

World-wide conditions of a passing nature have affected our industrial activities. I trust that the readjustment now in process will be rapidly completed and that normal production on a stable basis will shortly be restored. At the present time the prospects of a large agricultural yield are good, and opportunities for labour are unusually numerous in the rural districts.

Federal legislation prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into this Province will shortly become operative, in accordance with the deci-

sion of the electors in the recent referendum. It is expected that this enactment will materially assist the enforcement of The Ontario Temperance Act. Provision has been made for an appeal from conviction by a Magistrate under the Act, and other amendments have been found advisable to facilitate the operation of the measure.

The financial provision you have made for all branches of education should ensure progress in this most important subject. Considerable legislation has been adopted respecting the school system, including measures to increase the financial support of high schools; to remedy the conditions of the rural schools adjacent to large cities and towns; and to confer power upon County Councils to form County Boards for secondary education. From these and other educational measures good results may be expected.

Much attention has been given to the problem of the extension of the Hydro-Electric System to the rural districts and small urban centres. The suggestions contained in the valuable report to the Legislature on this subject have been carefully considered, and notable progress has been made towards accomplishing the object in view. The Government has been authorized to give financial assistance towards the construction of rural transmission lines which will help to reduce the cost of electricity to agriculturists and to the small urban centres from which such lines will radiate.

Legislation providing facilities for rural credits has been very fully considered and adopted. While adhering to sound business principles, this legislation provides for short term loans for farmers and also for advances for agricultural development, extended over a period of years.

Several measures affecting social welfare have been enacted. Provision has been made for the protection of children of unmarried persons, as well as their legitimation by the subsequent marriage of their parents. Authority has been given for the legal adoption of infants. Old and helpless parents have been provided for by The Parents' Maintenance Act, and there has been a broadening amendment to The Mothers' Allowances Act. The registration of clergymen and others who are authorized to solemnize marriage will hereafter be required, and Municipal Clerks will have charge of the issuing of Marriage Licenses. Power has been given to the Government to appoint women magistrates in large cities.

To improve the administration of justice, provision has been made for the appointment of County and District Magistrates with a view eventually to the abolition of the payment of Magistrates by fees. Another helpful enactment in this connection is the establishment of the office of Commissioner of Police, who will have charge of all law enforcement, including that of The Ontario Temperance Act.

Attention has been given to the extension and preservation of our forest resources. The Government has been authorized to set aside Crown Lands for reforestation and to acquire other lands for the like purpose. Provision has been made for co-operation between the Government and the various County Councils in the furtherance of this most beneficial undertaking.

Important measures concerning the financial institutions established and conducted under the law of Ontario have occupied your attention. You have provided for the inspection and supervision of the business of Loan and Trust Corporations, for the greater security of those who entrust their funds and estates to the care of these institutions. An amendment has been made to the Ontario Insurance Act, touching Fraternal Insurance Societies, which marks the culmination of many years of effort to place these societies upon a better and more enduring basis.

As a measure of safety an Act has been adopted requiring the licensing of persons and corporations selling material or apparatus to be used for the protection of buildings from damage by lightning. The approval by the Fire Marshall of the system of installation has been made necessary.

Among the other measures adopted are Acts to provide further funds for the development of Northern Ontario, to facilitate land settlement, materially amending the Dairy Standards Act and fixing a date at which it will come into force, respecting the Mining Act and for other purposes.

I regard with satisfaction your cordial approval of the recommendations of the War Memorial Committee. The steps being taken to secure, while it is yet available, as complete a record as possible of the war services of our people are highly commendable. The establishment of a suitable memorial hall will ensure the preservation of much valuable historical material, and will prove of inestimable service to posterity.


I desire to thank you for the financial provision you have made for maintaining the public service and the various activities of the Government, and to assure you that these appropriations will be administered with a due regard to economy and efficiency.

In conclusion, I commend the enactment of much beneficial legislation, and I join with you in the earnest hope that the blessing of Almighty God will continue to rest upon our people and upon our Country.

The Provincial Secretary then said:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

It is His Honour's will and pleasure that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued and this Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.



Appendixes

TO THE

Fifty-fifth Volume

OF THE

Journals of the Legislative
Assembly of Ontario

Session 1921

LIST OF APPENDIXES, 1921.

No. 1. Report of the Industrial Rehabilitation Board Committee.

No. 2. Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

No. 3. Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Appendix

No. 1

REPORT

OF THE

**Industrial Rehabilitation
Board Committee, 1921**

APPENDIX NO. 1.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE ONTARIO LEGISLATURE ON INDUSTRIAL REHABILITATION.

*To the Honourable the Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly of
the Province of Ontario:—*

Whereas on Monday, the 12th of April, 1920, on motion of Mr. McNamara (Riverdale), seconded by Mr. Homuth, it was

Resolved, That it is expedient in the opinion of this House to establish an Industrial Rehabilitation Board to investigate and establish, in accordance with the conditions in Ontario, a system and standard of vocational training for the male and female employees in any industry or profession who are *bona fide* residents of the Province of Ontario, including persons employed as sailors or in any other capacity on board steamboats or sailing vessels on the Great Lakes, and who have been disabled from following their ordinary occupation or calling by injury, disease, muscular restriction, impediment, or impairment in the course of their employment, or from any disability due to the aggravation of any disease attributable directly or indirectly to their employment;

and whereas on the 12th of April, 1920, on motion of Hon. Mr. Drury, seconded by Hon. Mr. Raney, it was carried:

“That all the words of the motion after the first word ‘That’ be omitted and the following substituted therefor: ‘the question of establishing an Industrial Rehabilitation Board in this Province be referred to a Special Committee of this House to be hereafter named’;

and whereas on Friday, the 16th of April, 1920, it was ordered that the following members compose the special committee appointed upon the question of establishing an Industrial Rehabilitation Board in the Province: Messieurs. McNamara, Rollo, Johnston (Simcoe), Warren, Casselman, Price, Maglavery, Tolmie, and Cooper (Toronto), and that the said Committee be empowered to sit during the Recess:

In pursuance of the above instruction your Committee beg leave to report that several meetings were held, and a most careful and thorough investigation of the referred subject of industrial rehabilitation was undertaken.

Suggestions were invited from many interested persons, experts and specialists in certain particular vocations and professions; and favourable comments of the press noted. The subject of equipping and retraining men injured in industry and disabled to prevent pursuit of their former vocations was discussed by those interested, and attention was directed to the notable results attained in Canada, the United States, and many European countries.

While it is admitted that there is considerable range in the liberality of their various provisions in the above-named countries, special attention was directed to the causes and effects, remedies, loss in man power, and gain through production, by rehabilitation at a nominal cost within the Province of Ontario.

Therefore your Committee endorses the following:—

- (1) The principle of rehabilitation.
- (2) The right of election to compensation for the farmers of Ontario.
- (3) The draft Industrial Rehabilitation Bill embodied in and made a part of this report.

(4) That this report be printed and widely distributed among the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, to labour, educational and manufacturing associations or concerns, and that the Bill be held over until next session.

We consider that industrial rehabilitation may be briefly defined as the restoration of earning power to disabled workmen. To use a more scientific definition, it includes, in its widest sense, the reclamation of potential powers of production, inactive through subnormal physical or mental capabilities. It is grounded upon the assumption that there exists in the mentally and physically handicapped portion of the population certain latent capabilities susceptible of development by systematic training and encouragement.

Prior to 1915 certain isolated institutions in Belgium, Holland, England, and the United States were attempting to train the cripples of industry, and certain national schools for the education of the deaf, the dumb, and the blind had been established. In 1915 practically all of the civilized countries at war had started a movement for the systematic training of war cripples, although such training was largely without unified control, being for the most part handled by committees and municipalities, or in cases where the money was furnished by the central government, control was largely in the hands of the local authorities. From 1916 on, control became more unified, and elaborate national systems for the care of war cripples have become the rule rather than the exception.

In 1917 attention was directed (1) to the cripples other than war cripples, and the idea has grown into legislative enactments in California (2), New York (3), Massachusetts (4), Minnesota (5), Illinois (6), Nevada (7), New Jersey (8), North Dakota (9), Oregon (10), Indiana (11), Pennsylvania (12), Rhode Island (13), Virginia (14), and the United States (15), although action in some of these jurisdictions has been limited to certain classes of cripples, as, for instance, those coming under workmen's compensation legislation.

Of the methods used in the case of war cripples it has been said: "The evolution of retraining has taken place by natural growth. Hand in hand with the retraining has gone study, research and experiment" (16).

There is much available literature describing the various processes used in rehabilitation. The object of all rehabilitatory work is the reduction of disability to the smallest possible minimum:

Rehabilitation may be considered as comprehending the following:

- (1) Adequate medical and surgical care to relieve physical disability as far as possible.

(NOTE.—The bracketed numbers indicate references as attached.)

- (2) Functional re-education to encourage latent functional powers.
- (3) Prosthesis, the fitting of and instruction in the use of artificial appliances to overcome bodily disadvantage.
- (4) Professional re-education to hasten and encourage social and economic rehabilitation.
- (5) Facilities and aid to ensure employment consonant with disability.
- (6) Compensation for permanent disability.

It has been found that the problem of application of rehabilitation is essentially one of the individual:

“Not to be solved by any scientific formula, for the factors due to varying individuality are not susceptible to accurate measurement. These men (i.e., the cripples) cannot be sorted and classified and then each group treated according to some prearranged scientific plan. The most complete system, charted, organized and planned in advance, will fail, if it does not provide a ready means of adapting it to individual need; and unless it provides at all times for the fullest understanding of human nature” (17).

An analysis of the causes of cripplings discloses the following:

1. Congenital defect—(a) Mental.
(b) Physical.
2. War wounds.
3. Accidental injury.
 - (a) At occupation (1) Under Workmen's Compensation.
(2) Not under Workmen's Compensation.
 - (b) Not at occupation.
4. Disease.
 - (a) At occupation (1) Under Workmen's Compensation.
(2) Not under Workmen's Compensation.

While it is not possible to ascertain with high accuracy the number of cripples in Ontario, nor the annual augmentation, by the use of some data obtained by the Welfare Federation of Cleveland (18), it is possible to obtain figures which are minima. In that data appears the result of a survey of general population, and the compilation included persons recognized by themselves or their families as being seriously handicapped physically through the lack of normal use of skeleton or skeletal muscles, a definition which closely corresponds to a pensionable disability under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario. There are at least 350 cases of pensionable disability in Ontario each year coming under the Workmen's Compensation Act (there were 317 in 1918 (19) and 379 in 1917 (20) in Schedule 1 industries only). The Workmen's Compensation Act covers about 65 per cent. of the employed population of Ontario.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CRIPPLES EACH YEAR IN ONTARIO.

Cause	Per Cent. of Total	Estimated Annual Number
	Cleveland	Ontario
Congenital.....	7	330
Accidental occupation.....	11	519
Other accident.....	32	1,510
Infantile paralysis.....	13	614
Other disease.....	34	1,605
Not stated.....	3	142
Totals.....	100	4,720

This estimate is absolutely minimum, as it is based upon a conscious underestimate of the number of pensionable disabilities under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario. It does not include war cripples, and the narrowing of the Cleveland definition in recognizing only defect of skeleton or skeletal muscles, excludes cases of mental disorder and of cardiac, respiratory, alimentary, etc., diseases.

By the introduction of some basic data some more or less tangible figures may be obtained. The average impairment in each case of pensionable disability under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario is 22 per cent.; (21) the average working week is six days and the average working year fifty weeks; (22) the average weekly wage is \$24.80; (23) each \$1.00 of wages expended produces \$5.053 worth of finished product; (24) the annual wage expenditure in Ontario is assumed as a constant, namely, the estimated wage expenditure for 1919 under Schedule 1 of the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act; (25) the average life-time is taken as twenty-five years. (26)

ESTIMATED TIME, WAGE AND VALUE OF PRODUCT LOSS DUE TO CRIPPLES IN ONTARIO.

	All Cripples (one year) (27)	One Year's Cripples (one year)	One Cripple (his lifetime)	One Cripple (one year)
Time loss.....	7,788,000 days	311,520 days	1,650 days	66 days
Wage loss.....	\$32,190,400 00	\$1,287,616 00	\$6,820 00	\$272 80
Value of product loss...	\$162,658,091 20	\$6,506,323 65	\$34,461 46	\$1,378 46

A considerable number of the employees of the Ford plant at Detroit, about 18 per cent., are physically below standard. On November 1st, 1917, 6,095 of the men employed in that factory were either crippled or diseased, there being 3 men without legs, 54 with one leg or foot missing, 22 with but one

hand or arm, and 2 totally blind. Of these all were hired with their present deformities, except 2 one-armed men and 1 man with but one foot. The plant reported further openings for legless men 670, for one-legged men 2,637, for one-armed men 715, for totally blind men 10. Of the total number of cripples and other men physically under par working at that plant 85 per cent. were classed by their foremen as fully efficient, and 15 per cent. were found to be unable to keep up with their able-bodied fellow-workmen in the matter of production. In this latter class the deficiency in almost all cases was but slight. (28)

Cripples largely rehabilitate themselves to some extent. They must or else starve. A close examination into sixty-two cases is made in the last report of the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board, and it was concluded "there is an opportunity for every disabled worker, provided he be willing to seize it, to earn wages which with his pension will bring his earnings to a parity with what he was earning at the time of injury." (29)

Dr. Jules Amar, of France, than whom there is no greater authority, has summed the matter up:

"How many are capable of being re-educated, and how many doomed to be assisted? By consulting former experience, and on the faith of the soundest proof, eighty per cent. of the maimed are capable of vocational re-education." They may be divided as follows: Forty-five per cent. totally, that is to say, that they may succeed in earning normal salaries, on condition that ten per cent. among them, or thereabouts, specialize. The direction in which they specialize should always be, as has already been said, within the limits of their former trade. Twenty per cent. may not arrive at a full working capacity, as their re-education is partial, but still it gives an appreciable output. The directing of men of this class towards their proper profession involves a series of scientific observations, for the purpose of providing employers with exact knowledge as to the value of each man's output and capacity. Finally, fifteen per cent. will have to practise subordinate trades (*petits metiers*), in which production is small, their re-education being entirely fragmentary. Whereas the sixty-five per cent. representing the first two classes may be put into ordinary workshops or establish themselves as "workmen in their own rooms," the last fifteen per cent. must work in workshops organized for this purpose, where in any case they can earn a bare livelihood. The majority of the twenty per cent. not capable of being re-educated are dependent upon relief institutions for work; nevertheless, a very small minority attain sufficient productivity to be useful in the workshops.

In a general manner, it appears to be unreasonable, according to these totals, not to seek to re-educate almost all the mutilated. It is a question of science and of method; it demands the organization of training schools, of which we are about to speak. It unites medical and technical knowledge, to the end that artificial limbs will be adapted to satisfy physical and vocational capabilities. The proportion dependent upon relief is then reduced; and one must endeavour, without ceasing, to diminish it. I wish that the term "relief" were in reality, as in its definition, a synonym for collaboration or for union.

One does not *give* relief, that is to say, charity, to the glorious victims of the present war; one *owes* them work in the noble acceptance of the word.

Maimed or mutilated..	{	Re-educable, 80 per cent.....	{	Total: 45 per cent., with	} Professional schools.
		Non-re-educable, 20 per cent..		some specializing	
				Partial: 20 per cent.....	
				Fragmentary: 15 per cent.	
				Relief institutions	
				Partly in special workshops (30)	

Without great elaboration, let it be said that a comprehensive scheme of rehabilitation for disabilities from all causes necessitates medical, educational and industrial, and hence institutional agencies, beyond those which are now existent. The principal conclusions and recommendations of the Cleveland survey are pertinent.

“The problem of the crippled population is first of all a problem of child welfare, although adults were more numerous than the children—more than three times as many—a fourth of the crippled population were not only under the age of fifteen at the time of the survey, but a third of the adult cripples became disabled while under the age of fifteen. Thus a total of forty-nine per cent. of the whole group were disabled in childhood.

As a children’s problem it is essentially a medico-educational one. The nature of the causes and the form of the crippled condition, the consequent length of time and well-known conditions of life and treatment needed to minimize the handicap require that provision for medical and educational care be planned in close relation to each other.

The varieties of muscular and skeletal defects are so many, and crippled persons, like normal ones, have so great a variety of aptitudes, that no single or simple means will satisfactorily provide for their vocational preparation. Their needs must, therefore, be met as part of a general, liberal programme for prevocational education.

The problem of the crippled population is also a problem of adults in working life. The number who are over sixty years of age is small; the number of those who became crippled after age sixty is still smaller. But the number becoming crippled during working life by accident, especially of men, is large, and the number crippled from all causes very large.

The great variety of forms of handicap and notable differences in aptitude and experience prior to becoming crippled point to the need of a most flexible system of service to those among cripples who cannot make their way unaided, but who may be benefited by special plans for their rehabilitation and re-education. This plan may well be a part of an adequate system for vocational training of all citizens.” (31)

There are many individual units in Ontario which have to do directly or indirectly with cripples. These are:—

- DOMINION (1) Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.
(2) Employment service.
(3) Public health work.

- PROVINCIAL (1) Asylums.
(2) Child welfare work.
(3) Educational work.
(4) Public health work.
(5) Employment service.
(6) Workmen's Compensation Act.

- MUNICIPAL (1) Educational work.
(2) Hospitals.

- PRIVATE (1) Fraternal orders.
(2) Trades unions.
(3) Hospitals.
(4) Charities.
(5) Individual efforts.

There is as yet no continuous, co-ordinated, central organization in Ontario that has to do with cripples. "Canada is tending her war-disabled from clearing station to his last hospital better than the wounded soldier has ever been tended in any war," and the war cripples of Ontario are included. The Workmen's Compensation Act is paying compensation, paying for medical and surgical aid and paying for artificial limbs for certain cases of accident, long steps toward rehabilitation, but the compensation cripples are not rehabilitated.

"The individual received direct from surgical treatment, often crippled more from inadequate and ignorant attention than by injury, generally without proper prosthesis, and always without special knowledge being applied, without either functional or professional re-education, given a pension and without aid or assistance except from benevolence or shame of employers or charity from outsiders, is thrown upon his own resources and allowed ignorantly and passively to rehabilitate himself." (32)

As the need for it passes, and that is now, valuable equipment, irreplaceable for the most part, that has been devised and used in rehabilitating so many Canadian soldiers is to be scrapped.

The Employment Service Council of Canada last May resolved that a special division for the placement of handicaps should be formed. (33) The Ontario Public Employment service has placed some cripples. Technical schools are open to cripples as well as to able-bodied men. The Canadian National Institute for the Blind has inaugurated a scientific service for those totally blind and is converting them into wage earners.

Dealing with the question of rehabilitation in quite a general way, it is suggested that any scheme which would embrace all cripples should be the matter of very careful consideration. Wholesale undertaking might perhaps paralyze results, for general work is largely experimental, and rehabilitation, as a whole, in the event of failure or of even mediocre success would eventually suffer. It is felt that the course of wisdom is to create a nucleus around which a more elaborate plan might grow.

A scheme embracing all cripples would, of course, necessitate the utilization of forces and institutions now in existence and these would have to be centralized and completely co-ordinated. The financial outlay necessary for allowances, for equipment, for surveys and for staff would necessarily be heavy. (The cost of allowance at \$30 a month for six months to each cripple exceeds the total annual budget of the Province.) (34) While centralization would reduce the total burden, nevertheless the mere matter of allowances presents a difficult problem of public finance.

There is, however, strong chance for success in rehabilitating cripples under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Workmen's Compensation Board already performs three, and sometimes four, of the essential steps in scientific rehabilitation, namely, medical and surgical aid, functional re-education (as far as such is contained in medical aid), prosthesis and compensation for permanent disability. Under its jurisdiction come bodies of employers mutually bound up together; it can charge industry for the burden of industry's cripples. It possesses contact with both employers and injured workmen. The Workmen's Compensation Act in itself perhaps foreshadows authority for rehabilitation. The Board "may in any case where in its opinion the interest . . . of the workman . . . warrants it, advance or pay to or for the workman such lump sum as the circumstances warrant and as the Board may determine."

Scientific rehabilitation, as the result of war experience, connotes adequate medical care, proper prosthesis, functional re-education, vocational training, and system for employment—these form the physical side; and, from the mental side, understanding of psychothemia, sympathetic counseling, patience, and tolerance. It follows as a matter of course that in order to achieve the ends of rehabilitation a system of pay or allowance must be provided for the cripples and their dependents. The necessary adaptations of these methods to industrial cripples constitutes the patent answer to the question, "How to deal with crippled workers."

The jurisdictional differences must be noted. Under present systems or under present laws, it is impossible for a compensation board to exercise mandatory control of the patient from time of injury. It is possible, however, to eliminate the inefficient and unscrupulous medical practitioners. It is not possible to require a patient to submit to occupational therapy, but it is possible

in large industrial centres to make arrangements with hospitals so that occupational therapy be made a part of hospital regimen.

The first thing necessary to a plan of rehabilitating industrial cripples is the appointment of a vocational officer, a man of broad sympathies and good judgment, one conversant alike with industrial processes and human nature. On notification of an accident likely to result in serious permanent disability this officer should, if possible, interview the injured man and his dependents, to provide proper hospital accommodation and a living allowance for maintenance of family, so that the fear of want could be eliminated from the mind of the patient, for it is the actual fear of want, of subsequent incapacitation and industrial uselessness that engenders psychothemia, the poison that creeps into the mind suddenly shocked by injury and then allowed to stagnate through long and forced idleness, and psychothemia, even as neurosis, often disables more than injury itself. Any business or financial worries settled on the mind of the patient should be dissipated by sound advice so that surgical recovery can be hastened. The patient should be visited often, his prior occupational record should be studied, and his employer canvassed for suitable employment. The thought that any service rendered is with the ultimate idea of reducing compensation should not be allowed to germinate. When convalescing time comes, a start should be made towards suggesting new avenues of employment necessitated by injury; that he can be self-supporting, that his power to work can be restored should be the thoughts dominant in the patient's mind—this by the power of suggestion. Naturally the man's desires should be consulted, but he should be impressed gently but firmly with the fact that he must compete with non-disabled workers and so piloted into a sensible and practical occupation. He should be advised further as to the most suitable type of artificial appliance. Employers within the jurisdiction should be canvassed for suitable opportunities. It is more than a belief that there is suitable employment for every disabled man provided he is not insane and that he retains some useful faculty. In point of fact, experience, and such meagre statistical data as are available, demonstrate this fact. The actual introduction to the new trade should be in the shop or existent institution for rehabilitation and re-education. If fitted, the man should receive further education—in night schools, social service classes, technical schools or business colleges. Finally, when placed he should be further encouraged to "carry on" and sympathetic tolerance should overbear his vagaries.

It is manifest that pay and allowances would be necessary. These could be deducted from compensation without too greatly reducing the amount and without fear of overpayment.

Objections can be urged, it is true, against such a plan, that it is academic in scope, paternalistic in conception, and socialistic in execution, that men will not submit, that employers will not provide employment, that the trade unions would object, that it would cost too much, that it is not practical.

Whether it be paternalistic, idealistic, socialistic, or academic is beside the point. The fundamental thing is that there is a problem, that that problem requires solution, that it can be solved, and that it can be solved only by action. All the writings or talkings cannot restore one cripple to service unless there be action. That the employers will hire these men is a proved fact. Even as a matter of business if a cripple can compete and the employer, through compensation, has already paid him a part of wages, surely in return for 100 per cent. labour he is willing to pay a minimum of wages up to a reasonable amount. That men will not submit is not shown to be true by war experience, and even if some of the wastage can be reclaimed something is done. Trade unions will not object if they understand the fundamental conception of rehabilitation, for to do so would defeat some of their own ends. The overhead cost of the scheme is not overwhelming—the services of one or at most two officers and the incidental postage, office, and travelling expenses—for the number of cripples in any one jurisdiction in any one year is small.

In last analysis the argument against action in restoring cripples to industrial usefulness, in view of the necessity to provide for the added risk by reason of prior disability is untenable. In the case of jurisdictions which refuse permanent total disability compensation to a substandard workman who has his remaining earning capacity seriously impaired or wiped out in the accident under consideration, the conclusion cannot be supported by the premises. A careful calculation for a jurisdiction which provides for total disability regardless of whether that disability was incurred in the present or in a previous accident shows that the average rate per hundred of pay-roll would be increased by less than one-third of 1 cent in order to meet the added burden necessitated through a humane consideration of facts.

Furthermore, with Canada's four years of war cripples back in the country, the problem of prior disability in relation to subsequent compensation has not become acute nor pressing to the Ontario Compensation Board. Pennsylvania has a record of 42,111 employment openings in that State for its soldiers, sailors, and marines who may return disabled by war service, and it is understood no question of increased compensation liability has become apparent.

(35)

It might be considered that legislation for the purpose of providing rehabilitation to pensioners, or persons severely disabled, under the Workmen's Compensation Act might be considered as class legislation. Rehabilitation being a benefit is an addition to compensation and if the extension of benefits is class legislation, then, logically the original benefits were introduced by class legislation. If rehabilitation should not be provided for because legislation introducing it is class legislation, then for the same reason The Workmen's Compensation Act, it is submitted, should never have become law.

It is quite true that The Workmen's Compensation Act does not cover all classes of workmen, but excluded employers in all industries other than in the

industry of farming and employers of domestic servants can elect to bring their workmen under Part 1 of the Act. (36) In some cases, where number-limit exclusions obtain, a workman, by election, can bring his employer's industry under. Sir William Meredith, the framer of The Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act, wrote in his Final Report (36):

"I have not thought it advisable at the outset to bring within the scope of Part 1 all employments. . . . There is, I admit, no logical reason why, if any, all should not be included."

The administration of legislation providing rehabilitation for pensioners or persons severely disabled under The Workmen's Compensation Act should, it is submitted, be under the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation Board. This would prevent duplication, confusion and expense. The Board not only is in possession of the medical and vocational history of the workman, and is in contact with the employers of labour but also is now charged with the supervision of medical aid, the awarding of compensation and the furnishing of artificial appliances.

It is believed that not more than 20 per cent. of pensioners will be rehabilitated under the proposed bill. Persons not British subjects are not included, nor are persons not resident of Ontario unless they are citizens of and resident in a country with reciprocal rehabilitation privileges. Some cripples go into business for themselves, some are taken back directly into the industry in which they were injured, at the same or different occupations, some find work in allied industries in the same or allied occupations and some enter quite dissimilar occupations in quite dissimilar industries. (37)

Assuming the number of cripples to be seventy each year and assuming full compensation course of instruction and therapeutic treatment, the total cost of rehabilitation as outlined in the bill hereunto appended, will not exceed \$50,000.

Six months' compensation to each of seventy cripples at 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ % of \$24.80	\$28,933 33
Seventy courses at \$125.00 a course	8,750 00
Seventy cases of therapeutic treatment at \$100.00 a case	7,000 00
Total	<u>\$44,683 33</u>

Overhead cost, consisting of office, staff and clerical assistance together with incidental expenses such as stationery and postage, and travelling expenses of workmen and examination (specialists) fees would not total more than \$5,000, it is estimated, due consideration having been given to present staff and facilities of The Workmen's Compensation Board.

BILL.

HIS MAJESTY, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as *The Industrial Rehabilitation Act*.

2. *The Workmen's Compensation Act* is amended by adding thereto the following section:

Rehabilitation.

44c.—(1) Where a workman, by reason of permanent injury entitling him to payment of compensation for life, is or may be expected to be seriously handicapped in obtaining remunerative employment, the Board, if of opinion that he will be materially benefited thereby, may, within a reasonable time after the injury, arrange for or provide:

(a) Such therapeutic treatment in addition to medical aid as in its opinion will be necessary to rehabilitate the workman physically;

(b) Such course or courses of instruction as in its opinion is necessary to provide for the occupational re-training of the workman;

(c) Such assistance as it may be able to give the workman in securing suitable employment.

(2) In the industries in Schedule 1 the benefits provided for by subsection 1 shall be paid for by the Board out of the Accident Fund and the necessary amount shall be included in assessments levied upon the employers, and in the industries in Schedule 2 they shall be paid or provided for by the employers individually as the Board may direct.

(3) The period during which an injured workman is undergoing such therapeutic treatment or receiving such instructional course shall, for the purpose of payment of compensation, be considered a period of temporary disability, but in fixing such compensation regard shall be had to any amount actually earned by such workman, and payment of such compensation shall not in any case be continued after the expiration of six months from the date of actually entering upon any course of instruction.

- (4) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any workman not a British subject resident in Ontario, except workmen who are residents of and owe allegiance to a country or place outside of Ontario under the laws of which country or place a British subject resident in Ontario would be entitled to industrial rehabilitation, and in the case of such non-resident the benefits may be limited to the equivalent of those provided for by such law.
- (5) To assist in defraying the expenses incurred in the administration of this section there shall be paid to the Board out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund such annual sum, not exceeding \$ _____ as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may direct.
- 3.** This Act shall become operative on _____, 1921, and shall apply only to workmen injured on and after that date.

REFERENCES.

1. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin No. 248, United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, Washington, 1919.
2. Chapter 183, Laws of 1919, also Chapter 418, Laws of 1919.
3. Chapter 760, Laws of 1920.
4. Chapter 230, Laws of 1918, also Chapter 231, Laws of 1918.
5. Chapter 365, Laws of 1919, also Chapter 367, Laws of 1919.
6. Act approved June 28, 1919
7. Chapter 182, Laws of 1919.
8. Chapter 74, Laws of 1919.
9. Chapter 162, Laws of 1919.
10. Chapter 435, Laws of 1919.
11. Employment Service Act, 1919.
12. Act No. 418, Laws of 1919.
13. Chapter 1737, Laws of 1919.

14. Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 1920.
15. Fess-Kenyon Act, 1920.
16. Retraining Canada's Disabled Soldiers, W. E. Segsworth, M.E., Ottawa, 1920, p. 9.
17. W. E. Segsworth, M.E., *ibid*, page 5.
18. Publications of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, Series 2, No. 3, New York, 1918.
19. Report for 1919 of The Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, page 46, Toronto, 1920.
20. Report for 1918 of The Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, page 42, Toronto, 1919.
21. Special Compilation made by the writer in 1918.
22. Standard adopted by the Committee on Statistics of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions.
23. Report for 1918 of The Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, page 9.
24. Derived from the Census of Manufacturers, Canada, 1916.
25. The amount is \$303,778,470.90. Report for 1919 of The Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, page 20.
26. The median age in the United States is given as 24 years (Vol. 1, United States Census, 1910, page 309), at which age the complete expectation of life is 40.38 years (United States Life Tables, 1910, page 16). The under-statement has been to allow for industrial expansion.
27. These values are also for one year's cripples (their lifetime).
28. Iron age, September 26, 1918, Vol. 102, pages 739-742.
29. Report for 1919 of The Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, page 55.
30. Special Bulletin, April, 1916, Military Hospitals Commission, Ottawa, page 33.
31. See Reference 18.
32. "Restoring the Injured to Industry," T. N. Dean, American Industries for October, 1917, New York.

33. Canada Labour Gazette, July, 1919.
34. The total amount would be \$21,240,000.
35. Section 25 (4).
36. "How to Deal with Cripples," T. N. Dean, before the Fifth Annual Meeting of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, Bulletin No. 264, United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, Washington.
37. A study of pensioners under The Workmen's Compensation Act, Ontario, which covers over 2,500 cases and which is now in process or compilation, will, in all probability, show that 20 *per cent.* is a maximum figure.

Your committee beg to acknowledge the great and valuable assistance rendered by the following physicians and experts: Lieut-Col. (Dr.) McVicar, M.C., Medical Director Dominion Orthopedic Hospital, Toronto; Major Young, principal Vocational Officer for the Province of Ontario; Professor H. E. J. Haultain, Mining Department, University of Toronto (who was the first Dominion vocational organizing officer for the Province of Ontario); A. R. Burnette, Doctor of Sociology, University of Toronto, formerly D.S.C.R.; and your committee desire special mention to be made of the invaluable work and aid rendered by Mr. T. N. Dean, Statistician of the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board, who at your committee's request acted as advisor during the investigation.

J. McNAMARA, *Chairman.*

Appendix No. 2

REPORT

OF THE

Standing Committee on Public
Accounts, 1921

Appendix No. 2

R E P O R T

OF THE

Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 1921

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1921.

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

Your Committee has had produced before it the following accounts, vouchers, correspondence and particulars in connection with the Public Accounts of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended the 31st October, 1920, which it has carefully examined and considered.

Details in connection with the following items:—

Timber investigation, \$50,000.00, page 585, Public Accounts, 1920.

Travelling and other expenses in connection with the redemption of securities in England \$4,000.00, page 538, Public Accounts, 1920.

Game and Fisheries, \$819,765.71, page a36, Public Accounts, 1920.

Repairs and maintenance, Parliament and Departmental Buildings—
Items \$1,015.98 and \$304.77, page 452, and items \$124.50, \$542.45, \$6,204.54, \$5,299.55, \$3,330.45, \$2,588.91, \$1,411.44, \$142.50, \$250.00, on page 453, Public Accounts, 1920.

Provincial Highways, \$10,725.34, page 745, Public Accounts, 1920; \$21,412.80, page 747, Public Accounts, 1920; \$12,255.30, \$1,157.28 and \$2,800.00, page 751, Public Accounts, 1920; and \$78,800.00, page 759, Public Accounts, 1920.

Automobiles, repairs, maintenance, etc., \$66.14, \$603.48, \$45.00, \$6,331.63, page 457, Public Accounts, 1920.

Automobiles, purchase, etc., \$950.00, page 457, Public Accounts, 1920, and \$9,999.40, page 562, Public Accounts, 1920.

Provincial Motion Picture Bureau—Moving picture machines, equipment and films, etc., \$132,958.20, page 537, Public Accounts, 1920.

Enforcing Ontario Temperance Act, \$1,674.49, \$1,000.00, \$47,216.69, \$5,007.60, \$240.00, \$18,071.97, page 542, Public Accounts, 1920.

Maternal and Child Welfare and Public Health Nursing Division, \$11,430.40, page 565. Public Accounts, 1920.

Messrs. the Hon. Frank Biggs, Minister of Public Works; A. H. Pepall, Financial Agent; R. T. Harding, K.C.; J. Rogers, Chief Provincial Police; J. D. Flavelle, Chairman, Board of License Commissioners; Donald Macdonald, Deputy Minister, Game and Fisheries; W. L. Haight, Crown Attorney, Parry Sound; George Moore, Police Magistrate, Parry Sound; J. Armstrong, Deputy Sheriff, Parry Sound; T. Spencer, Chief of Police, Parry Sound; C. H. Knight, Provincial Police, Parry Sound; H. R. A. Ely, Patrol Officer, Game and Fisheries Department; Neil McNaughton, Overseer, Game and Fisheries Department; R. P. Fairbairn, Deputy Minister, Public Works; W. W. Dunlop, Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities; F. G. Lee, Caretaker, Parliament Buildings; L. C. Parkin, Auto Dealer, Dundas; Roy A. Reynolds, Dundas; George Hogarth, Chief Engineer, Highways Department; W. A. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways; Percy Woodward, Dundas; Wallace Matthews, Dundas; J. M. Mowat, Accountant, Board of License Commissioners; Dr. J. W. S. McCullough, Health Officer; Martin Jerome, Auto Dealer, Dundas; O. Elliott, Director, Government Moving Picture Branches; William Dawson, formerly Director Motion Picture Bureau, and E. J. Callaghan, Fort Frances, were examined.

Your Committee has held, during the Session, seventeen meetings, and submits herewith the Minutes of the Proceedings and the evidence given as taken by stenographer.

JAMES W. CURRY,

Chairman.

Committee Room,

Toronto, April 27th, 1921.

MINUTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Legislative Assembly,

Toronto, February 24, 1921.

The Select Standing Committee to whom was referred the examination of the Public Accounts of the Province for the fiscal year 1919-20, and composed of the following members: Honourable Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Carmichael, Clarke, Cooper (Toronto), Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Doherty, Ferguson, Freeborn, Godfrey, Grant, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Hogarth, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnson (Lanark), Lennox, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, MacBride, MacVicar, Mageau, Magladery, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Raney, Rollo, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Stover, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield, met this day for organization.

Present—Messieurs Cunningham, Dewart, Ferguson, Hall, Hay, Hicks, Hill, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, Mageau, Mills, Murdoch, Pinard, Racine, Raney, Sewell, Smith, Stover, Tolmie, Tooms, Warren, Watson.

Moved by Mr. Smith that Mr. Curry be elected Chairman for the Session.

On Motion of Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That Messrs J. D. Flavelle, J. F. Mowat, J. A. Ayearst and W. B. Cleland be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m., and give evidence regarding the following items (Public Accounts, 1919-20): p. 541, Enforcing Ontario Temperance Act, \$316,055.70; p. a86, Board of License Commissioners, repayment with interest of advance of \$150,000.00 for acquisition of Liquor Vendors' Stock, \$153,191.78; p. a37, License Branch, Licenses, etc., Commissioners, \$1,010,788.99, and bring with them and produce all books, letters, papers and documents connected therewith.

On Motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered, That the Provincial Auditor be summoned to appear before this Committee at its next meeting, Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m., and

produce all accounts, letters, vouchers and papers relating to item, page 585, Public Accounts, 1919-20, "R. T. Harding accountable *re* Timber Investigation, \$50,000.00."

On Motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered, That R. T. Harding be summoned to appear before this Committee at its next meeting on Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m., in connection with the item \$50,000.00 on page 585, Public Accounts, 1919-20, and that he be required to produce all books, papers, letters, accounts, vouchers and memoranda in any way pertaining to this expenditure "*re* Timber Investigation."

On Motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. Hill,

Ordered, That Mr. A. H. Pepall, of the Toronto Plate Glass Company, Toronto, be summoned to appear before this Committee at its next meeting on Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m., in connection with item \$4,000.00, appearing on page 538, Public Accounts of Ontario, 1919-20, and that he bring with him and produce all books, papers, letters and memoranda in connection therewith.

On Motion of Mr. Stover, seconded by Mr. Pinard,

Ordered, That Mr. Donald Macdonald, Deputy Minister of Game and Fisheries, be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m., and give evidence with respect to the following items (Public Accounts, 1919-20): p. a36, \$819,765.71, and particularly Fur Dealers' Licenses, \$34,850.27; Fines (game), \$14,246.88; Sales (furs, etc.), \$11,086.10, and to bring with him and produce all books, papers, letters and documents relating thereto.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, March 2nd, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room.

Wednesday, March 2, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Bowman, Carmichael, Cunningham, Dewart, Ferguson, Freeborn, Godfrey, Halerow, Hall, Hay, Henry,

Hill, Lennox, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, Mageau, Magladery, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Pinard, Price, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Smith, Stover, Tolmie, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Mr. A. H. Pepall was sworn and examined.

Mr. R. T. Harding was sworn, examined and ordered to attend at next meeting of the Committee.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, March 4, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, March 4, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Carmichael, Hicks, McAlpine, Price, Raney, Smith, Tolmie, Watson.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie, Committee adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, March 9th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, March 9, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Bowman, Braekin, Buckland, Cunningham, Ferguson, Freeborn, Godfrey, Greenlaw, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, MacVicar, Mageau, Nixon, Oke, Pinard, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Smith, Swayze, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson.

Mr. R. T. Harding re-attended and was re-examined.

On Motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Pinard,

Ordered, That Mr. Elliott, of the Moving Pictures Department of the Provincial Treasurer's Department, be summoned to appear before the Committee and give evidence in connection with item, Salaries, \$6,866.66, appearing on page 535 of the Public Accounts, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered, That E. J. Callaghan, of Fort Frances, be summoned to appear before the Committee on Wednesday, March 16th, and to bring with him all papers, letters and documents passing between himself and R. T. Harding or Mr. Backus, many of them in reference to item of \$50,000.00, appearing on page 585 of the Public Accounts, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Pinard, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered, That J. Richardson & Son, or any one on their behalf, be summoned to appear before this Committee and give evidence in respect to an item of \$59,056.76, appearing on page 767 of the Public Accounts, 1920, and to bring all papers, documents, etc., respecting the same.

On Motion of Mr. Pinard, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered, That James Wills & Son, or any one on their behalf, be summoned to appear before this Committee and give evidence in respect to item \$4,566.31, appearing on page 767 of the Public Accounts, 1920, and to all documents and papers in respect to the same.

On Motion of Mr. McCrea, seconded by Mr. Mageau,

Ordered, That Mr. Pepall, of Aemilius Jarvis & Co., be summoned to appear before this Committee at its next meeting and give evidence with reference to item \$4,000.00, appearing on page 558 of the Public Accounts as paid to A. H. Pepall.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, March 11th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, March 11, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Buckland, Cunningham, Dewart, Freeborn, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod,

MacVicar, Mageau, Marshall, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Raney, Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Widdifield.

Mr. J. Rogers, Chief of Provincial Police, was sworn and examined.

Mr. J. D. Flavelle, Chairman of Board of License Commissioners, was sworn and examined.

Mr. Donald Macdonald, Deputy Minister of Game and Fisheries, was sworn and examined.

On Motion of Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Walker,

Ordered, That Mr. George Moore, Police Magistrate for the District of Parry Sound, be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 16th, at 10 a.m., and give evidence with respect to the enforcement of The Game and Fisheries Act, and particularly in regard to moneys paid for violations of the said Act, and to bring with him and produce all books, letters, papers and documents relating thereto. page a36 of the Public Accounts, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Walker,

Ordered, That Mr. H. R. A. Ely, Special Patrol Officer of the Game and Fisheries Department, be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 16th, at 10 a.m., and give evidence with respect to the enforcement of The Game and Fisheries Act, and particularly regarding any moneys received by him on behalf of the Department, and to bring with him and produce all books, papers, letters and documents relating thereto, page a36 of the Public Accounts, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Walker,

Ordered, That Mr. Neil McNaughton, Overseer of the Game and Fisheries Department, be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 16th, at 10 a.m., and give evidence with respect to the enforcement of The Game and Fisheries Act, and particularly regarding any moneys received by him on behalf of the Department, and to bring with him and produce all books, papers, letters and documents relating thereto. Page a36, Public Accounts, 1920.

On Motion of Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Walker,

Ordered, That Mr. Walter L. Haight, Crown Attorney for the District of Parry Sound, be summoned to appear before this Committee on Wednesday, March 16th, at 10 a.m., and give evidence with respect to the enforcement of The Game and Fisheries Act, and particularly with regard to moneys paid for violations of the said Act, and to bring with him and produce all letters, papers and documents relating thereto. Page a36, Public Accounts, 1920.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, March 16th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, March 16, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Buckland, Clarke, Cunningham, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McLeod, MacVicar, Magean, Magladery, Marshall, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Pinard, Racine, Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Mr. W. L. Haight, Crown Attorney, Parry Sound, sworn and examined.

Mr. Geo. Moore, Police Magistrate, Parry Sound, sworn and examined.

Mr. J. Armstrong, Deputy Sheriff, Parry Sound, sworn and examined.

Mr. T. Spencer, Chief of Police, Parry Sound, sworn and examined.

Mr. C. H. Knight, Provincial Police, Parry Sound, sworn and examined.

Mr. H. R. A. Ely, Patrol Officer, sworn and examined.

Mr. Neil McNaughton, Overseer, sworn and examined.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Walker,

It was unanimously resolved that the Treasurer be requested to authorize the payment of the expenses of Messrs Armstrong, Spencer and Knight, of Parry Sound, they having been requested to attend, by telegraph, time not permitting the issue of the regular summons by order of the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, March 18, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Toronto, March 18, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Buckland, Clarke, Dewart, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, McAlpine, MacVicar, Murdoch, Price, Racine, Raney, Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Tolmie, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That the Deputy Minister of Public Works produce before this Committee all bills, receipts and vouchers pertaining to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920:—

Page 452. Standard Sanitary	\$1,015 98	
Vivid Electric Lamp	304 77	
		\$1,320 75
Page 453. Adams Furniture	\$124 50	
Canadian General Electric	542 45	
T. Eaton Co.	6,204 54	
Grand & Toy	5,299 55	
Mitchell & McGill	3,330 45	
Murray-Kay	2,588 91	
Robert Simpson	1,411 44	
Standard Bronze	142 50	
Goldie-McCullough	250 00	
		\$20,094 34

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That the Deputy Treasurer be requested to produce before this Committee the bills, invoices, receipts, vouchers and cheques, and other papers pertaining to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920:—Page 745, \$10,725.34; page 747, \$21,412.80; page 751, \$12,255.30, and that Mr. Leonard C. Parker, Dundas, be asked to appear before this Committee.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Ordered, That the vouchers and accounts pertaining to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920, be produced by the Deputy Minister of

Public Works before this Committee:—Page 457, repairs and maintenance, W. R. Brock, auto rugs, \$66.14; Cutten & Foster, Ltd., motor robes, curtains, tire chains, etc, \$603.48; T. Eaton Co., auto robes, \$45.00; pay lists, wages of chauffeurs, \$6,331.63.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Ordered, That Mr. Dunlop of the Provincial Secretary's Department, be requested to appear before this Committee and give evidence *re* the following items appearing on page 405 of the Public Accounts, 1920: Wm. Davies Co., Ltd., \$10,947.64.

On Motion of Mr. Sinclair, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That Alfred Hewitt, of College Street, be summoned to appear before the Public Accounts Committee on Wednesday, March 23rd, to give evidence on oath as to the item on page 23 of the Public Accounts, 1920, relating to the salaries for the Department of Game and Fisheries, \$24,880.96.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, March 23rd, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, March 23, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Buckland, Cunningham, Dewart, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Homuth, McAlpine, McCrea, MacBride, MacVicar, Mageau, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Rancy, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Stover, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Mr. R. P. Fairbairn, Deputy Minister of Public Works, sworn and examined.

Mr. W. W. Dunlop, Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities, sworn and examined.

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Hill,

Ordered, That the Deputy Treasurer be required to produce before the Public Accounts Committee all documents and vouchers, and particularly the invoices of films purchased from the Canadian Aero Film Company, as referred to and included in the Public Accounts, 1920, page 537. Item, Canadian Aero Film Company, films, \$85,461.00.

And that Mr. O. Elliott, Director of the Moving Picture Bureau for Ontario, attend before this Committee to give evidence and to produce any film required for inspection.

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Hill,

Ordered, That the Deputy Minister of Public Works be required to produce before the Public Accounts Committee all invoices, vouchers, checks and contracts pertaining to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920:—

Page 759. L. C. Parkin, contract for 5-ton Chain-Driven Dump Trucks, 8 at \$9,100.00.....	\$72,800 00
3½-ton Sterling Worm-Driven Trucks, as per contract, 6 at \$7,516.50	45,099 00
Total	\$117,899 00
Page 751. L. C. Parkin, auto storage, repairs and supplies	\$1,157 28
1 Touring Car (McLaughlin)	2,800 00
Total	\$3,957 28

And further, that the said L. C. Parkin, of Dundas, Ontario, appear before the Committee for examination.

On Motion of Mr. Sinclair, seconded by Mr. Dewart,

Ordered, That J. F. Mowat be summoned to appear before this Committee to be examined in connection with the items on page 542 of the Public Accounts, 1920, "Enforcing Ontario Temperance Act"—J. O. L. Spracklin, \$1,674.49; W. J. Ward, \$1,000.00; Special Officers' services and expenses, \$47,216.69; Automobile & Supply, Limited, automobiles and supplies, \$5,007.60; Elliott, J. C., legal services, \$240.00; White, M.E., services and expenses of operators, \$18,071.97.

On Motion of Mr. Pinard, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That Nathan Slavin, Fanny Slavin and A. Courian be summoned to appear before this Committee to be examined in connection with item on page 541 of the Public Accounts, 1920, "Enforcing Ontario Temperance Act, including salaries and travelling expenses of the Commissioners and Officers of the Board and Inspectors, \$316,055.70."

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That O. Elliott, Inspector of Theatres, be summoned to appear before this Committee to be examined on oath in connection with the items at pages 535 and 536 of the Public Accounts, 1920:—Inspection of theatres (salaries), \$5,800.00; contingencies, \$8,068.35; travelling expenses, \$1,896.82; to provide for telephones (including resident telephones) where approved by Provincial Treasurer, for the Inspector of Theatres and members of staff, \$31.89; Inspector of Theatres, for use of motor car, \$500.00.

On Motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Pinard,

Ordered, That W. Dawson, Director of Provincial Motion Picture Bureau, be summoned to appear before this Committee to be examined on oath in connection with the items at pages 536 and 537 of the Public Accounts, 1920:—Salaries, \$3,614.00; contingencies, \$5,633.81; travelling expenses, \$4,767.19; motion picture machines, equipment and films, printing and advertising, \$132,958.29.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Ross (Kingston),

Ordered, That the Committee on Public Accounts request the permission of the House to investigate the operation of, and purchase of cattle for the Ontario Reformatory Abattoir at Guelph, and to have produced before it all accounts and vouchers in respect thereto, up to, or as close as possible, to April 1st, 1921.

On Motion of Mr. Buckland, seconded by Mr. Thompson,

Ordered, That this Committee ask permission of the Legislative Assembly to inquire into purchases from the T. Eaton Co., Ltd., from the end of the last fiscal year to the 1st March, 1921, and that all accounts be produced.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, March 30th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, March 30, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Dewart, Freeborn, Godfrey, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, Mageau, Mills, Murdoch, O'Neill, Pinard, Price, Racine, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Mr. Fairbairn, Deputy Minister of Public Works, re-called and re-examined.

Mr. F. G. Lee, caretaker of the Parliament Buildings, sworn and examined.

Mr. L. C. Parkin, auto dealer, Dundas, Ontario, sworn and examined and ordered to attend at next meeting of the Committee on Friday, April 1st.

Note read by Mr. Dewart,

To whom it may concern,

This is to certify that E. J. Callaghan, of Fort Frances, is suffering from an attack of scarlet fever and is at present in quarantine at his residence here for a period of six weeks from March 14th, 1921.

(Sgd.) J. E. O'DONNELL, M.D. |

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That Roy A. Reynolds, of Dundas, Ont., be subpoenaed to appear before the Public Accounts Committee to give evidence in relation to the L. C. Parkin contract at page 759 of the Public Accounts, 1920, and that Mr. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways, be asked to produce the contract above referred to.

On Motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That Mr. Fairbairn, Deputy Minister of Public Works, be requested to produce all accounts of the T. Eaton Co., Ltd., rendered since the close of the last fiscal year.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Ordered, That Mr. Dunlop, Inspector of Prisons and Charities, be requested to produce before this Committee all vouchers and papers in connection with the operation of the Provincial Abattoir at the Ontario Reformatory at Guelph. Such vouchers and papers to cover the operation of such abattoir from the beginning of the present fiscal year to the present time, also that Mr. Spry be requested to appear before this Committee in connection with the operation of such abattoir.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, April 1st, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, April 1, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Carmichael, Clarke, Dewart, Doherty, Freeborn, Godfrey, Greenlaw, Halcrow, Hall, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, MacVicar, Marceau, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Pinard, Price, Rancey, Rollo, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Walker, Warren, Widdifield.

Mr. Roy Action Reynolds, Dundas, sworn and examined.

On Motion of Mr. Sinclair, seconded by Dr. Godfrey, decided that all evidence be admitted, irrespective of legal rules of evidence.

On Motion of Mr. Freeborn, seconded by Mr. Doherty,

Ordered, That Mr. W. A. McLean be summoned to appear before the Committee with respect to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920:—

Page 759. L. C. Parkin, contract for 5-ton Chain-Driven Dump Trucks, 8 at \$9,100.00.....	\$72,800 00
3½-ton Sterling Worm-Driven Trucks, as per contract, 6 at \$7,516.50	45,099 00
	\$117,899 00

On Motion of Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Freeborn,

Ordered, That Mr. George Hogarth be required to appear before the Committee for examination with respect to the following items in the Public Accounts, 1920:—

Page 759. L. C. Parkin, contract for 5-ton Chain-Driven Dump Trucks, 8 at \$9,100.00.....	\$72,800 00
3½-ton Sterling Worm-Driven Trucks as per contract, 6 at \$7,516.50.....	45,099 00
	\$117,899 00

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, April 6th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, April 6, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Clarke, Cunningham, Dewart, Freeborn, Godfrey, Hall, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Homuth, Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, MacVicar, Mageau, Marshall, Mills, Murdoch, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Stover, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Hon. Frank Biggs, Minister of Public Works, sworn and examined.

Mr. George Hogarth, Chief Engineer of Highways, sworn and examined.

Question by Mr. Hill: "Why did you purchase trucks of other makes, of same capacity, since purchase of Sterling Trucks from Parkin, if the Sterling is the best on the market."

Chairman ruled the question out of order.

Yeas and Nays asked for, and Chair sustained by vote of 18 to 7.

Mr. Hall moved,

That "questions as to merits of other motors than the Sterling be expunged from the evidence."

Hon. Mr. Drury objected, he wished all the evidence to go in, and after a short discussion, the Motion was withdrawn.

On Motion of Mr. Brackin, seconded by Mr. Hall,

Ordered, That Wallace Matthews, of Hamilton, and Percy Woodward, of Dundas, be summoned to appear before the Committee on Friday, April 8th.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, April 8th, at 10.00 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, April 8, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Bowman, Brackin, Buckland, Freeborn, Godfrey, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Homuth, Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, MacVicar, Mageau, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Smith, Stover, Swayze, Tooms, Walker, Warren.

Mr. W. A. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways, sworn and examined.

Referring to the purchase of Sterling trucks, Mr. McCrea put the following question to witness:

Do you, as Deputy Minister, think that that is the proper way to conduct that class of business in the public interest?

Chairman ruled that the question need not be answered.

Yeas and Nays called for.

Committee by vote of 10 to 9 instructed witness to answer.

Mr. Roy A. Reynolds, Dundas, recalled and re-examined.

On Motion of Mr. McCrea, seconded by Mr. Hill,

Ordered, That O. Elliott be asked to attend this Committee and give evidence respecting the following items appearing in the Public Accounts, 1920, on the following pages:—Page 535, salary, \$3,000.00; page 536, traveling expenses, \$62,561.00; page 536, expenses, \$56.55; page 537, Canadian Aero Film Co., \$85,245.59, and to produce all books, papers, letters, accounts, vouchers, checks, and other memoranda respecting the said items and also to produce all films referred to in the item of \$85,245.59 as having been paid to the Canadian Aero Film Co.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, April 13th, at 9 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, April 13, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 9 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Brackin, Buckland, Cunningham, Dewart, Doherty, Godfrey, Halerow, Hall, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Hill, Hogarth, Homuth, Johnston (Simcoe), Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, Mageau, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Pinard, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Mr. Percy Woodward, Dundas, called and sworn.

Mr. Wallace Matthews, Dundas, called and sworn.

Mr. L. C. Parkin, Dundas, recalled and re-examined.

Mr. J. M. Mowat, Accountant, License Commissioners, called and sworn.

On Motion of Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Tolmie,

Ordered, That M. Jerome and H. Jerome, of Dundas, Dr. McCullough, Medical Health Officer, and George Hogarth, of the Department of Public Highways, be summoned to appear and give evidence on oath before this Committee at its next sitting, touching items in Public Accounts of 1920 at page 457, touring car, \$950.00; page 562, \$9,999.58; page 565, \$11,430.40; page 747, \$21,412.80, and produce all vouchers and other documents touching the foregoing items.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, April 15th at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, April 15, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Brackin, Buckland, Clarke, Cunningham, Dewart, Freeborn, Halcrow, Hall, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, Johnson (Lanark), McAlpine, Mageau, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, O'Neill, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Thompson, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Watson, Widdifield.

Dr. J. W. S. McCullough, sworn and examined.

Mr. Martin Jerome, Dundas, sworn and examined.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, April 20th, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, April 20, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Mr. O. Elliott, Director of Moving Picture Branches, sworn and examined.

Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, April 22nd, at 10 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Friday, April 22, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Hon. Mr. Drury, Messieurs Biggs, Brackin, Buckland, Cunningham, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Hay, Henry, Hicks, Homuth, Johnson (Lanark), Lennox, McAlpine, McCrea, McLeod, MacVicar, Murdoch, Nixon, Oke, Price, Raney, Sewell, Sinclair, Smith, Tolmie, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Widdifield.

Mr. William Dawson, formerly Director Motion Picture Bureau, sworn and examined.

On Motion of Mr. Price, seconded by Mr. Henry,

Ordered, That Captain W. R. Maxwell, Chief Pilot, Laurentide Co., Ltd., Grand Mere, Que., be subpoenaed to appear before this Committee at its next meeting, Wednesday, April 27th, 1921.

On Motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Ordered, That Messrs. Irwin Proctor, President of the Canadian Aero Film Co., Roy O'Connor, and Blaine Irish, be summoned to appear before this Committee at its next meeting, Wednesday, April 27th, at 9 o'clock.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Wednesday, April 27th, at 9 a.m.

Public Accounts Committee Room,

Wednesday, April 27, 1921.

Committee met pursuant to adjournment at 9 a.m.

Present: Mr. Curry, Chairman; Messieurs Buckland, Dewart, Ferguson, Greenlaw, Hall, Hay, Hill, Homuth, Mills, Murdoch, Nixon, Racine, Sinclair, Smith, Swayze, Tooms, Walker, Warren, Widdifield.

Mr. E. J. Callaghan, Fort Frances, sworn and examined.

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

March 2, 1921.

The Committee met at ten a.m. with the Chairman, Mr. Walter Curry, presiding.

MR. A. H. PEPALL called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Ferguson.

Q.—What is your full name?

A.—Andrew H. Pepall.

Q.—What is your occupation?

A.—Sales manager of the Toronto Plate Glass Company.

Q.—How long have you been there?

A.—I have been with them since 1917, with the exception of about five months when I was loaned to another company.

Q.—Did you live in Toronto before that?

A.—I have lived in Toronto all my life.

Q.—What business were you in before you went into the plate glass business?

A.—I was sales manager and owner of the Canadian Underskirt Company with my brother.

Q.—There is an item here showing apparently that you were paid four thousand dollars for some services and travelling expenses going to England.

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How did you happen to be selected for that particular job?

A.—I was asked to go by the Provincial Treasurer.

Q.—Had you known the Provincial Treasurer a good while?

A.—For about seven years, I think.

Q.—Did you know him in Stratford?

A.—Yes, sir. I knew him on the farm.

Q.—Did you live in Stratford?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—How did you come to get out to the Smith farm?

A.—I got acquainted with Mr. Smith selling him Delco.

Q.—How long since is that?

A.—That was in the spring of 1915.

Q.—And you have known him since then?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was your mission in England?

A.—I was to act as financial agent for the Ontario Government to raise a loan and to redeem securities.

Q.—And the Provincial Treasurer sent for you and asked you to go to England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did you do when you went to England?

A.—I went to England and arranged a loan at Lloyds whereby, as the Ontario securities were deposited there they would have them verified by the Bank of Montreal, accumulate them, and, when I gave instructions, to draw a draft and it would be paid.

Q.—In other words, it was to assemble securities at Lloyds and they drew against them in Ontario?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Lloyds did the assembling; you didn't do that?

A.—No.

Q.—So your mission there was to visit Lloyds and tell them the Province of Ontario desired to redeem a loan and the Province wanted to have the securities assembled by them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was your sole mission over there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you delivered that message?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I assume you didn't have anything to do with the assembling of the securities; Lloyds did that?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—So then the whole work of your trip was a message to Lloyds?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Which they carried out?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was there any reason why that message couldn't have been given Lloyds by cable or letter?

A.—Yes, sir. I had to take with me authority to raise the loan while those securities were being accumulated.

Q.—What authority?

A.—A letter from the Provincial Treasurer authorizing me to raise the loan. The letter was not addressed to Lloyds. It was for the bank where we could get the best financial arrangement.

Q.—What did you do in connection with that?

A.—I took the matter up with the Bank of Montreal and I took it up with the Bank of Commerce in England, and I talked it over with Lloyds, and Lloyds gave us the best proposition.

Q.—Did you discuss it with the Bank of Montreal or the Bank of Commerce here before you left?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—There was no attempt to make an arrangement with either of the offices here?

A.—As far as I know, no.

Q.—What was the first news that came to you that the Province required your services?

A.—The Provincial Treasurer spoke to me.

Q.—When was that?

A.—Possibly a month before I left.

Q.—When did you go?

A.—I left here on February 27th.

Q.—And you were gone how long?

A.—Fifty days.

Q.—What was the arrangement about your remuneration?

A.—I was to get \$80 a day, which included all my expenses and remuneration for my services.

Q.—What experience had you had in connection with financial matters before you went over there?

A.—Not very much outside my own business.

Q.—This was your first venture in the world of finance, in this line of work?

A.—Yes, in this line of work.

Q.—You had no previous experience handling bond issues or floating large borrowings?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What was your special qualification for this job?

A.—As I understood it, the Provincial Treasurer wanted a man he could absolutely trust, because I was going over there with wide authority.

Q.—He knew you very well—you were close friends?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—He had every confidence in you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Will you tell me exactly what you did in the Old Country when you reached there?

A.—I went and saw the Bank of Montreal and presented the letter to the manager giving me authority to have access to the names of shareholders of the inscribed stock we were after. I talked to him about the loan for the accumulation of the securities and he said they didn't have the money.

Q.—That loan would be simply a temporary matter to take care of the securities as they were accumulated?

A.—Yes; I asked for it on a thirty day basis. He asked me what I wanted, and I said I might require up to \$12,000,000. I talked it over with the Bank of Commerce and they gave me the same answer and both advised me to see Lloyds. I saw Sir John Ferguson, of Lloyds, and showed him my authority. He called a meeting of the directors and the loan was granted.

Q.—You didn't take the precaution to take a letter from the Bank of Montreal here to the agency in London, or from the head office of the Bank of Commerce to their agency there. You had no introduction from them?

A.—I had the introduction to the Bank of Montreal from the Provincial Treasurer.

Q.—But you had no introduction from the head office in Canada of either the Bank of Montreal or the Bank of Commerce?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Didn't it strike you that would be an advantage if you were going to do business with one of the agencies or branches of these banks?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—It didn't occur to you?

A.—It didn't occur to me.

Q.—I suppose that might be due to your lack of experience in financial problems?

A.—Possibly.

Q.—Then I gather, Mr. Pepall, that you went to England with a letter from the Provincial Treasurer, that you saw the manager of the Bank of Montreal and the manager of the Bank of Commerce, both of whom advised you to go to Lloyds; you went to Lloyds and Lloyds called a meeting of the directors and decided to accept the task of redeeming and taking care of this loan?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long did that take?

A.—We were discussing off and on what we wanted and how to go about it for several days. I cannot say exactly how long.

Q.—Possibly a week?

A.—Yes, possibly a week.

Q.—And did that complete your mission?

A.—No, sir; I had to O.K. the stock as it was delivered to Lloyds after it was verified by the Bank of Montreal. I had to stay there.

Q.—How was it verified?

A.—This stock was inscribed stock, and the Bank of Montreal have the records of ownership, and when so many thousands of bonds had been delivered to Lloyds it was taken to the Bank of Montreal and certified to as being the proper ownership.

Q.—What had you to do with that?

A.—I had nothing to do with that. I had to O.K. the payment of the stock by Lloyds.

Q.—The stock register was with the Bank of Montreal. The stock would be verified there?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then it is taken by the Bank of Montreal back to Lloyds, who redeem it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Well, where do you come in. If the Bank of Montreal O.K.'d that stock as appearing on their register, that would be identification?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—They then take it to Lloyds, and in the ordinary channels that would be paid for by Lloyds?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then where did you come in, what weight had your signature?

A.—Simply to O.K. the price they were paying.

Q.—Why was it necessary for you to O.K. it at all?

A.—Because there was a set price Lloyds were to pay for it.

Q.—You think the Bank of Montreal, as agents of the Government, couldn't have looked after that?

A.—I don't say they couldn't.

Q.—Couldn't they have looked after it quite as well if you had been on this side of the water?

A.—Possibly.

Q.—What was the amount of the loan that was taken care of?

A.—We bought \$8,800,000 odd.

Q.—Almost nine millions?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the nature of the securities. Were they the ordinary provincial bonds?

A.—No; they were inscribed debenture stock, free of succession duties.

Q.—Did they take care of all the stock outstanding?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did Lloyds undertake to take care of all of it?

A.—No. The limit I was asking for was \$12,000,000. Had we got all the stock that would have taken care of practically all of it. There was about \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 outstanding.

Q.—You wanted to get that \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 called in and paid off?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you succeeded in getting about one-half of it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How was it taken care of over there? By a new issue?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Was it paid off entirely?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What rate was it bearing?

A.—Three and a half, four and four and a half for the three series.

Q.—Was there any attempt made to find the money in England to pay it off?

A.—Not as far as I know; no, sir.

Q.—You didn't make any attempt?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you make any inquiries in England as to what a loan could be floated for there?

A.—Well, at the time we were there the Italian Government floated a loan at eight per cent.

Q.—You say at the time “we” were there. Who were the parties?

A.—Mr. Æmilius Jarvis.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis was on the same mission?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was Mr. Jarvis’ connection with it?

A.—The Provincial Government had made an arrangement to buy from Mr. Jarvis all the Ontario securities he could get hold of.

Q.—So Mr. Jarvis was over arranging to accumulate them so he could buy them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then it was really Mr. Jarvis who was buying these securities accumulated at Lloyds?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is Æmilius Jarvis the broker?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was a brokerage proposition with him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis, the broker, goes over to do business for himself under an arrangement to assemble and redeem these securities. Did he require your assistance?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What for?

A.—To raise the loan.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis needed you to assist in raising the loan?

A.—That was the agreement, as I understood it, the Government made, that they would raise a loan to accumulate these stocks.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis required your assistance to raise a loan in England to redeem these assembled stocks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Jarvis discussed it with you beforehand?

A.—I don’t quite get what you mean.

Q.—As I understood from you, the Provincial Treasurer sent for you and told you there was a loan to be redeemed in England, and I suppose he told you there was an arrangement with the Jarvis firm?

A.—As I understand it, Mr. Jarvis was called in to check up whether it would be a good thing, from the Provincial standpoint or not, and he did so.

Q.—Apparently he decided it was a good thing, for the mission was undertaken?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you the Pepall in the Æmilius Jarvis firm?

A.—No.

Q.—Who is that?

A.—My brother.

Q.—Did Mr. Jarvis take you in mistake for your brother?

A.—No.

Q.—How did he come to pick out a man with no experience at all to help him?

A.—He didn't take me.

Q.—The Provincial Treasurer sent you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was because the Provincial Treasurer, with his want of experience, thought Æmilius Jarvis couldn't look after this thing without you?

A.—I don't say that.

Q.—I understood from your statement that the matter could have been taken care of just as well if you hadn't been there?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Tell me where you were such a vital necessity?

A.—Because the Provincial Treasurer wanted someone representing him to go to the Old Country and raise that loan.

Q.—Why?

A.—Because they would not accept it otherwise.

Q.—Are these things never done by communication?

A.—I can't say that.

Q.—It was Mr. Jarvis arranged to take care of these securities?

A.—He arranged to buy them.

Q.—It was Lloyds' duty to take care of the securities as the Bank of Montreal brought them there, saying they were genuine securities appearing on the register?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Æmilius Jarvis was there to check up and know how much he had to take care of?

A.—He was there to buy them.

Q.—He was there to check them up and see they were genuine before he would buy them?

A.—I suppose so.

Q.—Do you think he would buy them without examination?

A.—You understand the procedure—we got the financial papers and the brokers, Mr. Jarvis got a lot of brokers who agreed to help him—

Q.—I can understand all right what Mr. Jarvis did as a broker. I am trying to find out what you did. It seems to me you had rather a joy ride out of this thing?

A.—I didn't take it that way.

Q.—You worked hard while over there?

A.—I won't say I was killed with work.

Q.—Now the bonds went first to the Bank of Montreal?

A.—No; they went first to Lloyds.

Q.—The Bank of Montreal would first say whether they were genuine?

A.—Before Lloyds paid for them the securities were deposited at Lloyds, taken to the Bank of Montreal, verified by them, and then paid for by Lloyds.

Q.—Again I ask, where did you come in?

A.—As a financial agent.

Q.—But a financial agent should have had something to do. The securities were assembled at Lloyds under instruction. I suppose Mr. Jarvis went to Lloyds with you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis would have an entree to Lloyds as a financial man of standing which you could not have had yourself as an ordinary layman?

A.—In the ordinary sense; but the letter of the Provincial Treasurer gave me that entree.

Q.—But Mr. Jarvis went with you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And I presume that the fact that you were with Mr. Jarvis had something to do with giving you standing with the people there?

A.—Undoubtedly it would help.

Q.—Lloyds got the securities and took them to the Bank of Montreal, saying, “Here are Ontario securities we have assembled, and we want to know if they are genuine.” The bank checks them up and says, “Yes, they are genuine bonds of such and such a series.” That was the course of the transaction?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That being done, Lloyds took care of them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Æmilius Jarvis, because he was to take care of them eventually, was there to see that no improper bonds were put over on him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Again let me ask you, where did you come in on that?

A.—I seemed to have kept myself quite busy while I was over there.

Q.—You seem to have kept quite busy, but the point with me is this: With Æmilius Jarvis going to London in connection with this same loan, checking up and seeing that the securities he was eventually to take care of were genuine securities of the Province—that is what took Mr. Jarvis over there?

A.—Mr. Jarvis was to buy the securities.

Q.—Yes; but he didn't go over to buy them. He went over to see that they were checked up and verified. Mr. Jarvis' business is in Canada and his account would be here?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The money would be here to pay for the securities?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that the securities could have been sent to him without his going over. Lloyds could have made a draft on Mr. Jarvis here and settled the whole matter?

A.—He didn't figure it that way.

Q.—He went to England for what purpose—wasn't it to check up and verify the securities and verify the amount?

A.—No, sir; to buy them.

Q.—I thought you told me he agreed to take care of them before he left?

A.—He was to buy them.

Q.—He did arrange to buy the securities before he left here at all?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—He didn't need to go to England to buy them?

A.—That is his business.

Q.—You are a financial man of outstanding importance at the present time; I want your judgment in the matter. Mr. Jarvis could have arranged all this without going over?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Except for checking up the securities?

A.—No, I don't think so.

Q.—Will you tell me why?

A.—In the first place, if it had been done in that way we might not have got the securities.

Q.—Why? The Bank of Montreal and the Bank of Commerce and Lloyds, who assisted you in getting these securities, and advertising in the financial journals—

A.—And the help of the brokers.

Q.—Yes, all that was arranged through local financial people in London, wasn't it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You couldn't have arranged it without the local people taking hold of it—it had to be done through local agencies?

A.—Yes, absolutely.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis went over with the object of seeing that these bonds were assembled and ascertain the amount he could secure for purchase?

A.—Yes.

Q.—To ascertain the whole amount that would be available for his purposes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And to verify these securities over there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—To be sure he was getting real bonds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he did all those things when he was over there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is to say, to see that there were \$8,000,000 of these securities gathered together, to see that the Bank of Montreal verified them as genuine—and then what did he do next? Did he make a draft on the home office?

A.—When they were all accumulated.

Q.—He made a draft on the home office and paid for the securities, took them up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And brought them home in his grip?

A.—No, sir. They were cancelled in London.

Q.—So there was not even a parcel for you to bring back?

A.—No.

Q.—Were you working with the plate glass people when the Provincial Treasurer sent for you?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What were you doing, then?

A.—I had been loaned to take charge of the sales organization of the Knight Metal Products.

Q.—Who were the Knight Metal Products Co.?

A.—They were a munition concern that started out to manufacture farm power machinery.

Q.—Are they still in existence?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What happened to them?

A.—They failed three or four months after I left them.

Q.—Did you have any financial interest in them?

A.—No, sir. I simply went to organize their sales department.

Q.—Were you with them when you were loaned to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—The Knight Metal Products Company re-loaned you to the Province of Ontario?

A.—You can put it that way if you wish.

Q.—I am putting it the way you put it. You said you were loaned by one concern to another?

A.—I took the position of sales manager in Metal Products with the consent of the head of the Toronto Plate Glass.

Q.—Did you sever your connection with the Plate Glass Company?

A.—Theoretically, yes.

Q.—You severed your connection to take the new job?

A.—Yes, with his consent, knowing it was only a temporary proposition.

Q.—It was your purpose to go back to the Toronto Plate Glass?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And have you gone back?

A.—Yes.

Q.—After you got through with the metal people were the Toronto Plate Glass people consulted about your trip to England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—They consented to your going?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you still with the Toronto Plate Glass people?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose you are paid a salary by the Plate Glass people?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it as munificent as this \$80 a day?

A.—Well, you must remember that \$80 a day included expenses.

Q.—I have no doubt you had a lot of expenses. They tell me it is an expensive place to go.

A.—It is, when you pay a thousand dollars for your boat trip.

Q.—Were you under salary with the Knight Metal Products when you gave it up and went to England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When was the arrangement of \$80 a day made—before you left here?

A.—As I recollect, yes, sir.

Q.—Are you sure about that?

A.—I would not swear to it, sir.

Q.—You would not swear?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—How many conversations did you have in making the arrangement before you went?

A.—As to the \$80 a day?

Q.—As to the arrangement under which you should go?

A.—We had quite a number.

Q.—Who discovered you—you didn't discover the position? The Treasurer looked you up?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell the Committee any reason why you should be picked up for such a job as that? It strikes me as a rather important thing for a man who had never had any experience whatever in financial operations.

A.—Well, as I understood it, the way it was put up to me was that the Hon. Mr. Smith wanted somebody to go that he could absolutely trust.

Q.—And that was the result of your acquaintance away back on the farm? That is the only reason you know?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The thought that your brother was with Æmilius Jarvis never occurred to you?

A.—When we first talked it over Æmilius Jarvis was not mentioned in the matter at all. He was brought in afterwards to go into the matter of whether he thought it was a good thing from the Provincial standpoint.

Q.—What was the first conversation you had—if it hadn't been decided whether the Province should go into it or not? What was the discussion with you about?

A.—As to what I thought of the proposition.

Q.—With your knowledge of financing and the sale of Delco lights, you were called in as an expert?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—He discussed with you what you thought of the Province redeeming these \$17,000,000 of bonds floated in England?

A.—No.

Q.—You told me the first conversation was as to what you thought of the Province redeeming these bonds?

A.—Not as a financial expert.

Q.—Just what you thought of a trip to England?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then what were you asked?

A.—What I thought of it from a business standpoint.

Q.—From a business standpoint you thought it would be a good business to redeem them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were called in as a specialist in finance; it couldn't be anything else, could it? Were you there talking about the business or the pleasure of the trip?

A.—The business.

Q.—And the business of the trip was surely a financial proposition?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Provincial Treasurer was undoubtedly endeavouring to decide whether it was good business to redeem these securities floated in the Old Country?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And he wanted your judgment?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And what conclusion did you reach after discussing it with him? What did you advise him?

A.—That it was a good proposition.

Q.—On what did you base that, on what experience?

A.—Simply on the facts and figures he had at his command.

Q.—And it took your judgment to convince him that it was a good proposition?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What contribution did you make to the judgment arrived at?

A.—I simply checked it up with the figures.

Q.—And you came to the conclusion that it was a good thing?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And then, what occurred?

A.—Well, sir, as far as I am concerned, I think the matter was taken up then with the Cabinet.

Q.—You can't tell what occurred in the secrecy of the Cabinet?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—And that is all that transpired between you and the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You were called in, and he said “Here is the proposition. There are a lot of bonds floated in England, would it be good business to redeem those bonds and put out a loan here through some brokerage firm?” You look the figures over and say, “That is good business,” and the Treasurer decides to do it?

A.—I would not say that. He did not tell me he had decided. We simply talked the matter over.

Q.—When did he tell you he had decided?

A.—About two weeks before I sailed.

Q.—When was this conversation with you when he asked you your view?

A.—I think it was about a month before.

Q.—So, after the first interview with you, about two weeks subsequently, he decided?

A.—He told me it had been decided.

Q.—So your advice in the matter evidently carried considerable weight?

A.—Oh, I don't know.

Q.—Do you know anyone else he consulted except yourself?

A.—I do not know for sure, outside Mr. Jarvis. I know Mr. Jarvis was consulted, and I understood several other people were consulted.

Q.—Who did you understand that from?

A.—Simply what I heard.

Q.—Where did you hear it?

A.—Reports.

Q.—What reports?

A.—In talking it over with Mr. Smith.

Q.—He told you he had consulted a lot of other financial people?

A.—He said he had talked it over with others.

Q.—Did he tell you that during the first interview?

A.—No.

Q.—He adopted you as a financial oracle and consulted you first. That is your view of it?

A.—I would not put it that way.

Q.—Then put it your own way?

A.—I would say he talked to me as a friend, and asked me what I thought of the proposition.

Q.—And not as a financial man at all?

A.—Absolutely, not as a financial man.

Q.—Simply as a business friend, not as a financial man at all?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it at that time he decided you should go to England?

A.—About two weeks later.

Q.—Two weeks after he told you it had been decided the Province would redeem the securities and he wanted you to go to England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Naturally you said, “What is there in it for me, what am I to be paid?”

A.—I think that was talked over.

Q.—And it was decided that you were to have \$80 a day?

A.—I would not swear to that. I think it was. I am not sure.

Q.—I would be inclined to think it was.

A.—Two days before I sailed, I tried to get out of it because Mrs. Pepall was not well. I only went because Mr. Smith assured me he had nobody else at that time.

Q.—Nobody else he could trust?

A.—No, but it was only two days before the boat sailed, and he couldn't find anyone else in that time.

Q.—Then I gather from what you say that it was before you went that the remuneration was fixed at \$80 a day?

A.—I think so.

Q.—When you reached there, the arrangements took about two weeks? You got the banks and you got Lloyds, Mr. Jarvis discussed it no doubt with you and others. Lloyds decided they would carry out the arrangements. They assembled the securities that came in, and Mr. Jarvis, after the Bank of Montreal identified them, arranged to take them up?

A.—The final day set for the lodging of securities was April 6.

Q.—And it was necessary for you to stay until the final day?

A.—I considered it was.

Q.—Why?

A.—To give Lloyds authority, to guarantee that the draft would be paid.

Q.—What did you do to guarantee Lloyds that the draft would be paid?

A.—I gave them a letter.

Q.—The authority from the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Undoubtedly that would be the way. The Provincial Treasurer would write a letter guaranteeing that Lloyds would be reimbursed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose you gave them that letter when it was decided that they would undertake it?

A.—I gave them the letter authorizing me to raise the loan.

Q.—You gave them the letter assuring them that if they made this loan it would be guaranteed by the Province?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your duties were completed then?

A.—No, on the date of the final lodgment of the securities I gave them a letter guaranteeing that the draft would be paid within 30 days. I dictated that to the stenographer in Lloyds' offices.

Q.—There was no reason, was there, why that could not have been given when you went there, when you guaranteed that whatever securities were assembled would be guaranteed?

A.—Sir John Ferguson claimed that no time was set in the letter, and he wanted a guarantee that the amount would be paid in thirty days.

Q.—That letter could have been written just as well when you got there. Or a cablegram could have done that?

A.—Possibly.

Q.—What I am getting at is this. You appear to have been away fifty days. I suppose the time counted from the time you left until you returned. That would be probably thirty-six or thirty-eight days in the Old Country?

A.—No, about thirty.

Q.—You must have gone in a slow ship?

A.—In those days they were not trying to break any records. The *Adriatic* took practically ten days to make the trip from Southampton to New York.

Q.—Now your sole duty, as I understood it, was——

A.—As a financial agent.

Q.—You said, as a friend?

A.—I went to London as financial agent of the Ontario Government to raise the loan.

Q.—With a letter from the Provincial Treasurer—an open letter, I suppose?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Introducing you to the financial houses there?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And a financial house, at your suggestion, undertook by advertising and otherway, to gather together these Ontario securities?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And having done that, Mr. Jarvis, who had agreed before leaving here, apparently, to buy them, was there to protect himself and identify them and ascertain the amount required to buy them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So your sole duty in England was to ask the banks and financial people to gather together the securities, and to write a letter to Lloyds saying we will guarantee that this shall be paid. That was your job?

A.—Well, yes. It seems to me I had a little more than that, but to put it baldly, yes.

Q.—Both of these things, I am inclined to think, could have been done from here?

A.—Well, it was not considered so.

Q.—I am asking you. You went over as a financial agent, a financial expert—couldn't they both have been done from here?

A.—No, sir. I don't think so.

Q.—Don't you think that if you had gone to the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, or the general manager of the Bank of Commerce here, that they could have arranged that with their British agencies just as well as you could have arranged it, with all their experience?

A.—There was one reason, I think that if it had become public we would not have been able to buy the securities at the price the Government had set.

Q.—If it had leaked out—you think that if you had communicated with the head office of the banks they would have let the information out to the public?

A.—I do not know that.

Q.—You know they would have confidential communication with the British agencies; you know it would be confidential?

A.—I would think so.

Q.—So that there is not much in the suggestion that it would leak out unless you took the secret over in your pocket-book?

(No answer).

Q.—The point I want to make is this—this matter could have been arranged from Ontario here without your intervention at all?

A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Then let us get down to the final analysis, why?

A.—Because I do not think we could have arranged the loan.

Q.—What did you do that they could not have done?

A.—I met the directors of Lloyds Bank and the thing was discussed very fully.

Q.—Mr. Jarvis was there to talk about it?

A.—Not while I was in Lloyds. We discussed that proposition between ourselves. No doubt they talked it over with Mr. Jarvis.

Q.—But Mr. Jarvis knew of the whole proposition?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And he went over there to further it?

A.—He went over to buy them.

Q.—He couldn't buy them unless they were got together, could he?

A.—No.

Q.—He wanted to buy them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your idea is that he just went over to close the deal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Didn't he go over to assist in every way desirable. That is the only way it was made possible?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The only way possible was for Mr. Jarvis to go over and promote the assembling of the securities, to satisfy himself that they were genuine and to pay for them. Your sole job was to carry a letter saying that the Province would pay for these things. That could have been done by a letter carried by Mr. Jarvis or in a dozen other ways without your intervention?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—I want to know why you don't think so?

A.—Because I don't think Lloyds would have guaranteed the loan without authority from the Provincial Treasurer.

Q.—That is what I am saying; if that authority had gone by letter or cable, it could have been arranged just as well, couldn't it? Or do you think your persuasive eloquence at the meeting of directors carried them off their feet?

A.—I don't think my persuasive eloquence did, but I think the proposition as I outlined it to the Board of Directors had a lot to do with them guaranteeing the loan.

Q.—That could have been done without your going there?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—So that with all their years of dealing with the British public through their offices there, our banks could not have succeeded in carrying out that transaction without your going over?

A.—I am not saying it could not have been done. I am taking the stand that it was done much quicker and, I think, more economically.

Q.—These bonds were long term bonds in England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What were they bearing?

A.—3½, 4 and 4½ per cent.

Q.—Do you know what was being paid Jarvis for the money for which Jarvis redeemed them?

A.—No, sir; I don't.

Q.—That money was borrowed a year ago?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And money at that time was running in this country about what—6 per cent?

A.—I imagine so.

Q.—So that we borrowed money from Mr. Jarvis at 6 per cent to take up 3½, 4 and 4½ per cent. loans over there?

A.—Yes, sir. But we bought them, of course, at less than par.

Q.—What position does your brother occupy with Æmilius Jarvis?

A.—He is general manager.

Q.—Did you consult him about this transaction?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You talked it over with him?

A.—I did.

Q.—And he gave you advice as to what should be done when you got there?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You talked it all over with Mr. Jarvis?

A.—Yes, sir; after Mr. Jarvis had been called in by the Government.

Q.—But you talked it over with your brother before that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And your brother knew exactly what was likely to happen. He concluded that you were the proper man to go? Did he advise you to go?

A.—I do not know that that proposition entered our discussion.

Q.—What did you discuss with him?

A.—In the first place, I swore him to secrecy and then outlined the proposition to see whether or not, in his opinion, it was a good proposition from the Province's standpoint.

Q.—He corroborated your own view?

A.—I can say that we spent four nights until the early hours of the morning going into it.

Q.—And he corroborated the view you had expressed? It only took you a few minutes to make up your mind on the proposition, but it took your brother, who was an expert, four nights to reach a conclusion?

A.—No, sir; I didn't state that, or if I did I made a misstatement. I said I had been consulted.

Q.—You told me the Treasurer sent for you. He had a mass of figures and asked your opinion, and you said it would be a good thing. And you said your brother took four nights to make up his mind, that he pored all night over it?

A.—I would not put it in that way.

Q.—Your brother was not able to reach a conclusion as quickly as you were?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—You had no authority to go to your brother. You said you went to him and swore him to secrecy? Did you give advice to the Provincial Treasurer before you consulted your brother?

A.—Possibly.

Q.—Isn't that the fact?

A.—I consulted my brother before I said I considered it a first-class proposition.

Q.—That is new, I think. You said that when the Treasurer first consulted you, he had a mass of figures and that you went over them with him and said that it was a good proposition?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that before you consulted your brother you had given your advice to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And after advising the Provincial Treasurer he came back to you two weeks after and said, "We have decided to go on with this."

A.—No, sir; I did not say that.

Q.—I am asking if that is the fact?

A.—No, sir; not on that advice.

Q.—Had you had any further discussion with the Provincial Treasurer in the meantime?

A.—I may have had.

Q.—You didn't tell him you had disclosed the secret to anybody else?

A.—I told him I had taken it up with my brother.

Q.—And that your brother's views were the same as yours?

A.—That he had gone into it fully, and that that was his view.

Q.—As I understand it, there was a flotation in England which the Treasurer thought it desirable to pay off, and he felt that somebody should go to England and look after it?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And he picked you as a financial expert, or agent, as you put it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And instructed you to go to England?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had never had any experience in financing before in your life?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—And you knew nothing about bond flotations or financial arrangements of that character?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—And before you went away you were told you were to have \$80 a day for the time you were away negotiating this proposition?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. HAY: Mr. Pepall, these bonds were being redeemed at a fixed price?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Who fixed the price?

A.—The Government.

Q.—Before you left?

A.—Yes, before I left.

Q.—Then in England, under what method did you redeem these bonds? Did you make any campaign yourself?

A.—Mr. Jarvis made quite an extensive campaign. He got a list, got the big insurance companies and the big brokers. He entertained the financial editors at the Savoy, and they got behind the proposition and we set out, or Mr. Jarvis set out to accumulate these securities.

Q.—Did you have a list of the bondholders?

A.—I got that from the Bank of Montreal.

Q.—Did you personally solicit anyone?

A.—No, sir; I had nothing to do with that whatever.

Q.—Were they being advertised in the London papers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Saying that the bonds would be redeemed up to a time and at a price?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When in England, did you discuss with any of the banks or bankers whether the price that had been fixed by the Provincial Government was too low or too high?

A.—They seemed doubtful.

Q.—Of what?

A.—That we could get any large amount of the securities at the price.

Q.—Why, was the price too low?

A.—They didn't think it was too high.

Q.—You would have discussed with the Provincial Treasurer the price before you went over, or did the Treasurer fix the price at which they would be taken?

A.—As I understood it, the Cabinet fixed the price.

Q.—But you had a fixed price?

A.—Yes, that I could guarantee Lloyds to pay.

Q.—Would there be brokers in England who would encourage clients to sell as a result of your being there?

A.—Yes, they were paid the regular brokerage. But that was Mr. Jarvis' dealings. I had nothing to do with that. He made quite a campaign which I assisted in in any manner I could.

Q.—That would be a social campaign?

A.—A little bit, yes.

Q.—Are you any relation of the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you think that with the assistance of Mr. Jarvis, and aside from the authority you had, and the necessity of your being there to O.K. these issues, your being there encouraged some people to dispose of their stock?

A.—Yes, sir. I think possibly I helped a little. I have only one regret in the whole thing, and that is that we were not able to get more and that exchange didn't stay where it was when we started.

Q.—All told, you got how much?

A.—\$8,800,000 odd.

Q.—That is all free from succession duties?

A.—I understood so.

Q.—Have you in mind any discussion with Mr. Jarvis as to the possible amount of profit there might be to the Government in redeeming all these bonds at the rate you paid?

A.—We actually saved \$2,000,000 and some odd thousands.

Q.—How did you arrive at that. Did you know the price at which the Government here borrowed the money from Æmilius Jarvis & Co.?

A.—No, I do not.

Q.—Then how did you figure the profit?

A.—Simply what the bonds cost the Province below par as well as the exchange.

Q.—But they had to borrow the money to pay for these bonds?

A.—That is something I do not know about.

Q.—How did you arrive at this two millions. What I want to find out is how that profit could have been arrived at if you didn't know the price at which you borrowed money to redeem the bonds. You say you don't know as to that?

A.—No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be the discount on the face value and the exchange—on that they saved two millions.

MR. HALCROW: When would these bonds mature?

A.—I cannot say off hand. I think they ran to 46, 47 and 65.

MR. TOLMIE: Did you discuss with the Provincial Treasurer the price at which these bonds would be redeemed?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you discuss with the Provincial Treasurer the price that you would have to pay for the money you borrowed?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—How would you be able to give him any advice as to the wisdom of redeeming these bonds if you didn't know the price at which they proposed to redeem them and the price they proposed to pay for the money borrowed?

A.—We had approximate figures, both of which turned out to be pretty nearly correct.

Q.—Then you did discuss with him the price?

A.—Yes, absolutely. That was before the Cabinet decided to go ahead. That was threshed out thoroughly.

Q.—In the first conversation?

A.—In the first or second. We had two or three.

Q.—You spoke about an O.K. What did you mean?

A.—To O.K. the amount of money paid. Take it in this way. Suppose Mr. Jarvis had paid more than the price set by the Government, I would not O.K. that amount. I would only O.K. up to the amount the Government set.

Q.—You don't think Mr. Jarvis would pay more than the Government authorized, do you?

A.—I do not expect that he would, but I was there to see it was not done.

Q.—But it would have been Jarvis' loss if he had paid more?

A.—Yes, it would have been.

Q.—So that the Province was not concerned. What you were concerned with the price the Government was paying to redeem them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the price?

A.—Eighty, ninety and ninety, for the three series.

Q.—Do you mean that you saved two millions because you bought them below par?

A.—Yes, and we had the benefit of exchange.

Q.—Which could have been done by anybody negotiating from Toronto just as well as going over there?

A.—That is entirely a matter of judgment.

Q.—You don't know what the money cost here, that eventually redeemed those bonds?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—So that you don't know what was saved, as a matter of fact?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You bought sufficiently below par to make a difference between the par value and what you paid, of two millions?

A.—Yes, with exchange.

Q.—Do I understand you to say that you were watching that Jarvis did not pay more for the bonds than what he agreed to pay?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: Did Jarvis act for himself or for the Province?

A.—The Province had made a deal with Jarvis whereby they guaranteed to take up all the bonds he could get at a certain price.

Q.—And Jarvis was to make what he got on the turnover? You were sent over to assist Jarvis in putting the deal over, out of which Jarvis was to make a large commission?

A.—I don't know anything about what Jarvis made.

Q.—He went over as a broker, having agreed to buy these bonds. He was not going over for his health. He went over to make money?

A.—Yes, he went over to make a profit.

Q.—You went over to see that Mr. Jarvis didn't pay more than he should and lose anything at all. You went over to O.K. everything and see that Mr. Jarvis was not out of pocket?

A.—I do not know as I would look at it in that way at all.

Q.—That is what the O.K. meant?

A.—No, to see that the Government didn't pay more.

Q.—But the Government had a fixed price they were going to pay?

A.—Yes, and that was the limit of the price he could get.

Q.—The Bank of Montreal knew that—Lloyds knew it?

A.—Lloyds knew it.

Q.—So that they would not pay any more than the price the Government had set?

A.—No, I suppose not.

Q.—They have a staff to look after those things without importing a fellow from Canada?

A.—I imagine so.

Q.—So your usefulness was largely a formality, wasn't it?

A.—It may have been. It was not considered so.

Q.—It is difficult to admit, but still that is what it looks like to me. You have told us that Mr. Jarvis went over on his own behalf and took up these bonds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And at a price agreed upon before he left?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—A price which permitted Mr. Jarvis to get a brokerage or profit out of it in the ordinary business way?

A.—I suppose so.

Q.—Your duty was to O.K. every bond for Mr. Jarvis and see he didn't pay any more than he agreed to or more than he could get?

A.—I didn't put it that way, I think. If I did, I certainly was wrong. I simply saw that Lloyds didn't advance for the Government more than the price agreed upon.

Q.—Lloyds undertook to advance a certain amount for which you had instructions from the Government?

A.—Lloyds loaned me, as representing the Ontario Government, up to \$12,000,000.

Q.—That was for redeeming bonds, and they were instructed as to what price was to be paid for those bonds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the instructions were in the newspapers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And every financial house in England knew they could only get a certain amount?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Lloyds knew they could only pay a certain amount?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And still you were there to O.K. them and see that Lloyds didn't pay any more than they should pay, which would be their loss, and to see that Jarvis didn't pay any more than he should pay, which would be his loss, so that you went over to protect Lloyds and Mr. Jarvis?

A.—I didn't look at it in that way.

Q.—I can't see where your intervention helped out this Government a bit. You had a nice time anyway?

A.—I did, splendid.

MR. HALL: Did you find the Old Country financiers as slow as you thought you would?

A.—No, sir. I will take my hat off to them.

HON. MR. SMITH: You were asked whether Mr. Jarvis went over for his health or not. You don't know, in fact, whether he went for his health or not?

A.—No, sir.

MR. PRICE: What is the term of years of the Jarvis loan to the Government?

A.—I do not know. I represented the Provincial Treasurer in the trip to the Old Country, but I did not represent him when I got back.

MR. HALL: Just what did this trip cost the Province?

A.—\$4,000. In figuring it out I figure my expenses cost me a little over \$3,000.

Q.—Did that include drinks on the steamer?

A.—Of course that went into expenses.

MR. PRICE: If the loan from Jarvis was a period of twenty years, there would be a loss on this transaction?

A.—No, sir. If you will take and figure out what it costs this Province to allow succession duty free bonds, you will get the biggest surprise of your life.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know anything about the loan here?

A.—No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you can't speak about it.

A.—What I did find out was that succession duty free bonds are costing this Province so much that if the average member knew it, he would take a fit.

MR. DEWART: After you were consulted by the Provincial Treasurer, did you reduce your opinion to writing?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you give him any report at any time?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What form did your discussions take?

A.—Simply conversations.

Q.—Couldn't you crystallize that conversation into some form so as to tell us what it was?

A.—I do not know as I can.

Q.—What was the advice you gave him. He was engaging you apparently for some useful purpose. What was the advice you gave him?

A.—I understand I was engaged because he had either to go himself or send someone he could trust to raise the \$12,000,000. That was the reason I went, not because I knew anything about bonds or financing or otherwise, simply because the Treasurer figured he could absolutely depend on me to look after his interests.

Q.—Then it had been decided before you went across that certain bonds should be redeemed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then you must have had some figures before you to show whether it would be a profitable transaction?

A.—The Treasurer went into that thoroughly.

Q.—And you gave your judgment in favour of this scheme?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then you saw the proposed scheme, and it must have been in writing?

A.—It was worked out, I believe, very extensively.

Q.—Have you a copy of it?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—If you were going over for the Provincial Treasurer, you would have a calculation?

A.—That was all done before I left. My mission was to raise \$12,000,000. That was all.

Q.—So there was a document in writing, showing a calculation of what could be done?

A.—I do not know, sir.

Q.—Did you see such a document?

A.—I saw the proposition worked out. Had we got what we reckoned for exchange alone, the sum we would have saved would have been several millions.

Q.—Was the price at which you were to make the loan fixed?

A.—I was to get the loan at the cheapest possible price. The price I got was one-half per cent. under the other banks.

Q.—Was there a limit to the terms on which you could borrow?

A.—No, I do not think there was.

Q.—When you arrived at the conclusion that you had what you thought was a fair rate, did you communicate?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you cable?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you settle the matter on your own say so and responsibility, without consulting the Treasurer here?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—After communicating to him the terms?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You must have made a calculation to satisfy yourself that these were good terms?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you that calculation?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you destroy it?

A.—I never had it in writing. I simply talked it over with three of the banks.

Q.—It was simply in your head?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it there still—if it is, I would like to get it. I would like to know what the Province paid you for?

A.—As I remember it, we borrowed that money on a six and one-half per cent. basis from Lloyds, until the draft was paid, whatever time it was.

MR. FERGUSON: You say you settled the price on your own judgment?

A.—No, on the rate of interest I could get on the loan. I talked the rate of interest over with the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of Commerce.

Q.—The price you were to permit Jarvis to pay was settled here before you went over?

A.—Absolutely. I had nothing whatever to do with it.

Q.—You knew what it was?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There were no negotiations between you and anyone else in respect to that?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Your sole duty was to ask Lloyds to arrange a thirty day advance to take care of these securities while they were accumulating?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you had authority to do that from the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You don't think that could have been done with one of the banks here communicating with Lloyds or their own agents?

A.—I do not say it could not have been done. But I don't think it could have been done as satisfactorily.

DR. GODFREY: If the banks had handled it, you would not have got your \$4,000. Is that it?

A.—I did not go over there on account of the \$4,000. I tried, two days before the boat sailed, to get out of it.

MR. HALL: I understood you to say you didn't bring the bonds back, that they were cancelled. I would like to know what became of those bonds. Did Jarvis get them?

A.—These bonds eventually came here, but they were cancelled at the Bank of Montreal to save insurance. Otherwise they were negotiable bonds and would have to be insured.

MR. DEWART: Did you know what bonds those were that were taken up and cancelled—what issue of bonds?

A.—They were three loans due in 1946, 1947 and 1965.

Q.—Were they loans upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—As I understand it, the money was borrowed for thirty days at Lloyds at 6½ per cent. Then Lloyds were to be repaid. Were you conversant with what was being done with reference to the repayment of Lloyds?

A.—I had nothing to do with that.

Q.—Were Lloyds repaid out of the \$16,000,000 loan that appears to have been floated in December, 1920?

MR. CHAIRMAN (to witness): Do you know?

A.—I don't know anything about it.

MR. FERGUSON: Did you know if Jarvis went over and made an arrangement with Lloyds to pay them off. Your own was simply a temporary carrying arrangement?

A.—I simply guaranteed that it would be paid. I raised the loan and guaranteed that the draft would be paid in thirty days.

Q.—Did you keep a copy of the guarantee?

A.—I did.

Q.—What became of it?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you think it could be looked up?

A.—I do not know, sir. It was simply a letter guaranteeing that the draft would be taken up in the Province of Ontario.

Q.—You signed it on behalf of the Province?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you authority to do that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had authority to do that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you the written authority to do that?

A.—No, sir; that is at Lloyds' Bank.

Q.—Did you keep a copy of that?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—I presume the Treasurer would have a copy of it?

A.—I presume so. This guarantee, while guaranteeing that the money would be paid, did not set any date for payment, and they asked me to give them an undertaking in writing that the draft would be paid in thirty days after presentation, which I did.

MR. HALL: Did I understand you aright when I heard you say that all these arrangements by which Jarvis was to pay for those bonds, were made before you left. The arrangement was made with the Treasurer that Mr. Jarvis should pay for the bonds?

A.—I understood so.

Q.—Was Jarvis in England during the whole time you were there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you suggest anything you did that Mr. Jarvis couldn't equally well have done?

A.—I don't think the Provincial Government would give him the authority I had to borrow money.

Q.—Isn't his financial standing as well known as yours?

A.—Yes, a lot better.

Q.—You represented the Government in borrowing the money from Lloyds to redeem the bonds, afterwards sold to Jarvis, for a certain sum which was fixed before you left the country?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Couldn't Jarvis and the Government have done this just as well? Couldn't he have had the authority given to you, seeing it was in his interest, and save the country the \$4,000 they paid to you?

A.—That is a matter for the Government to decide. I was asked to go to England.

MR. DEWART: You have been with the Toronto Plate Glass Co. for some time?

A.—Between two and three years.

Q.—At any big salary?

A.—I get \$3,600 a year and bonus.

Q.—What would that amount to during 1919?

A.—What has that to do with this?

Q.—We want to know whether you were worth the \$4,000.

A.—I can say I refused a position not long ago at \$10,000 a year.

Q.—I am asking you what your earnings were with the Toronto Plate Glass Co. in 1919, in salary and bonus?

A.—Possibly between \$5,000 and \$6,000.

Q.—Had you any other business from which you were drawing income in 1919?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What were your earnings in 1920?

A.—The same earnings.

Q.—That was your only occupation apart from this particular matter?

A.—I do not quite get the drift of this—I am mixed up in the oil business.

Q.—You get an income from that?

A.—Yes.

The witness was then dismissed.

R. T. Harding called and sworn.

MR. FERGUSON: You are a practising barrister in the City of Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been practising in Toronto?

A.—From four to five years.

Q.—Where did you practise before that?

A.—In Stratford.

Q.—You were the friend of my friend the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—He is a friend of mine, has been for 25 years.

Q.—Not only a personal, but a political friend?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were his solicitor?

A.—I have done work for Mr. Smith for a great number of years, maybe twenty years.

Q.—And you came to Toronto four or five years ago?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you start to practise alone in Toronto?

A.—No.

Q.—You made a partnership with whom?

A.—I was with Mr. Dewart in the firm of Dewart, Harding, Maughan & Hodgson.

Q.—How long did this partnership continue?

A.—I retired from that partnership on the first of October, 1919.

Q.—You have been acting as counsel for the Crown in connection with the Timber Inquiry?

A.—I have.

Q.—When did you first take up that work?

A.—There was a discussion about the Order-in-Council and Mr. Raney telephoned me and I went and saw him and he asked me to go with Mr. Bayly, and we prepared the Order-in-Council that went through appointing the Commission.

Q.—I think the Commission was dated the 9th of March?

A.—I think you will see the Order-in-Council was sooner than that.

Q.—Now when were you first approached in connection with the Timber Inquiry? Who did you first approach or interview in connection with this, personally?

A.—In reference to that it was a surprise to me. I never made any application. I never knew about it at all.

Q.—You had no idea you were likely to be called upon?

A.—No.

Q.—No idea that there was likely to be a Timber Inquiry?

A.—I did to this extent. Prior to the issue of the Commission, I discussed with Mr. Smith on one or more occasions, some irregularities in reference to the Crown Lands Department and improvements that could be made there.

Q.—Where did you get your information with reference to the Crown Lands Department?

A.—I got it from different sources.

Q.—What were the sources?

A.—It is pretty hard for me to tell.

Q.—Maybe, but I would like to know.

A.—If you came through what I have gone through during the last nine months, your memory would not be as good as it might be on small matters.

Q.—Well, tell us some of the sources of information. You went to the Treasurer and discussed with him the desirability of inquiring into certain matters?

A.—Or making certain alterations or changes which I thought would be beneficial.

Q.—You knew nothing about the timber business previous to that?

A.—No.

Q.—You had no experience?

A.—No.

Q.—Where did you get the information that impressed you with the necessity for something of that kind being done?

A.—From different sources.

Q.—Let us know some of the sources. Might I suggest one. You got some information from one Callahan?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Callahan was very zealous I believe with reference to one particular company, the Shevlin-Clark Company, and he communicated this to you?

A.—Yes, that is true.

Q.—What was the first time Mr. Callahan communicated with you? In the summer of 1919, wasn't it?

A.—No. It was after the election. I did not know Mr. Callahan at all until after the election, and I was out of Mr. Dewart's office. I was out in my own office when the election came on.

Q.—Mr. Callahan was a client of Mr. Dewart's?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had seen him around Mr. Dewart's office?

A.—No, sir. My best recollection is this. The first time I ever saw

Mr. Callahan Mr. Dewart brought him into my office in the Royal Bank Building after the election was over. That is my recollection. He came in there and discussed with me something entirely different from this altogether.

Q.—Mr. Dewart brought him and introduced him to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then Mr. Callahan unbosomed himself to you in respect to the timber?

A.—Not at that time. It was after that I had a communication with him.

Q.—You had a communication from Mr. Callahan and you had a retainer from Mr. Callahan?

A.—That is right.

Q.—When was the first retainer from Mr. Callahan?

A.—I got a retainer from Mr. Callahan along about December following the election.

Q.—Was that a written retainer?

A.—No.

Mr. Harding at this point appealed to the Chair, claiming that he should be questioned upon matters not relevant to the item of expenditure under discussion, and after argument by Mr. Ferguson that his question had to do with matters bound up in the item, the Chairman ruled that nothing which had taken place between Mr. Harding and his client with reference to matters not covered by the item before the Committee should be gone into.

(Mr. Ferguson proceeding.)

Q.—Had you a retainer from Mr. Callahan in December, 1919?

A.—Prior to the issue of this Commission.

Q.—And was that retainer in writing?

A.—No.

Mr. Harding appealed to the Chair and the Chairman stated that he would rule any question out that conflicted with his ruling already given.

(Mr. Ferguson proceeding.)

Q.—I have asked the witness when he had his retainer from Mr. Callahan. He says it was in December, 1919. I have asked him if it was in writing, and I understood him to say it was not.

WITNESS: Any retainer I got from Mr. Callahan or any conversation I had with him was months prior to the issue of the Commission. He was a private client of mine at the time, and I do not think it is fair to go into his business.

Q.—I am inquiring into public business.

A.—This has nothing to do with public business.

Q.—Mr. Callahan's retainer to you was to prosecute the Shevlin-Clark people, who were licensees under the Crown?

A.—That is not so.

Q.—Then what was the nature of Mr. Callahan's retainer?

A.—Mr. Callahan's retainer was simply this. My instructions from him

in reference to this were that there were grave irregularities practised by the Shevlin-Clark Co. at Fort Frances, had been for years. He thought the Province was getting the worst of it. He wanted me to gather with his assistance all the evidence I could get and then take that to the Government and lay it before the Attorney-General with the object of trying to get a Commission of Inquiry issued. I did work with him for several weeks, but it had nothing to do with this, because the Commission was issued entirely without my submitting any evidence I had.

Q.—Without your intervention at all?

A.—Except once. I did go once before the Cabinet. My object in going there was this. There were a large number of complaints from different people, as I was instructed.

Q.—Who instructed you?

A.—I cannot really tell you who told me.

Q.—Where did you get that information?

A.—I cannot tell you that.

Q.—That is a serious statement. Do you mean to tell me that a man engrossed with this enquiry for nine or ten months cannot tell me where he first got his information that led him to make representations on it?

A.—I cannot say that.

Q.—You cannot say where you got the information?

A.—No, I can not.

Q.—Can you tell us that the only information you got from Callahan was respecting the Shevlin-Clark Company?

A.—Altogether. The evidence we endeavoured to collect was altogether as to possible sources of information.

Q.—What did you do as a result of what happened in Council?

A.—I simply went to gather evidence I could get from different sources. The first thing I heard was that the Commission had issued.

Q.—When was that Council meeting?

A.—I think it was about four weeks before it was actually issued.

Q.—When did you have these conversations with the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—I think it was in December.

Q.—It was in December that you got the Callahan retainer?

A.—I think I spoke to him before that.

Q.—Well, where did you get the information on which you went to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Well that is pretty hard for me to say.

Q.—Oh no, it isn't.

A.—I have no recollection at all.

Q.—No information except what you got from Callahan?

A.—It was right after the Provincial election, and I had been out on the stump speaking, and there had been certain things raised in the House.

Q.—What were they?

A.—I cannot tell that.

Q.—Neither can I.

A.—There were several things stated.

Q.—Well, tell us what things were raised in the House in reference to the administration of Crown Lands. Don't you think you are drawing on your imagination?

A.—It was a political source I got it from.

Q.—A political source—and the inspiration was political that led you to make use of it?

A.—I got the thing originally from what I had heard in politics and I was discussing it with Mr. Smith.

Q.—Then in conversations you had with the Treasurer were some time about December?

A.—I think so.

Q.—What was the nature of these conversations?

A.—We discussed many things. One was the possibility of having a Commission running the Department.

Q.—And ousting the Minister of Mines?

A.—No. We were discussing whether sufficient revenue was being raised in the Department, that was a large revenue producer.

Q.—Have you any idea how much revenue is raised from it?

A.—I think it was about \$1,250,000 last year.

Q.—Out of \$25,000,000 of an annual budget. So that not 10 per cent. of the revenue comes from that Department?

A.—That may be so, but we get about as much from our forests as New Brunswick.

Q.—Then you went to work after a consultation with Mr. Raney, and Mr. Raney disclosed to you that he was going to select you?

A.—No. He simply said he wanted me to go and see Mr. Bayly and draft this Order-in-Council, and he said, "I am writing you a letter. The Government are going to appoint you to take charge of the inquiry." He wrote me the letter.

Q.—With your zeal for the public good that you exhibited then you began actual operation in the Department at what time?

A.—I think in the latter end of February.

Q.—And the Commission was issued on the 9th of March?

A.—I think it was dated the 9th of March. Speaking from recollection, I think the actual date of the Commission was the 9th of March, but that as a matter of fact, it went through a week or ten days before that.

Q.—Do you mean to say that the Government falsified the date they put upon a public document?

A.—No; the Order-in-Council was passed some days before.

Q.—The Commission was issued about the 9th of March and you had been working in the Department some weeks before that?

A.—No. I did not go into the Department until after I had been appointed by the Government and had my letter from the Government.

Q.—I am not protesting that, but you were in the Department some weeks before the Commission issued?

A.—No. That was in the latter part of February. The Commission was issued on the 9th of March.

Q.—Well you were there about ten days before the Commission issued?

A.—The Order-in-Council had been issued.

Q.—When did you first approach the Commissioners regarding their appointment?

A.—I did not have anything to do with it at all.

Q.—Did not you have anything to do with the selection of the Commissioners?

A.—All I recollect is this. I was in the hall one day. I think it was just the very day or the day after—no—I will put it this way. I never spoke to Mr. Latchford about it at all. I did speak to Mr. Riddell. I think it was early in December I met him and I said that if the Government of Ontario consider it advisable to issue a Commission to investigate the Crown Lands Department would he accept a Commissionership. And he told me at that time that he would think it over and if it was in the public interest he would accept it. That was away in December.

Q.—At Osgoode Hall?

A.—Yes I happened to be there one day.

Q.—Then you recommended his appointment to the Attorney-General?

A.—No. I will tell you what happened. When the Attorney-General told me I was to have charge, he said “We have decided on one Commissioner, Mr. Latchford, who would you recommend for the other one?” I said I did not know, but Mr. Riddell appeared to be the best man in sight. He said, “Well, I will take that up with Council,” and the next thing I knew he was appointed.

Q.—Then as a matter of fact, you with your staff of assistants were at work in the Department before the Commission was actually appointed? There is no getting around that because I can prove it.

A.—I was in getting evidence after the Order-in-Council was passed, after I was retained.

Q.—After you were retained you went into the Department and were carrying on an investigation before any commission was appointed, but after you had spoken to Mr. Justice Riddell and knew he was willing to accept the commission?

A.—Yes, I had spoken to him.

Q.—Then, you told us the Attorney-General had instructed you to see Mr. Bayly, and between you draft the commission?

A.—And we did. Of course he had more experience in that than I had. I went into his office and he dictated it to me and I made suggestions.

Q.—Then, I suppose that as Crown Counsel you submitted it to the Commissioners?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you mean to say they took the Commission without knowing the scope of it?

A.—As far as I am concerned I do not think they saw it until it was read out.

Q.—Do you mean to say they accepted a wide open Commission without knowing the scope of it or what they were to investigate?

A.—What I say is this, as far as I am concerned I do not know whether they did or not. I didn't do anything toward that. When you put the question in that way to me I believe that when the Attorney-General wrote them a letter notifying them that they had been appointed he enclosed in the letter to them either a copy of the Commission or a copy of the Order-in-Council.

Q.—That was after the Commission was settled and issued?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What I want from you is this. You are asking this committee to accept a statement that these two eminent judges agreed to accept the Commission of Inquiry without knowing what their authority would be or what the scope of their work was?

A.—That is hardly fair.

Q.—Wasn't it the natural, the ordinary thing for the judge to say, "What do you want me to do?"

A.—He didn't say so to me.

Q.—Don't you think that would be the ordinary thing?

A.—No, I don't.

Q.—Have you had judges accepting commissions in other ways?

A.—There is only one kind of commission.

Q.—I understand there is a contest in the courts now as to whether there is one or more kinds. It isn't one kind of a commission. Extensions or limitations entirely depend on the wording of the commission.

A.—They must be within the Act.

Q.—They must be within the Act, but they can be limited or extended as is seen fit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now in the Public Accounts on page 585, there is an item here, "Accountable R. T. Harding, re timber investigation, \$50,000. What arrangement was made with you in regard to the expenditure of this Commission. They issued an accountable warrant for \$50,000?"

A.—The way it was carried out was this: As soon as we got the Commission the first thing I had to do was to hire accountants and different men of that description.

Q.—We all know you organized the force—the Government advanced you certain moneys to carry that on?

A.—What they did was this. I went to work and spent \$25,000 first. I handed it over to my bookkeeper, and I had an auditor audit it. I spent the \$25,000 and came to the Department and handed in the receipts for that. I spent \$25,000 before I got a single cent from the Government.

Q.—You spent \$25,000 of your own money?

A.—Yes. I handed the receipts in and they gave me a cheque for \$25,000. Then I spent \$25,000 more and came up with the receipts in the same way and got another cheque.

Q.—Where are these cheques—they are not accounted for in the Public Accounts?

A.—The first cheque I got was a grant that went through the House of \$25,000 for the Timber Inquiry.

Q.—But here is an accountable warrant for \$50,000.

A.—There was a vote in the House for \$25,000 and an accountable warrant for \$25,000. I think you will find that is correct.

Q.—The method of procedure you had arranged with the Treasurer, or with whom?

A.—I went into the Treasurer and told him what I was going to do, and he told me to go ahead and do it.

Q.—The Treasurer gave you a free hand—a wide-open commission?

A.—No, he did not.

Q.—You said you told him what you were going to do and he told you to go ahead?

A.—My authority in reference to it is what I say. I didn't make any arrangement with anybody except that I told Peter I wanted some money—

The Chairman (interjecting)—Who is Peter?

Witness—The Hon. Peter Smith. He told me to go on and I spent \$25,000 before I got anything from the Government at all.

Q.—And was an arrangement made with you as to how you were to proceed, and as to how this thing was to be financed?

A.—I do not know any arrangement was made at all.

Q.—Do you mean to state that you had instructions to go on with the investigation, that without anyone saying you would be recouped you went ahead and spent \$25,000 of your own money?

A.—I think I got the Provincial Treasurer to write a letter to the general manager of the Home Bank.

Q.—He delivered that letter to you?

A.—He gave it to me and I gave it to Mr. Mason.

Q.—What did that letter say?

A.—Now, memories are treacherous—

A.—A man who is undertaking to spend a quarter of a million—when he gets authority he will know what it is.

A.—Did you say a quarter million?

Q.—Is it more than that? What was in that letter?

A.—I cannot tell you what was in it. I made that arrangement with Mr. Mason when I went into the bank.

Q.—Then your arrangement must have been with the Treasurer or someone. The Prime Minister, according to his statement, said he was looking after the whole thing.

A.—I never spoke to the Prime Minister or Mr. Bowman about it.

Q.—I see Mr. Bowman hasn't been consulted at all. The Prime Minister said he was the whole thing.

A.—Well, I consulted Mr. Bowman, often.

Q.—Yes, when you wanted access to the records. The truth is that the Prime Minister is the man from whom you got directions as to the procedure of the inquiry? Isn't that so? He has said so in his evidence.

A.—He may have given me directions and another day I might go in and see Mr. Raney. Both the Prime Minister and Mr. Raney actively assisted me in any way they could.

Q.—So that you did get instructions from the Prime Minister and the Attorney General in reference to it?

A.—No doubt about it.

Q.—Did you get instructions as to the expenditure of these moneys?

A.—In this way, in so far as getting the money was concerned I think I did. On one occasion when we got \$25,000 I was in the Council Chamber and Council was going on. The Premier was the one I spoke to in reference to that. I went in different times when expenditures were to be made, and I got his approval before I made it.

Q.—Then all you can tell us is that there was no fixed arrangement as to how you were to get the money, unless it was in the letter to Mr. Mason—was it an open letter?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Or a letter of credit?

A.—I do not know as you could call it a letter of credit. I will get the letter from Mr. Mason and bring it up.

Q.—All right. It was on the strength of the letter that you got the money from Mr. Mason?

A.—Largely.

Q.—You don't suggest that you can go into the bank and hook on to \$25,000 without some one's authority. Would you have gone down without that letter to Mr. Mason and incurred an expenditure of \$25,000?

A.—Oh, don't ask me that.

Q.—Oh, yes. It was on the strength of that letter you got it, and you couldn't have got it otherwise?

A.—The letter will speak for itself and I will bring it up here.

Q.—Now, how many repayments and special warrants have been issued to you?

A.—Two.

Q.—For what amounts?

A.—Both for \$25,000.

Q.—On your authority, covering the payment of assistance, counsel, experts, witness fees, transportation, entertainment and the rest of it?

A.—There was no entertainment.

Q.—I am told you had the merriest time ever after you left for Sudbury and until you got back?

A.—There is no truth in that.

Q.—Then all you have received in connection with this expenditure is \$50,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And nothing has been paid on account of the investigation except the \$50,000?

A.—That is all.

Q.—Did you pay the Commissioners?

A.—Yes; \$2,000 each on account.

Q.—When did you pay them?

A.—That will be in here.

Q.—It isn't in here. That is the reason I am asking you. There is no item in the public accounts in reference to you except the \$50,000. Was it last spring or last fall?

A.—Justice Riddell and Justice Latchford gave the receipts. It is in the vouchers.

Q.—I am not disputing that. I am asking you about it. Have you the receipts here?

A.—No, it is in the file. In addition to that I have the cheque with the names on the back of it.

Q.—So that you paid everybody—it was your party entirely?

A.—Yes, for various reasons—

Q.—Never mind the reasons. I am asking you?

A.—Yes, I made all disbursements.

Q.—You paid Mr. McEvoy?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Campbell?

A.—No.

Q.—What is the total disbursement in connection with the inquiry?

A.—My bookkeeper and the auditor who looked after the books can give you that expenditure better than I can.

The Chairman—You are entitled to tell as nearly as you can.

Witness—I think about \$71,000 or \$72,000. It may be more than that.

Q.—That does not include your own fees?

A.—No, except the payment of \$2,000 on account.

Q.—So that the \$71,000 or \$72,000 paid out, on account of which you have only had \$50,000, must be added to by the amount for your own services?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you settle in full with everyone engaged?

A.—No, not every person; for this reason: When I left on the 4th of December there would be about another \$25,000 spent. Instead of putting in enough to make it up to \$75,000 or whatever it was, including my own fees and getting another \$25,000, I waited until we could get all the accounts of the Commission up to the 4th of December.

Q.—Then what is your account against the Government for services?

A.—My own account against the Government, according to an arrangement with Mr. Raney, will be taxed.

Q.—What will it be?

A.—I haven't rendered it.

Q.—What do you estimate it at?

A.—I can't tell you.

Q.—Now don't trifle with us.

A.—I am not trifling.

Q.—Yes, I think you are. I am trying to be fair and decent with you. You take the biggest job you ever had in a legal way in your life and you sit here and tell us you don't know what your fees are.

A.—I haven't made a charge. What I am going to do is this: I am going to make a per diem charge, so much a day for preparation and so much for each day in court, and you can take it that I was practically engaged from the time the Order in Council went through until the day I left—night and day at it.

Q.—What do you propose to charge per day?

A.—Well, I don't know. I haven't fully made up my mind.

Q.—Oh yes, Mr. Harding, be frank with us. You have been nine and a half months almost exclusively engaged in this work. You haven't drawn a cent but the \$2,000 and you tell us you have no idea of what is coming to you.

A.—You ask me to tell you what I am going to charge?

Q.—I am asking you what the Government owes you, in your estimation?

A.—I think I should be paid \$50 a day for preparation and \$100 a day for in court.

Q.—You were about 75 days in court?

A.—I can get you the exact number.

Q.—I gather from the way the Commission carried on, that speaking roughly about alternate weeks were in court and the others in preparation so that the division would be pretty much fifty-fifty?

A.—I do not think so. I imagine preparation would be about 55 per cent. of the time.

Q.—If my recollection is right I think you were some seventy days in court?

A.—That may be right. I do not think it was as much as that.

Q.—Would you say sixty days in court?

A.—It is in the neighbourhood of sixty days.

Q.—And the days in preparation would be about 65 per cent.?

A.—I think you will find that I was in court from 35 to 40 per cent. of the time and the balance in preparation.

Q.—So that you would be about 60 days in court and about 150 days in preparation?

A.—Possibly in the neighbourhood of 150 days.

Q.—So that approximately it would be \$5,000 for preparation and \$6,000 for court, so that in rough figures your estimate of your bill is about \$12,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that has to be added to the \$72,000 disbursements you have already incurred?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That would be \$84,000. Then there are some outstanding accounts as yet that you haven't squared away. What do those amount to?

A.—I cannot really tell you. The difficulty has been to get the receipts necessary, the system of book-keeping. I brought the book-keeper up to the Department before I started, but when the accounts came in they wanted it done in an entirely different way.

Q.—You can prepare for us and show us exactly what is the amount?

A.—Every dollar of it. I had the auditor in every month to go over the books.

Q.—When did you get the first \$25,000?

A.—I cannot give you the date.

Q.—The books will show when you got that?

A.—Absolutely.

Q.—The same would apply to the second \$25,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They were filed covering the \$50,000—they must have been filed before the 31st of October?

A.—I suppose so. I really don't know. That part I didn't bother with, except to have it done.

Q.—Your mission was to go ahead?

A.—Yes, I went full steam ahead right from the start.

Q.—You cannot tell us when your vouchers for the total of \$50,000 were handed to the Department?

A.—No, I cannot give you that.

Q.—Whom did you give those receipts to?

A.—My book-keeper came up and gave them to the gentleman sitting over there, Mr. Brown.

Q.—You had no personal communication with Mr. Brown?

A.—I think she (the book-keeper) came up with me and I introduced her to Mr. Brown, or it may have been to Mr. Clancy. I took her in and introduced her and she carried out the whole matter.

Q.—Why haven't you had these things settled up before this?

A.—One of the difficulties is this: There is one man who has a difference in his account of \$40 or \$50.

Q.—Who is that—Rochester?

A.—No, a man named Grupp.

Q.—You have paid Rochester?

A.—No, not all.

Q.—How much have you paid Rochester?

A.—I paid him over \$20,000.

Q.—Quite a bit over \$20,000?

A.—It is in the accounts.

Q.—Did you turn over \$24,000 to Rochester to spend?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you ever send him \$24,000 at one time?

A.—Never.

Q.—Have you paid him more than \$24,000?

A.—I can't tell exactly.

Q.—Is it a fact that you have paid him \$32,000 to \$33,000?

A.—The expenditure, the total expenditure, I think, will run about \$33,000, between \$33,000 and \$35,000.

Q.—Where did you get hold of Rochester?

A.—I think that Mr. Rochester was recommended to me first by Mr. Hurdman. Then I had three or four names submitted to me of men who could undertake a job like that.

Q.—Rochester's duties were largely, if not altogether, in the Fort Frances district?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In the Shevlin-Clarke area?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you directed the method of operation and inquiry that should be carried on by Rochester?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the Government has paid, or the Province will have to pay Rochester some \$35,000?

A.—In that neighbourhood.

Q.—And that was largely the outcome and for the purpose of securing the information that Callahan wanted?

A.—No.

Q.—Callahan got the benefit of all that?

A.—No. That measurement would not have been made on those limits if it had not been the Commissioners' request that it be done.

Q.—The Commissioners, on your suggestion?

A.—No.

Q.—Yes. Look at the record. Your suggestion was a stump and top scale. Your suggestion to the Commissioners was that they should direct that such a thing should be done and you paid Rochester and he got the men he

required to make the stump and top scale. That is what the record shows. Isn't that the fact?

A.—I sent him out to measure up Berth A of five square miles on instructions from the Commissioners. When the result was known I was instructed to have him go on and make the other measurements.

Q.—So that the whole \$35,000 of Provincial money was spent on the Shevlin-Clarke area while you held a retainer from Callahan to do that?

A.—Not to do that.

Q.—To investigate the Shevlin-Clarke operations. That was your retainer. Was not that your retainer? (No answer.) Your retainer from Callahan was to investigate the Shevlin-Clarke operations. The Commissioners have so stated in the valedictory they issued for you. That was so stated.

A.—You term it a valedictory?

Q.—Someone says an obituary, but wasn't that the fact?

A.—Oh no.

Q.—We won't be pushed aside. Isn't it the fact that the Province has spent \$35,000 to satisfy a retainer you got from Callahan to investigate the Shevlin-Clarke operations?

A.—No, that isn't so.

Q.—Isn't that the result of what has been done?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you mean to say that Callahan hasn't benefited and hasn't succeeded in achieving his purpose through this expenditure?

A.—Callahan had the same purpose exactly as the men who started the investigation had.

Q.—Now who is Callahan?

A.—He runs a wholesale grocery, I think.

Q.—Don't you know it is; haven't you been in it?

A.—I haven't been in it. I think it is a wholesale grocery, E. J. Callahan, Ltd.

Q.—Run for whom?

A.—Run for himself.

Q.—You know who Callahan is, that he is an employee of E. W. Backus, you know that?

A.—I do not. I do not believe it.

Q.—You have never heard of any of his relations with Backus?

A.—Certainly, I have heard what was in the newspapers.

Q.—Do you mean to say that you never, from Callahan or Backus, heard of this relationship?

A.—Never.

Q.—You say you never knew, with all your close communication with Backus?

A.—You say close communication?

Q.—Yes, I say it advisedly.

A.—Mr. Ferguson, as far as Mr. Backus is concerned I never did any business for him except to introduce him here. I never got a dollar from Mr. Backus in my life.

Q.—You got it from Callahan but it was Backus money.

A.—I don't believe it.

Q.—Do you mean to tell me and this Committee that with all your relationships with Backus at Fort Frances, at International Falls, where you have been interviewing Backus—

A.—I never interviewed Backus at those places.

Q.—Do you say you have never seen Backus in these places?

A.—I saw him once in Fort Frances in June and in August; I went down on the same train with him to Minneapolis. Those were the only two times I saw him.

Q.—You went to Minneapolis and saw him?

A.—I saw him on the train.

Q.—Did you meet by accident?

A.—No; he said he was going down, and I went down on the same train. I was not ashamed of it.

Q.—No; the trip was all right. The purpose of it is what I am interested in. You say that one of your meetings with Mr. Backus was when you took him to the Department and introduced him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Why were you introducing him?

A.—I will tell you so you will know how it happened. I have in my diary the exact date when I was in Fort Frances. He told me then he wanted me to make an application for him to the Crown Lands Department and get some wood for his mill. I told him he had better telegraph and make an appointment before he came down. He did come here. He came to my office and he had a written statement of what he wanted. I put that in my pocket, and he said I will take this up with you now and you will go and make this application. I said "I think your best plan is to go up and I will introduce you to the Premier and we can have a round-table talk and afterwards get down to it. I went up with him and introduced him to Mr. Drury, and Mr. Drury when he heard the name said, "Are you the terrible man Backus I have heard so much about?" and he said, "Yes, I am the man." Then he turned and said, "I would like to settle the dispute between the Canadian publishers and ourselves."

Q.—I am not concerned about that. You came up and introduced Mr. Backus to the Prime Minister and he had a proposition with reference to some wood which you discussed?

A.—No.

Q.—Wasn't it discussed at all?

A.—No.

Q.—Never mentioned?

A.—Not in my presence.

Q.—You never mentioned it yourself?

A.—No.

Q.—What was the application he was making?

A.—The application he was making hadn't been prepared at that time at all.

Q.—That was the application for the English River limit?

A.—It turned out that it was.

Q.—Didn't you know at the time just what the extent of the application was?

A.—When he first spoke to me I thought it was an application for wood in the Rainy River district. When he came down subsequently he told me.

Q.—You understood what it was before it came to the Government at all?

A.—I understood he was making an application.

Q.—For a concession which turned out to be the English River Limit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now you were in touch with his representative at the time—Mr. George was Mr. Backus' solicitor? You know that?

A.—I know he is.

Q.—You have communicated with him as such?

A.—Assuredly.

Q.—You kept in communication with Mr. George in connection with Backus matters?

A.—No.

Q.—I want you to be careful. Did you never have any communication with George with reference to Backus' affairs and dealings with this Government, will you swear that?

A.—I will swear that Mr. George didn't get into the Backus deal until I was out.

Q.—I am asking if you had any communication with George with reference to any of the Backus dealings with this Government?

A.—No.

Q.—None whatever?

A.—No.

Q.—Or in reference to other business matters of Backus that affected public affairs?

A.—None.

Q.—None whatever?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—All right. We will see about that.

Q.—Then you had a communication with Backus junior; you met him frequently?

A.—I met him once. I never had a letter from him.

Q.—You met one Dolberg?

A.—I met him in January, 1920.

Q.—Dolberg is the engineer and general manager for Backus?

A.—I understood he was manager of the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company.

Q.—A Backus concern?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He is the financial agent for Backus?

A.—I do not know that at all.

Q.—Don't you know he is?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you know a man named Newcombe?

A.—I never heard of him.

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

March 9, 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a.m. Mr. Harding recalled. Examined by Mr. Ferguson:

Q.—Mr. Harding, you said you would produce a letter or a copy of a letter from the Provincial Treasurer to the manager of the bank. Is this it, you produce?

A.—Yes, but it is addressed to me. Mr. Chairman, I haven't any objection to the Committee but I don't think it should be made public.

Q.—It has to go into the records of this investigation. This is the letter: Re Timber investigation.

“The Government will include in the further supplementary estimates a vote of \$10,000 to pay expenses of the Commission. I will send you a cheque for \$10,000 immediately after the Supply Bill has received the consent of the Lieutenant Governor, which will possibly be in two or three weeks. In the meantime you can use this letter for the purpose of procuring an advance to enable you to pay expenses. (Signed) Peter Smith.”

Q.—You went to the Home Bank, I think you said, with this letter?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And it was on the strength of that letter that you procured the first advance in connection with this?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The advance was \$10,000?

A.—That is right.

Q.—So that you were in error the other day when you said \$25,000?

A.—In error in this way: I put the proceeds of that into a trust account I had and then I went and checked against that until there was \$35,000. Then I got \$25,000 and paid for it.

Q.—You apparently did not leave this letter with the bank, what did you give the bank—a note?

A.—I got that from Col. Mason. The bank held this letter.

Q.—You have no paper undertaking also?

A.—I gave them a note for \$10,000.

Q.—Your personal note?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On the strength of this letter?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then you continued to incur expenditure and pay out money until your account ran up to \$35,000?

A.—That is my recollection, yes. Then I got \$25,000, and when the account ran over \$50,000 I got \$25,000 more.

Q.—Was this all in the trust account?

A.—Yes, a trust account of my own I had in the bank.

Q.—You carried separate accounts, a personal, a firm and a trust account?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You haven't your bank book here with your trust account?

A.—What I want to ask is this. It seems to me the other day—

Q.—I am the one who wants to ask things and you can answer. At any rate you went on spending. Where is the account of your expenditure. Have you it here . . . is this it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—This statement produced here covers a total of \$34,951.47?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is this a copy of the account as rendered to the Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In this account I see J. M. McEvoy \$4,240. That is right?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Is that the total amount paid to Mr. McEvoy?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Here is a charge T. E. Lawless \$2,104.65?

A.—Yes, he is one of the accountants.

Q.—Frederick Mowat, who is he?

A.—The Sheriff of Toronto.

Q.—I see one Theodore Ellis, witness conduct money \$110. Where did Ellis come from?

A.—We brought him down to Toronto out of the bush. I think Mr. Bell undertook to bring him down provided we would pay his expenses, and it would have cost us a lot of money to send a bailiff in to serve him. We undertook to do so and his account is filed.

Q.—The details of this account are with the auditor?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Frank R. Weston \$60—that is another?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He comes from Midland?

A.—Yes, he was a witness. He was here for about a week, four or five days or a week.

Q.—What was the nature of his evidence to keep him here a week?

A.—Mr. Hanley went up and employed him to make tests of different kinds in connection with the Georgian Bay Lumber Company and the Victoria Lumber Company.

Q.—Who is Mr. Hanley?

A.—W. J. Hanley, my partner.

Q.—This is the man who did that?

A.—Yes, he came here and gave his evidence, more or less as an expert.

Q.—The next item I see is Justice, on account of fees July 2, \$2,000, disbursements \$173.17, a total of \$2,173.17. Is that the date on which that was paid?

A.—I think that is the date of the cheque. If I haven't the cheque here it will be with the vouchers.

Q.—You knew of the legislation at Ottawa—the new judges act, didn't you?

A.—I know it was published in the press.

Q.—You knew at the time and the judges knew. The Act came into force and was assented to on the 1st of July—you knew that?

A.—Until three or four days ago—

Q.—I am asking you. You knew that when you paid this cheque?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And talked it over with the judge?

A.—I didn't know when the Act came into force until a few days ago. From the newspaper reports of the proposed legislation it was not clear whether it would apply to commissions already issued—that is the phase of it I talked over.

Q.—It was in the press at the time; the Act was introduced on the 28th of June, had second reading on the 29th of June, passed the House on the 30th and was assented to on the first of July. Everybody knew that from the press, and as a matter of fact it was discussed by the Commissioner and you?

A.—Only to this extent—that it was not known whether it would apply or not.

Q.—And so that you would not be taking chances you issued the cheque right off?

A.—No, I considered it would not apply to what had been done up to that time.

Q.—That was your view?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You paid a somewhat smaller account of \$2,083.15 to Justice Latchford on the same date?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did the Commissioners give you a bill?

A.—No.

Q.—How was the amount arrived at?

A.—It is rather difficult for me to say. My best recollection is that I discussed the matter with the Attorney-General. After the discussion I had with him I gave Justice Riddell \$2,000 and the cheque with their endorsement is with the auditor.

Q.—What was the basis of the \$2,000 payment?

A.—It was on the basis of paying him \$2,000 on account of what they would be entitled to get.

Q.—You discussed it with the Attorney-General and arrived at some basis on which you advanced him \$2,000?

A.—No. The reason I say no is this: At the time Mr. Peter White had written a letter saying he should get \$2,500 on account of his fees.

Q.—The White letter was before this date?

A.—I believe it was. That is my best recollection.

Q.—We will get that letter another day.

A.—I may be wrong but the \$2,500 had been talked of to me even before he wrote the letter.

Q.—The point is this: the pending legislation brought up the question of whether the judges were entitled as Commissioners to be paid or not, didn't it?

A.—Well, no, because I always considered they were entitled to be paid it.

Q.—And the legislation was not discussed?

A.—Only to this extent, as to whether they would be paid up to the date of the coming into force of the Act.

Q.—Then you went and discussed it with the Attorney-General?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the Attorney-General said you had better take a chance and pay the money now?

A.—No, Mr. White was asking—

Q.—I am not asking about Mr. White. Mr. White tried to put some good ideas into your head and you wouldn't accept them. Now as to this \$2,000 you say there was no definite or fixed basis at all?

A.—No.

Q.—That was just to pay them on account for their services?

A.—That is right.

Q.—And it was expected that they would be paid a further sum?

A.—I think so, yes.

Q.—And that \$2,000 would pay them up to that time?

A.—No, it was just on account.

Q.—You would not pay them ahead of time? The Commission might have fallen down any time, the way it was wobbling about?

A.—It was a pretty healthy child always.

Q.—The Commission had been in operation about three months. It started in the middle of April—about two and a half months. They got \$2,000 for that, up to that time?

A.—They got \$2,000 on account of services.

Q.—On account of services up to that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn't get any bill from them?

A.—Oh no.

Q.—You didn't get any voucher at any time?

A.—I think there is a letter acknowledging the receipt of it, with the papers.

Q.—Now I gather from the letter you sent to the Clerk of the Committee that all these papers had been sent back to you. Where is that letter?

A.—What has happened is this: I got from the auditor a long list of questions that will reach from here down to Bay Street, in reference to all these items, wanting additional information.

Q.—Of course that is what we want; here is your letter to the Secretary of this Committee, written yesterday:

“Re your letter of the 4th of March enclosing a copy of the letter of the 3rd of March from Mr. Brown, Provincial Auditor, and a copy of the list of particulars in reference to the accounts filed; you will understand that the details it will be necessary for me to get to cover all these items will cover a considerable time.”

Q.—The auditor has sent you back a long list of items that required additional vouchers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you that here?

A.—No, it will take me ten days to get it.

Q.—Where is the auditor's letter and list of items?

A.—The auditor will have it. I haven't it here.

MR. BROWN (Provincial Auditor): I didn't send it to Mr. Harding. I sent it to the Department of Crown Lands.

WITNESS: Mr. Grigg sent it to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get it here.

MR. FERGUSON: You say you got a formal letter from the Commissioners acknowledging the receipt of the \$2,000?

A.—That is my recollection.

Q.—And that is filed?

A.—With the cheque, with the auditor.

MR. FERGUSON to Mr. Brown: Have you a letter written by each of the Commissioners acknowledging the receipt of cheques?

MR. BROWN: I haven't a paper in the office. Everything is back in the Department of Lands and Forests.

MR. FERGUSON (to witness): I see here an item, Might Directories, Ltd., services March 30, May 28, August 28, November 11?

A.—I sent them over a copy of the summons to have copies made.

Q.—That is typewriting?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Stanley Meeking, service \$125, what is that? Meeking is an officer of the Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that for extra work?

A.—Yes, done at night.

Q.—E. G. Boyd—another employee?

A.—Yes, he made a lot of maps.

Q.—I see an item here—Employers' Detective Agency \$103. What were the services the Employers' Detective Agency rendered?

A.—I will tell you what that was. Mr. Rogers got a man and sent him to Sudbury or Port Arthur, I am not sure which. Mr. Rogers knew all about that item. That is the bill and we paid it.

Q.—That was not the man the Commission had shadowing me around the most of last summer?

A.—I give you my word I do not know of that. I had three chasing me, and I thought I was the only one being chased.

Q.—There was no difficulty in keeping track of you, you left such a trail.

A.—They have enough dictaphone conversations with my help to reach from here to Montreal.

Q.—At any rate, this wasn't the gentleman asked to keep track of me?

A.—No sir.

Q.—F. J. Niven \$300—he is the Secretary to the Minister?

A.—Meeking, Niven and two or three other men in the Department went back at nights for the purpose of making up a statement from the returns there. I was there several times until the wee hours of the morning. Every dollar they got they earned.

Q.—I am not disputing that. Here is an interesting bill: Prince Arthur Hotel, Port Arthur, \$676. Have you the details of that?

A.—The details and vouchers are with the bill. I think that is for two weeks.

Q.—Did you have to lease the hotel for two weeks?

A.—No, we had to lease a portion of it.

Q.—I understand a very substantial portion of it?

A.—Oh no. If you have stayed at these northern hotels you will have found how they charge.

HON MR. RANEY: Was that just yourself alone?

A.—That included everyone, court reporters and everyone else, every person connected with the Commission.

MR. FERGUSON: The details are set out in the statement?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I see a man named Fryer here. Who is R. Fryer, \$107.10?

A.—He is a gentleman by the name of Richmond Fryer.

Q.—Where did you get into communication with Fryer?

A.—At the Soo, I think.

Q.—How did you get into communication with him? How were you brought into contact with Fryer?

A.—You will have to ask me something easier than that; I don't know.

Q.—Haven't you any correspondence with Fryer?

A.—I think I did write him a letter or two. I haven't the slightest idea at the moment who it was but some person told me that Fryer, then running a company called the Searchmount Lumber Company, close to the Soo, could be of use to me.

Q.—You got further information about Fryer, as to his history and so on, didn't you? As a matter of fact you were told to get hold of Fryer, that he was a former sore-head employee of the Spanish River Lumber Company?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Didn't you know that he was an employee of the Spanish River Company prior to that and had some differences with them and was let out or got out?

A.—I would answer the other question if you hadn't said "sorehead." I knew he had been a woods operator for the Spanish River Lumber Company for some years, and that he was the best man I could get to give me the information on the Company's operations in the bush.

Q.—He was the best man you could get for your purposes?

A.—That is what I believed.

Q.—You knew he had severed relations with the Company and that there was bitter feeling?

A.—I did not know that.

Q.—Oh, yes you did, because Mr. Fryer hasn't hesitated to say so publicly and broadcast. With your corps of assistants you would scarcely fail to know that?

A.—I did not know that.

Q.—You did not know that at all? Mr. Robert McKay, when he cross-examined him, asked him a lot of questions about leaving the Company—is that the first you knew of it?

A.—No. Mr. Fryer told me himself.

Q.—When you got into contact with him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was well known in the lumber business what Fryer's attitude and feeling was toward his former employers?

A.—That may be quite true.

Q.—He made it quite plain to you, as to other people, that he had a grudge to satisfy, didn't he? Is that a fact?

A.—I don't think so. His evidence didn't show any grudge at all.

Q.—I am not asking that—he made it plain to you? I want you to be careful, for this committee sits again. Do you say Fryer never informed you, never told you of his severance of his connection with the Spanish River Lumber Company and let you know in any way of his antipathy to them?

A.—In this way, Mr. McEvoy was the first person to discuss the matter with him. He told me of differences he had with the Spanish River Lumber Company. If I was not going to call him or any person not in the employ of the Company who had some difference with them, I would not be able to call anyone at all.

Q.—I am not asking you that at all. At any rate, you got hold of Fryer and you got what evidence you could out of him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Fryer helped you to dig up a lot of other fellows?

A.—He may have given me other names.

Q.—You know he did?

A.—I think he did.

Q.—He consulted other witnesses for you?

A.—If he did, I didn't know of it.

Q.—You don't know if he went out and consulted other people and secured their evidence?

A.—What he agreed to do with me, was that he would send me names and addresses of some of the working bosses and some of the bosses of other companies I gave him a list of.

Q.—In other words you enlisted him to assist you and he was able to select other employees who felt as he did toward the Company?

Objection taken by the Chairman to the form of the question as being an assertion rather than an inquiry of witness.

MR. FERGUSON: Then I see you adjourned to Sudbury and spent some time there?

A.—The Commission sat there.

Q.—You were there?

A.—Rather.

Q.—There is a bill of \$512 at the Nickel Range Hotel?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That included the expenses of yourself and commission, your reporter and the judges—all these expenditures are set forth in detail in your accounts?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, how was it you included the judges' account? I notice here the judges are paid disbursements as well. For instance, Commissioner Riddell received \$173 and Justice Latchford \$83. If you were paying all their expenses, how was that incurred?

A.—You will find vouchers for that, what it was for.

Q.—W. J. Lethbridge, \$1,144. He is an accountant, is he?

A.—Yes.

Q.—D. Smith, \$691. He fares pretty well, who is Smith?

A.—He is a man I had employed to keep track of the records. When we started the House was in session and we couldn't get a person out of the Department, so I hired Smith, a young man in the city, to keep the records

for us while we were on the road. He brought them back and handed them in to the Department.

Q.—He was a sort of clerk to the Commission?

A.—A sort of utility man. He went around and did messages.

Q.—What became of Smith?

A.—He is in the city.

Q.—Is he here still?

A.—Yes, the last I heard of him, two or three weeks ago. He is travelling now, a commercial traveller.

Q.—Who is Frank Tucker—\$101?

A.—He lives in Toronto here, and we had to take him to Port Arthur. Then I think he was called subsequently in Toronto at a later date. He was originally a Port Arthur man and employed by Mr. Russell. I think he was Russell's bookkeeper.

Q.—George Fisher—\$376. That is down as disbursements on May 15, September 19 and October 9. Who is he?

A.—He is a wood ranger at the Soo. We sent him up to make a jack-ladder test at one of the mills up near the Transcontinental.

Q.—What mill was that?

A.—It was Col. Little's mill.

Q.—The New Ontario Contracting Co.?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You checked the Little mill?

A.—They had trouble there. They got the first part of the boom down but the balance was tied up in the lake. That is the reason that it is in there.

Q.—You didn't check the whole season's cut? You made a jack-ladder test?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did that give you a fair indication as to whether the proper return was made?

MR. MAGEAU: That would be only a partial check?

WITNESS: The difficulty was this. Col. Little started on the first of July and had bad luck. The machinery was badly installed. It would run a week and then break down, and being such a distance away it would be a long time before they could get repairs. These chaps started a boat check to rescale the logs. When I discovered that, I wired asking them to come back.

MR. MAGEAU: You say they made a scale of the logs in the lake, a check scale. Did you consider that would be an adequate scale of the logs?

A.—It was his opinion.

Q.—Whose opinion?

A.—Fisher's.

Q.—What did he know about it?

A.—He is a Government scaler, a check scaler and wood ranger.

Q.—He actually did scale the logs?

A.—So he said.

Q.—You didn't consider that scale a proper one?

A.—I stopped it when I found out what he was doing.

MR. FERGUSON: You paid Mr. White, on November 4, \$2,500 on account? So that evidently you were in error when you said he had been paid or had asked for anything in June?

A.—He wrote me a letter some months before that. I turned it over to the Attorney-General, and I expected from what I was told that they would make an advance to him. Subsequently I sent a cheque to him.

Q.—I see Mr. Titus gets \$200? He is a solicitor to the Lands and Forests Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How did he come in for \$200?

A.—I hired him to make a brief up from the files of the Department on one of the companies. I understood he did that after hours.

Q.—You think that was not part of his duty?

A.—I would not think so.

Q.—What company was it?

A.—The Spanish River Pulp & Paper Co. That was really an analysis of the agreements. There were, I think, three or four different companies and a lot of extensions and that sort of thing.

Q.—You didn't think that was a part of his duty as solicitor for the Department, to be acquainted with these things?

A.—I do not.

Q.—Who is C. H. Cook?

A.—An accountant.

Q.—An accountant you had from the outside? He is not an employee?

A.—No, he is an outside man. He was manager of the Merchants Bank at one time.

Q.—B. W. Harbinson, \$7,252. Does that cover a period of service?

A.—Yes, nearly six months' service.

Q.—Now, I see the Home Bank got \$271 interest?

A.—That was on the overdraft.

Q.—Over and above the \$10,000 the Treasurer gave you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you get your \$25,000 from the Treasurer?

A.—I haven't got that here. I can get it. There were two payments.

Q.—I see here that Miss I. M. Gerow was paid \$845—for what?

A.—For keeping the books.

Q.—Keeping what books?

A.—She had to check up the bills and do all that sort of thing.

Q.—You had Smith to take care of the papers and check up the Commission's work, to keep track of all that for you, and then you had a personal attendant to check up your travelling expenses, see you got hotel accommodation and all that?

A.—Yes. The idea was this. She had work in the office. She was paid a salary in the office——

Q.—Is she in your office?

A.—Yes. She gets \$25 a week, and I gave her \$10 a week extra for the work I had her do after hours for the Commission. She was getting \$10 a week for that.

Q.—That would be 84 weeks?

A.—She went with the Commission and paid the bills. She took a typewriter with her. Then she was paid \$50 a week.

Q.—She travelled with you and looked after details for the Commission—saw you didn't lose your grip and that sort of thing?

A.—Yes. At the same time, with these three or four auditors going through the books, they would bring in statements and those statements had to be written.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean to say that she went to look after your grip?

A.—No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then why do you say so. You said yes to that question.

MR. FERGUSON: I understand he did forget it once, only for her.

Q.—Then there was an item of \$2,000 paid to yourself on August 7. That, you say, is the only payment you had?

A.—Yes, out of that \$50,000.

Q.—Who is Dr. John Carruthers?

A.—I think he is at Little Gore Bay or Little Current.

Q.—He is paid \$175 for what?

A.—There is a refund. We had thirty or forty Indians——

Q.—The Commission didn't have a doctor too?

A.—No. There were thirty or thirty-five witnesses who went to Sudbury, and I sent him the money to have them subpoenaed. There is a statement in the accounts showing exactly where the money went to.

Q.—Here is transportation in a lump disbursement, May 4th to October 4th. R. T. Harding and party, \$1,957?

A.—That is railway fares and all that. That is all given in the statement. They have asked me now to get vouchers from the railways.

Q.—Then you have here Mr. Hanley, who is your partner, \$292?

A.—He was up north in Midland for about a week. He subpoenaed about ten or twelve witnesses and paid them their witness fees.

Q.—He went up to interview Weston, and White and Chew?

A.—Chew and others of that crowd up there.

Q.—And he is the man who secured that evidence?

A.—Yes, the details of the whole of that are shown in the vouchers.

Q.—Rex Hotel, International Falls, \$583. Did that cover the whole party's expenditure?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is International Falls on the American side, opposite Fort Frances?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then I see you came back to the Prince Arthur Hotel, Port Arthur, on June 23rd, and you paid them \$298?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that you have a total expenditure here of \$34,951?

A.—Yes. Here is the second part.

Q.—Then on this second return is D. B. Rochester, \$26,281. That is not all of the Rochester account, is it?

A.—No, I told you I thought it would be about \$32,000.

Q.—I understand he claims something like \$33,000 to \$35,000?

A.—Roughly speaking, that is what was paid of the amount.

Q.—To himself?

A.—I do not think so. I don't think that includes any of his own.

Q.—There is nothing for himself in this?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you had an account from his as to his own claim?

A.—Mr. R—— is settling it now with him. I think possibly the whole matter will be adjusted in a few days.

Q.—You haven't inquired to find out what it is?

A.—I think it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$32,000.

Q.—But what is the amount for his personal services?

A.—I cannot tell you that.

Q.—Then we have S. A. Marks, well known to fame. I see his services for 76 days are put at \$15 a day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—As a bushranger?

A.—He went in in charge of that party.

Q.—He had charge of a lot of check scalers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Ordinarily the Government paid them \$7 a day?

A.—They pay scalers \$7 a day.

Q.—Isn't \$5.50 to \$6 what scalers get?

A.—They are paid \$7 now.

Q.—At any rate, Marks was given \$15 a day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell me when he began his services?

A.—It is in that bill. I know nothing about it except that it was wages paid out. The detail is in the file.

Q.—At any rate, Marks' bill was \$4,010?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On whose operations did he check scale?

A.—He check scaled at the suggestion of the Commissioners one of the

townships of the Spanish River Lumber Company or one of its subsidiary companies.

Q.—Did he check scale a township or a berth?

A.—I think it was a township.

Q.—A six-mile township?

A.—No, nine.

Q.—Do you recall what township?

A.—You will find it in the papers. It is one of the lettered townships in the Mississauga reserve.

Q.—It cost \$4,000 to check scale that?

A.—Yes, the reason of that was that there was a large amount of conflicting evidence as to the quantity of blown-down timber still there, and we were trying to find out who was right.

Q.—And he did that under your instructions?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had authority to get any information you liked in any quarter you liked?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There was no question about his authority in going in there?

A.—Not the slightest.

Q.—You had full authority to give directions to make searches and collecting all that sort of information?

A.—Yes, if I considered it reasonable, and should be got.

Q.—Then there is George Fisher—that is the same Fisher?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I see he got \$8 a day for 48 days, \$384—he is an employee of the Government?

A.—Yes, but he was not on at that time.

Q.—Are you sure about that? He has been employed for years?

A.—I am not sure as to that, but I am satisfied he was not paid by the Government and by me. I looked after that.

Q.—He would not be paid \$8 a day by the Government?

A.—No, \$7.50 I think.

Q.—He is a ranger, or scaler?

A.—Yes, I think he is assistant to Mr. Hughson.

Q.—Alex. McCallum, \$384—he was an assistant to Fisher?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who are Burns and Burns?

A.—Lawyers at Fort William.

Q.—Theirs is \$1,342—what was that account incurred for?

A.—Legal services.

Q.—Did you get a statement from them?

A.—There is a bill for every dollar of his charges, what he was paid.

Q.—Itemized? Or in a lump sum?

A.—It is all itemized.

Q.—The bill of Burns and Burns, being a solicitor's account was, I suppose, O.K'd by the Attorney-General's Department and taxed by them?

A.—No. What I did was this. He sent me a bill. I did not know it had to be taxed. He was with me up there. I was alone——

Q.—Where was Mr. McEvoy?

A.—He was not with me in Fort William.

Q.—That is one of his complaints, that you sailed on to Port Arthur without taking him. Isn't that the fact, that that was one of his complaints?

A.—It is not going to help anyone to know.

Q.—I do not know about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is no part of these accounts.

MR. FERGUSON: Oh, yes. He acted for the people of the Province, and we are entitled to know everything they did in connection with this. At any rate, Mr. McEvoy so stated before the Commission, that he resented the fact that he had not been taken to Port Arthur—isn't that the fact? I don't want to put it stronger than that, but I know more about it than that.

A.—I suppose that will do.

Q.—That is a mild way of putting it?

A.—All right.

Q.—Then I see P. M. Wiley, \$1,576. Who is Wiley?

A.—He is a check scaler of the Government.

Q.—Where was he check scaling?

A.—Away up in the Cochrane district. I think he was up there. He came down and some person sent him to me as a man who knew the north country, and I hired him and put him in Port Arthur, in the Crown timber agent's office at Port Arthur.

Q.—You sent him to Port Arthur with authority to take charge of the Crown Timber Agent's office, to go into the books without any notice to the Crown Timber Agent there at all?

A.—I don't think there was any notice.

Q.—No notice to the Crown Timber Agent until your man walked in on him?

A.—No.

Q.—Sort of a vacation, as far as he was concerned, wasn't it?

A.—There was no notice sent to him.

Q.—He knew nothing about it, at any rate?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you got your correspondence here dealing with different matters you went into in connection with this Commission's work?

A.—No. Mr. Dennison has all that.

Q.—Has your correspondence?

A.—Anything that dealt with the Commission.

Q.—I suppose it is your correspondence?

A.—When Mr. Dennison was appointed, he came to me and asked me to let him have everything I had, and I did.

Q.—It is available for this committee?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have a letter here from the Provincial Auditor with reference to your accounts. On March 3, 1921, I see, he wrote Mr. Grigg: “I am returning to your department for further information accounts in connection with the return made by R. T. Harding against his advance of \$50,000 *re* Crown Timber Investigation. The details of the information required are set out in the attached memorandum. I might draw your attention to the fact that accounts for legal services must be taxed by the Attorney-General’s Department, and also that for any service, no matter of what nature the covering dates, rate of pay and the nature of the services should be definitely shown. Payments made to members of your staff for extra services should have been by the direction of the Minister of Lands and Forests or by Order-in-Council.”

Q.—That letter was sent to you?

A.—A copy was sent to me.

Q.—And with it an accompanying detailed list of the Auditor’s objections to the accounts?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—That is filed here in the shape of some 75 or more items?

MR. RANEY: You would not call it an objection to the accounts, but a request for different vouchers?

A.—Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: He objected to passing the accounts in the form in which they are?

A.—He has asked for additional information in reference to the accounts.

Q.—But he objected to passing these accounts in the form in which they are?

A.—That may be so. I don’t know whether it is or not.

Q.—To Mr. Brown—Isn’t that the fact, that you cannot pass these accounts in the form in which they are?

MR. BROWN: That is it.

Q.—Now I notice that in a great many of these items the Auditor finds there are no vouchers and no details of any kind. For instance, take the payment of \$700 to Mr. McEvoy—there is no voucher for that at all?

A.—The only voucher in there is some form of a bill from Mr. McEvoy saying he has expended \$700.

Q.—Is that the total amount of his bill?

A.—Oh, no. Those are his disbursements.

MR. RANEY: He didn’t voucher it?

A.—No.

MR. FERGUSON: I don’t suppose that has been arranged since?

A.—My bookkeeper is working on that now, and I expect in a week’s time to have it cleaned up.

Q.—Lawless, \$129—no vouchers?

A.—We wrote them telling them to get those things for us.

Q.—Justices Riddell and Latchford—no details, no vouchers?

A.—There is the cheque.

Q.—Stanley Meeking, no covering dates; Niven, no particulars; Port Arthur Hotel, \$676, with a note “why charge for laundry, tailor and tobacco,” also “details of bill of Miss Gerow”?

A.—I think the details are in the bill.

Q.—But the auditor says not. You have not satisfied him. Then Nickel Range Hotel, “Why charge for extra meals, drugs, etc.”?

A.—The bookkeeper will look that up. I don’t know anything about it at all.

Q.—You didn’t buy the drugs?

A.—No.

Q.—D. Smith, \$691,—no vouchers?

A.—That can’t be correct.

Q.—I am just reading what the auditor’s statement says. Titus, no measure of service given; Schroeder, no vouchers; Cook, \$369, no vouchers. No vouchers for hotel, pullman or details for meals, tips, etc. Harbison, no covering dates or rates shown. Was there any rate of pay fixed?

A.—Yes, he got \$30 a day for some and \$20 for others.

Q.—Then we find, “Why charge for section to Kenora and no voucher for Pullman returning.” Were you at Kenora?

A.—No, that is Harbison. He went there to go into the books of the Keewatin Lumber Company.

Q.—That is the Backus concern?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn’t find anything wrong there?

A.—We went there the same as to the others.

Q.—But there was nothing wrong with the Backus accounts?

A.—No.

Q.—Now all the way through I find that your accounts, which cover possibly 100 items—I find that the auditor raises objections to about 90 of them? In the Marks account apparently no particulars are given for the auditor says, “How is the amount of \$4,000 arrived at?” How was that arrived at?

A.—He has an account of so many days for himself and so many days for five or six men; what he was paid when he went in and when he came out.

Q.—The question is, “how is the amount of \$4,000 arrived at”?

A.—It is all there.

Q.—Burns account—no vouchers?

A.—That cannot be right. There is a long detailed bill with a receipt at the bottom of it for the money.

Q.—Mr. Brown says there was no voucher attached, the date of commencing services not shown, and the account not taxed?

A.—That is right. It wasn’t taxed, but he threw off \$300 or \$400. I paid it. I think he threw off \$300 if my recollection is correct.

Q.—Here is McGurin, \$446—who is he? One of Rochester’s men?

A.—Yes, possibly.

Q.—Miller, \$362—probably another of Rochester's men?

A.—Yes.

Q.—No proper pay list, according to the auditor. So there haven't been any accounts kept sufficient to satisfy the Provincial Auditor, on which he should pass these items?

A.—That is, the Rochester part of it.

Q.—Not only that. Here are 75 objections raised against the accounts?

A.—Yes, but one of them is an objection to the payment of \$2,000 to the judges. There is their letter or the cheque for the \$2,000 on account of services written on the body of the cheque, and the judges' endorsement. What more do you want than that?

Q.—It is not what I want, but what the Auditor wants?

A.—Well, that is the sort of objections being made. It is perfectly silly to ask us to get pullman car receipts from a darkey, and that sort of thing.

Q.—Other employees do it?

A.—That may be true.

Q.—Your secretary apparently didn't look after that?

A.—She didn't get receipts, but we will go to the railway and get them.

Q.—You told me the other day that you were in the Department in the latter part of February, ten days or so before the 9th of March?

A.—That is my recollection. Of course, I can't say as to the day.

Q.—You were there in the latter part of February—those are your own words?

A.—That is my recollection.

Q.—You were making an investigation into the different transactions in the Department?

A.—In the Department for the first week or ten days I doubt if I did very much, if I did anything, except to go in and turn the thing over in my mind. First, I wanted to ascertain how these returns were made, to get copies of the Act, of the forms and regulations. It was with a view to getting myself familiar with the matter.

Q.—Studying the matter?

A.—Yes, for at least ten days before I did anything.

Q.—And then, when you made up your mind that you had something that should be brought before the Commission, you discussed it with the Commissioners?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you mean to tell me, under oath, that you didn't discuss it? I want you to remember what the Commissioners themselves have said. You did not discuss with them the matters you were going to bring before them?

A.—That is a wide question.

Q.—Listen to my question. I am asking you if you are prepared to say that you did not submit to the Commissioners beforehand any of the evidence that you intended to bring before them?

A.—No.

Q.—You never did?

A.—No.

Q.—Well, we will produce the statement of the Commissioners. You say you never had any discussion with the Commissioners about any matter until you got up before them and produced the evidence formally in open tribunal?

A.—That is not what I said at all.

Q.—Let me hear what you did say? I asked you if you discussed with the Commissioners, before formally presenting it in open court before the Commission, any matter that you were about to bring before them?

A.—I may have, some.

Q.—Is it not a fact that you did some?

A.—I did on some occasions tell them the kind of evidence I was going to give.

Q.—And discussed it with them?

A.—No. I had control of the Commission and the evidence and I presented the way I wanted to without any suggestions of any kind from the court.

Q.—That is not what I have asked you at all. I have asked you if it was not a fact that you discussed beforehand with the Commissioners matters you were to bring before them in a formal way as Commissioners?

A.—No.

Q.—You said a moment ago you did?

A.—I have in this way. In the morning, possibly before the Commission would start, one of them would say, "Well, what are we going to have to-day," and I would say, perhaps, "Harbinson is coming up"?

Q.—Oh, Harbinson—be frank, Mr. Harding. Do yourself justice?

A.—Now, Mr. Ferguson—

Q.—Permit me, Mr. Harding, I am examining you as a witness.

MR. RANEY—Now, just a moment. The witness has a right to protest against your asking him to be frank.

MR. FERGUSON: I am examining the witness, I do not require any assistance from the Attorney-General.

MR. RANEY: You are not dominating this committee.

WITNESS: I was going to ask Mr. Ferguson to retract that. I have been frank with you, Mr. Ferguson, all the way.

MR. FERGUSON: You have said on a number of occasions that your memory was faulty, that you couldn't recall this, that and the other thing. I am merely putting it up to you?

A.—That is not lack of frankness because my memory is at fault.

Q.—Then I will ask you again. Are you prepared to say that you have not discussed at any time with the Commissioners evidence you were going to present to them as a Commission?

A.—I will say that I never did, except in this way. Incidentally I may have said we are going to have such and such a witness on a question of over-run, and he has found the over-run so and so, but that had nothing whatever to do with the shaping of evidence.

Q.—I am content to take your answer for the time being. Now, who paid the court reporter?

A.—I did.

Q.—Has he been paid in full?

A.—No.

Q.—There is a partial payment to Neal somewhere in these accounts?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And there is still a payment to be made him?

A.—That is right.

Q.—Do you know what the balance due him is?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—You haven't had any account for that?

A.—I think I can get you the balance owing to him.

Q.—Was no account sent to you?

A.—Not that I know of. There may have been one sent in to the office, and I would not see it.

Q.—You say you would not see an account in connection with this Commission?

A.—I have a bookkeeper looking after that.

Q.—Didn't you vouch for this to the bookkeeper, agree to the bill?

A.—Neal sends his account in there at such and such a price, so many days, and she knows whether that is right.

Q.—The bookkeeper never consults you?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—As far as this case is concerned, you don't know what the balance is?

A.—No.

Q.—But you say there is a balance due him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I think you told me you hadn't paid Mr. Campbell. Didn't Campbell get anything from you at all?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you remember when Campbell came to work?

A.—I cannot give you that date, no.

Q.—It was pretty dramatic. I thought you would know?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Are these the only outstanding accounts besides your own?

A.—I cannot tell you. I can get you a list.

Q.—I think you had better get us your bookkeeper?

A.—She can come if you want her.

Q.—Can you tell me what Neal is paid or what is his account?

A.—Neal was appointed by the Attorney-General. The Commissioners decided what they wanted and the price was fixed, and whatever that was, it was to be paid.

Q.—So that will be a charge outside of any expenditure we have been discussing at all—the reporter's account?

A.—I didn't hire him. The Attorney-General hired and notified him. But he has got some money on account.

Q.—From you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where is the item in your account?

A.—It may not be in there. Those payments in there are payments finished—accounts paid in full. I think the Neal account was not paid in full. I think there is a payment to be made him yet. We are making up a list to the 4th of December, and when that is made up it will include everything to be paid.

Q.—When will we be able to have that?

A.—Well, if this list the auditor has given me doesn't take up too much time, I imagine a week or ten days. You can understand the enormous amount of twaddle in that.

Q.—I am interested in knowing what the total amount is. You don't have to satisfy the auditor with reference to your bills as far as this committee is concerned?

Q.—In the \$84,000 to \$85,000 calculated here a week ago, you didn't include your own disbursements or expenses?

A.—Every detail will be in those accounts.

THE CHAIRMAN: He asked you, did they include your disbursements?

A.—I do not know.

MR. FERGUSON: You are unable to give exact information without the bookkeeping accounts?

A.—That is right.

Q.—Will you undertake, if we adjourn your examination for a week, to get the accounts here so we can get this thing cleared up?

A.—Yes, I will do that.

MR. MAGEAU: You didn't base any of your returns regarding the timber inquiry upon the measurement of those logs in the pond?

A.—No.

Examined by R. L. Brackin:

Q.—Mr. Harding there is a question I want to ask you regarding something that was said here the other day. I haven't seen the notes of evidence before the Commission. But a statement was made in the House in regard to the inception of the Commission, and I would like to ask with regard to that. The statement was to the effect that the inquiry—and I do not know whether by "inquiry" was meant the appointment of the Commission—but that the inquiry was started for political purposes.

A.—I did not say anything of the kind.

Q.—Mr. Ferguson I believe stated in the House yesterday—

A.—I did not say anything of the kind.

MR. FERGUSON: My statement was that the inspiration was political—do you remember that?

A.—No, not in that form.

MR. FERGUSON thereupon referred to the notes of evidence of the preceding meeting and read that portion of the evidence commencing on the tenth line of page 37 to the bottom of page 38.

MR. BRACKIN: What I want to get at is this; as far as this man Callahan is concerned, was it Callahan who first came to you about this matter?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Go back and tell me, if you can, about when that was. Whether it was prior to the election of October, 1919, or after the election?

A.—After.

Q.—How long after?

A.—The elections were in October. I think it was in November or the early part of December.

Q.—Prior to the election had there been anything done or any information obtained by you for the purposes of the election in regard to the timber matter—any information obtained?

A.—No.

Q.—Then during the course of the election certain things came to your attention?

A.—I saw in the press that such and such a speaker spoke of irregularities of different kinds in the Crown Lands Department.

Q.—Then Callahan came to you in November or December of 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At what place?

A.—In my office.

Q.—I won't ask you about the conversation between you and Mr. Callahan if you were retained by him. Your retainer was for what purpose?

A.—To collect all the information I could in reference to irregularities of the Shevlin-Clarke Lumber Company at Fort Frances. After it was collected I was then to go to the Attorney-General's Department with the information for the purpose of endeavouring to get a commission issued to go into the matter.

Q.—You were to go on whose behalf?

A.—On Callahan's behalf. It didn't transpire because the Commission was issued before I had completed the inquiry. The Attorney-General's Department got no information from me of any kind in reference to what I had collected from Callahan before the Commission issued.

Q.—Whatever you have said with regard to political inspiration or anything of that kind—did that have reference to the appointment of a Commission by the Government or did it have reference to the original coming to you by Callahan and to the instructions and retainer given you by Callahan?

A.—I got my original idea in reference to it from a political friend of mine, Mr. Callahan, but that information was not handed to the Department until after the Commission was issued. I told them I was collecting it and was checking it up.

Q.—The point is this; the whole reference to political inspiration, what-

ever it was—did it have reference to the appointment of the Commission or did it have reference to the original instructions given to you and your retainer?

A.—To the original instructions given to me.

Q.—Can you tell this committee whether you, either before you got this information or after you got this information, had anything to do with the appointment of the Commission to make investigation?

A.—Nothing whatever.

HON. MR. RANEY: Did you at any time communicate to the Government or any member of the Government the source of any information you had?

A.—No.

Q.—Did the Government or any member of the Government know you were acting for Mr. Callahan?

A.—No. I simply stated I was collecting the information for a client. I didn't think it was necessary to tell who it was at all. It didn't occur to me. If it had I would have.

Witness excused.

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

March 11, 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a.m., Mr. Curry in the chair.

J. E. ROGERS called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Dewart:

Q.—Mr. Rogers, what is your official position in the Government?

A.—Superintendent of the Ontario Provincial Police.

Q.—The Donald McDonald who is stated on page 23 of the Public Accounts to be Deputy Minister at a salary of \$4,400—do you know him?

A.—I know Mr. McDonald, yes.

Q.—Did you receive a request from any source to investigate a matter relating to him?

A.—I was instructed by the Honourable the Attorney-General to locate some papers said to have been taken out of the Chamber.

Q.—Have you a copy of the letter instructing you to make an inquiry or investigation?

A.—I cannot say it was a letter.

Q.—Have you there a letter forwarded to you by the Attorney-General containing a complaint made regarding Mr. McDonald?

A.—I saw a letter, I think it was from you.

Q.—A letter from myself to the Attorney-General?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you that in the file?

A.—I think it was returned to the Attorney-General.

Q.—Then, in consequence of this complaint made, did you make an investigation?

A.—I did.

Q.—And did you report?

A.—I did.

Q.—Did you obtain statements from any persons in the course of that investigation?

A.—I did.

Q.—From whom did you obtain statements?

A.—From Mr. Hewitt and from Mr. McDonald.

Q.—And did you recover the documents?

A.—I did.

Q.—From whom?

A.—From Mr. McDonald.

Q.—Where have these documents been since the day you recovered them?

A.—In my possession.

Q.—So that the documents you produce as recovered from Mr. McDonald have been in your custody since the time of the investigation?

A.—Yes, I saw Mr. McDonald and told him what I wanted, and he said the papers had been left in his office.

Q.—I just wanted to show that the papers had remained with you. Now tell us what the complaint was that you were asked to investigate?

A.—If I remember distinctly the charge was that certain papers had been taken from the desk of one of the members of the Chamber.

Q.—The member being?

A.—Mr. Stover.

Q.—And in consequence of the complaint did you see Mr. Hewitt?

A.—I did, sir.

Q.—Did you get a statement from Mr. Hewitt?

A.—I did.

Q.—Have you that statement there?

A.—The Attorney-General has it.

Q.—Have you a copy of it?

A.—There may be one in my office.

HON. MR. MILLS: What is the date these were alleged to have been taken?

MR. DEWART: During the session of 1920.

Q.—Have you the statement made by Mr. Hewitt. I thought that was in your possession?

A.—I think that was in my report to the Attorney-General.

Q.—Perhaps it will be necessary to get the report to the Attorney-General.

MR. ROGERS excused to return to his offices for papers desired.

J. D. FLAVELLE called and sworn; examined by Mr. Dewart.

Q.—Mr. Flavelle, you produce here upon this return all these pages of applications for clemency refused under the Ontario Temperance Act from the 1st of November, 1919, to the 1st of March, 1921. Is that a correct record from the files of the Department?

A.—Yes, as far as my knowledge goes.

Q.—Then so far as the papers are concerned in these cases in which applications have been refused, where would they be?

A.—All in the License Department.

Q.—If we desire to get production of them they can be brought, upon a request pointing out the particular case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The applications where there is clemency in whole or part and the Orders in Council are in your possession?

A.—No.

Q.—Where are they?

A.—In the Attorney-General's Department.

Q.—Would these papers include such records of evidence as were referred for consideration in connection with the application?

A.—Yes, both in these cases and in cases of clemency, the documents on which we based our recommendation.

Q.—We don't need to go outside the Attorney-General's Department to get the full file of the case where clemency was granted?

A.—Not unless you want to follow it up.

Q.—Do your records cover the business of the dispensaries?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Who keeps those?

A.—They are kept at the central agency, the wholesale department.

Q.—If the Committee desire to investigate and find out the purchases of liquor made during the last fiscal year and the price at which the liquor was purchased, the business of the dispensaries and the sale of liquor, the prices at which it was sold and where it was made—who would be the proper officer to ask for to give us that?

A.—Mr. Cleland, or Mr. Birmingham. I expected Mr. Cleland this morning but he hasn't got here. I think he would be able to go into that question more intelligently than I could.

Q.—Does Mr. Cleland settle the terms of purchase of the liquor you buy?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Is that subject to your approval or disapproval or do you accept his reports? Has he a free hand in purchasing?

A.—The only jurisdiction we have over him is this: We hold a weekly advisory board. I appear on behalf of the Board of License Commissioners as chairman, in an advisory capacity. We discuss anything pertaining to the work of the dispensaries but practically he has a free hand to do as he deems wisest.

Q.—Then who determines the classes of liquor that are to be dealt with?

A.—The general manager.

Q.—That is as to what different liquors shall be handled and what brands handled?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Is there a price list issued from time to time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that printed?

A.—There are a certain number printed and it is posted in the dispensaries.

Q.—One of these can be obtained from Mr. Cleland?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then who fixes the prices at which the various liquors are to be sold?

A.—Practically, the general manager. It is discussed very often by the Advisory Board. The intention is to charge a price including all overhead charges and delivery to different points in the Province and make a gross profit of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on a single bottle. We give special discounts to medical men and special discounts to druggists, and to hospitals we practically give it at less than cost. The practice is not to charge hospitals more than 5 per cent. of the original cost price. The carrying out of that is in the hands of the general manager.

Q.—What discount do you allow to medical men?

A.—Ten per cent. and to druggists 15 per cent.

Q.—So that you add $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. gross profit and take 10 per cent. off that in one case and 15 in another?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you happen to know what method is adopted so far as the purchase of Canadian whiskey and Canadian ales and porter is concerned. Are they purchased direct from the distillers and brewers?

A.—Yes, by the general manager.

Q.—There are no middlemen as far as whiskey or beer that is distilled or brewed in the Province of Ontario?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—Do you happen to know what is the price that is charged at the dispensary for ales and porter?

A.—I cannot give you that offhand. I may say that in the matter of beers we do not adhere to the rule in that we sell beers cheaper than $33\frac{1}{3}$ gross profit—beers and ales and porter.

Q.—There has been some complaint, as far as invalid women are concerned, and for whom doctors prescribe porter that 30 cents a bottle is a high price for beer brewed in the City of Toronto.

A.—I cannot say what it is now. When we fixed that basis originally it was the intention to make that on all liquor including beers, but we thought that was working and on the basis that softer liquors were more likely to be used without camouflage, the matter was taken up in the advisory meeting and I strongly suggested a reduction in the price of beer. The in-

tention was not to charge that to the people actually needing it. At the present time I am convinced it is considerably below the $33\frac{1}{3}$ percentage but I cannot give it to you offhand.

Q.—We can get that from Mr. Birmingham or Mr. Cleland? They would be able to give the figures showing the profits in carrying on the business last year?

A.—Yes, in fact it really is in that report of ours.

MR. TOLMIE: I understand you have submitted a statement of fines. Do you ever receive any fines where the cases are not gone on with, but paid in another way. Do you ever receive any fines where the cases are suppressed?

A.—Not as far as my knowledge goes. I do not know of any. I presume that some of them are convicted without any hearing necessarily of evidence—if they go up and plead guilty and are fined.

Q.—Would that appear to the public?

A.—As far as the record goes it would.

Q.—Can a case be settled out of court and not appear in the record?

A.—I would not think so. Certainly not with the consent of the Board.

Q.—What I mean is this: Supposing a man got into trouble. Could he go down to the Board and settle the matter and pay his fine?

A.—No such case has ever been handled by the Board to my knowledge.

Q.—The reason I asked was this: I have heard of certain cases where they are said to have come down here and settled the matter. It may be only a rumour? I hope it is?

A.—I have certainly no knowledge of a case of that kind.

Q.—And you would know?

A.—I ought to.

MR. HOMUTH: A man can be convicted by one of the Provincial officers. He can go to the magistrate before whom he is to appear and pay his fine without having a court hearing?

A.—Well, it is possible that may have been done. Personally I don't approve of that mode of settlement. Certainly it is not with the consent and knowledge of the Board.

Q.—As to the fines they would collect you would have no knowledge as to whether they appeared in court or not?

A.—The fines come to us from the respective officers for each district. They send in a statement showing that so and so was fined and the amount. We do not go behind that.

Q.—In cases like that it would simply be within the jurisdiction of the magistrate?

A.—Absolutely.

Q.—You would have no knowledge of that?

A.—Absolutely none.

MR. DEWART: When was Mr. Birmingham appointed general manager?

A.—I can get you the exact date.

Q.—Was there a special order in reference to that?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Rogers recalled.

MR. DEWART: Have you the correspondence in that matter there?

A.—Yes, I think it is all here.

Q.—Will you just say what the letters are?

A.—The first is a memorandum to the Hon. Mr. Raney from P. F. Cronin, secretary to Mr. Dewart, asking for the matter to be investigated. The second is a memorandum from myself to the Attorney-General reporting on the case. The next is a letter from Alfred Hewitt, stating how he got possession of the papers. The next is a memorandum from Mr. McDonald to me regarding the case.

Q.—Are there any other records in connection with this except the papers recovered?

A.—I think that is all.

Q.—Perhaps you had better state what the papers recovered were.

A.—A letter from F. A. Clement, Thessalon, to H. H. Dewart, K.C., dated 28th January, 1919; letter from Canadian Fisheries Association, Montreal, to Kenneth S. Stover, Toronto, dated April 12, 1920; letter to K. S. Stover, dated Bruce Mines, March 4, 1920, from J. P. McCrae, *re* Thomas Humphries' clerk; printed copy of petition presented to the Ontario Government by the Ontario Fisheries Association, on behalf of the fishermen of Ontario, that the Ontario Government fisheries should be discontinued; lead pencil memorandum on Ontario Legislative Assembly paper; letter of January 12, 1918, from George F. Horrigan, Port Arthur, to H. H. Dewart, M.P.P.; letter dated January 29, 1919, from George F. Horrigan, Port Arthur, to H. H. Dewart, M.P.P., Toronto; letter dated Port Arthur, March, 1919, from Richard Vigars, 34 College Street, Port Arthur, to H. H. Dewart, Toronto.

Q.—Do you produce all these documents now?

A.—Yes.

Q.—These have been in your possession since that time?

A.—When I got the letters from Mr. McDonald they were sealed, and have been that way ever since.

Witness excused.

Memo.—Exhibits which went into possession of Col. Little are marked Exhibit "B"; exhibits that did not go into possession of Col. Little, but remained in Mr. McDonald's desk, are marked Exhibit "C."*

Mr. McDonald, called and sworn.

MR. DEWART: Mr. McDonald, you are Deputy Minister of Game and Fisheries?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long have you acted in that capacity?

A.—Since the fall of 1916—I was acting deputy.

Q.—And as deputy since when?

A.—About a year later. I am not positive exactly.

Q.—At any rate in 1919 you were deputy Minister and have continued

*For Exhibits see end of Report.

in that position since?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You were deputy Minister in 1920—last session?

A.—Yes.

Q.—During which the sessions of the Public Accounts Committee were held?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Prior to that time, the time of your appointment, had you been working with or been interested in any fishing company?

A.—No, except an angling party on holidays.

Q.—Had you any interest at any time in any concession or business relating to fishing rights on Lake Nipegon?

A.—No.

Q.—None whatever?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—You were aware there was a local company in which Col. Little was interested?

A.—Not a local company.

Q.—A company?

A.—Just J. A. Little.

Q.—A concession—if that is what it was—on Lake Nipegon?

A.—There were applications made by several parties. I am not prepared to say whether they were companies or not. Any statement I make may be used against me, and I want to be correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are entitled to no privilege in any statement you may make before this Committee, and you are protected. You have nothing to fear regarding any statement you may make. Of course if a statement is untrue that is another thing.

A.—I would give no other than a true statement.

MR. DEWART: There were concessions given by the Government for fishing in Lake Nipegon?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you recollect now to whom those fishing rights were given in Lake Nipegon?

A.—Yes, I will get you that—A. S. Brown.

Q.—What did he have?

A.—He had a contract—there were about ten.

Q.—What twine did he have?

A.—I haven't the contracts. It was in the contracts—Thomas Craigie, Douglas Craigie, J. A. Little, A. McKeown, Alex. McKay, Allan McLeod, A. McRitchie, A. Ticknor, and in addition to that treaty Indians.

Q.—Can you give me approximately what each had?

A.—Brown's contract allowed him 15,000 yards. At that time Little had 30,000 yards and ten pound nets.

Q.—How many pound nets did Brown have?

A.—Little was the only man with pound nets.

Q.—What about the rest, the Craigies?

A.—They had about 15 yards.

Q.—McKeown?

A.—He had a smaller contract. I fancy 15 yards. I do not know positively.

Q.—So that no one else had as large a contract as 30,000 yards, except Little?

A.—No.

Q.—Was that the same contract as he had the year before?

A.—Yes, it was a renewal.

Q.—And in 1920 was Little's contract renewed for the same yardage?

A.—No, it was reduced in 1920 to 14,000 and ten pound nets.

Q.—There was a general reduction in yardage that year?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Little being reduced with the rest, but still being the largest fisherman?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Little was the man who was largely interested in the Government business, was he not? The Government was buying fish at that time?

A.—He was operating for the Government on the contract system.

Q.—That contract can be produced and will be put in?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I see by page 602 of the Public Accounts of 1918-19 that J. A. Little received \$40,944.55. What would that be?

A.—That would be for fish, and one thing and another.

Q.—Purchase of the fish and transportation of fish, and so on?

A.—No; just purchase of fish.

Q.—I see. Lower down there is an item of ice, etc., \$3,234?

A.—Yes, we ran short of ice and were obliged to purchase ice from Winnipeg.

Q.—He got that for you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that the business of Little and the Department in 1919 was an important and considerable business?

A.—Yes, \$40,000.

HON. MR. MILLS: How many tugs did Little have?

A.—Two tugs and a gasoline launch.

MR. DEWART: What were the tugs, do you know?

A.—The steamer *Ombabika* was one, and the other was—

Q.—Never mind if you can't remember.

HON. MR. MILLS: Was the *Ombabika* built in Lake Nipegon?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It had to be built there?

A.—Yes.

MR. DEWART: Who built the *Ombabika*?

A.—I did, or under my management.

Q.—When you were in the Department?

A.—No.

Q.—Before you entered the Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you aware there was a company or partnership Little formed to handle the business when he first started?

A.—No.

Q.—Little had applied for a license before?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there a company formed at first?

A.—I can't say that.

Q.—Was there a partnership?

A.—Mr. Rapsey's name was mentioned with Little.

Q.—Was Rapsey one of Little's partners?

A.—I would not be positive. It was Mr. Rapsey made the application to the Department.

Q.—In what year was that?

A.—That would be in 1917,

Q.—Were you interested in either Rapsey's or Little's application when it was first made?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you have any interest in it at any time?

A.—No, not at any time.

Q.—How long did Rapsey's interest in the fishing privilege continue?

A.—It never operated at all. It was not granted. The privilege was not granted.

Q.—Was Rapsey interested in the Little concession, do you know?

A.—I do not know, sir, at that time. He may have been for all I know.

Q.—Then when did Rapsey come into the service of the Government?

A.—When the Government started to operate Lake Nipegon.

Q.—When was that?

A.—In the fall of 1917.

Q.—What capacity was Rapsey engaged in?

A.—Rapsey was then preparing to operate Lake Nipegon.

Q.—Himself?

A.—Himself and Little.

Q.—What happened then?

A.—The concession was not granted.

Q.—What happened so far as Rapsey is concerned?

A.—He was engaged then as foreman by the Government.

Q.—Did Little get a concession?

A.—Not to my knowledge. Little got a contract.

Q.—You are not in a position to say who formed any partnership to handle the concession or business Little had there?

A.—No.

Q.—Was Rapsey interested as a partner?

A.—It was clearly understood when I engaged Rapsey that he had no connection whatever with Little.

Q.—If he had you didn't know of it?

A.—That is correct.

Q.—Was Little any particular friend of yours?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—So that there was no reason, as far as your personal dealings with Little were concerned, why you should protect him?

A.—No, sir, no more than any person else.

Q.—And if the business of Little with the Department was called into question there was no reason why you should assist him because of personal relationship?

A.—No.

Q.—Therefore, you would not be afraid to have any matter relating to Little investigated by any Committee of the House?

A.—I have no objection to any investigation.

Q.—Now, you were called as a witness before the Public Accounts Committee of last session. On Wednesday, April 14, on page 9 of the Appendix to the Journals of last session, I see you were ordered to attend. The Committee adjourned to meet on April 16, when there was no quorum. On April 21 certain business was taken up. You appeared and were sworn on Friday, May 7. You recollect that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you gave evidence at that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, Mr. McDonald, we have here a statement signed by you, which Mr. Rogers has put in to-day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did the documents that you referred to in that statement come into your possession?

A.—It is hard for me to remember the exact date, but what I said in that statement is absolutely correct.

Q.—This says they were placed on your desk on May 3, 1920?

A.—That would be correct.

Q.—Do you recollect the circumstance of coming to my office and seeing me in my office before you gave evidence at the Committee?

A.—I did not go to your office.

Q.—Here in the building. Do you recollect coming in and speaking to me before you gave evidence?

A.—In your office? No, sir.

Q.—Don't you recollect the circumstance of coming in and having a conversation with me, and asking me what the matter was on which you were to give evidence, and I told you it was with reference to the business of the Department?

A.—No, sir. I don't remember such a thing.

Q.—At any rate you were examined on the 7th of May?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At that time you had these letters, which were produced, in your possession?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You knew their contents?

A.—I knew the contents, yes.

Q.—You say Hewitt told you to do what you pleased with them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you realize they were private letters?

A.—I didn't know what they were when he placed them there.

Q.—When did you read them?

A.—The next day, the 4th of May.

Q.—Three days before the examination in committee?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You saw that the first letter was a letter headed Port Arthur Liberal Association, Port Arthur, January 12, 1918, addressed to Mr. Dewart, and marked "Private." You saw that?

A.—Yes, I saw that.

Q.—You also saw that the letter dated Port Arthur and marked H. H. Dewart, M.P.P., was marked "Personal," is that right?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you saw that the third letter dated Port Arthur, March, 1919, was addressed to me?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that you knew all three of these letters were my personal property, from their personal character? You knew that?

A.—I knew they were your letters.

Q.—You knew they were letters that were my personal property?

A.—I knew they were your letters.

Q.—You knew where Hewitt got them and that he had no right to retain them in his possession?

A.—He didn't make that very clear.

Q.—He told you how he had got the letters?

A.—Not in detail, no.

Q.—He told you where he got them?

A.—He told me he picked them up.

Q.—Did he tell you where he picked them up? Did he tell you he picked them up in the room of one of the committees after the committee had risen, that they were lying on the table?

A.—I understood him to say he picked them up in the Committee on Fish and Game.

Q.—After the committee had risen, being evidently papers some member had left lying on the table?

A.—That is right.

Q.—You saw, on reading these letters, that they were undoubtedly letters on which I was basing an inquiry, as far as your Department was concerned?

A.—And myself personally.

Q.—And under these circumstances, do you think it was an honourable thing to retain in your possession what you knew to be personal letters addressed to me?

A.—I made two efforts to get in touch with you.

Q.—So you said, but I have tried to recall to your knowledge my speaking to you before you gave evidence.

A.—I was never in your office.

Q.—I am not going into the witness-box. All I can say is that you have no recollection of what is my recollection of the fact. At any rate you gave evidence on May 7. My recollection is that you were called and gave evidence at an earlier date, but I may be in error about that. But you understood clearly at the time you were before the Committee that these were letters on which I was basing inquiries?

A.—I had them with me to hand over to you. I had them ready to hand them over.

Q.—Why didn't you hand them over to the chairman, the acting chairman of the Committee? Did you think it was the honest thing to keep them in your possession?

A.—I didn't look at the matter in that way at all.

Q.—Was there anything to hinder you putting them in an envelope and seeing that they reached me here in the building?

A.—No, nothing to prevent me.

Q.—Did you think it was an honourable thing to have done?

A.—Well, they were letters of course, that—

Q.—I am not asking you about the contents. You knew they were my personal letters?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You knew I was the leader of the Opposition and here in the building, that there was no difficulty in getting access to me. Why didn't you return those letters?

A.—I tried twice to take them to you. I spoke to the chairman at that time. I explained to him.

Q.—You never showed them to him, Major Tolmie was acting chairman, and he is here. He says you made no reference to letters—is that correct? You made no reference to these letters, nor did you tell him you had them in your possession?

A.—No, not at that time.

Q.—You sat in the Committee, being examined with reference to matters knowing you had information in your possession on which an inquiry was to be based. You knew that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You knew you were stifling evidence which might be brought out against you?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you realize that?

A.—They were pressing me so close, questioning me about Col. Little, that I wanted to clear myself, clear my character.

Q.—Clear your character? If you thought you had to clear your character why didn't you say, "These letters have come into my possession in such a way. Reference is made to me in these letters, and I want to repudiate these references. They are untrue." Why didn't you adopt that course?

A.—I tried twice to get them to you.

Q.—You tried to get them to me—you know you could have left them on my desk any time?

A.—Well, it was not done.

Q.—You knew these letters referred particularly to the fishing rights Little had. That is correct, isn't it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You read this paragraph: "The Ontario Government granted rights to a local company headed by J. A. Little, a Tory stalwart, to fish Lake Nipegon, which had hitherto been a closed lake." You read that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you realize that if that was so that was a proper question for inquiry, as to how a closed lake came to be opened and licenses granted to a member of the dominant party?

A.—There was no license granted.

Q.—I am not asking you to determine the facts. Do you realize that that was an important question to consider—how the lake came to be opened?

A.—No, I do not.

Q.—Don't you think it had any importance?

A.—I do not.

Q.—A little further down the price at which the fish was sold and the cost of getting the fish was referred to. That company had been paying 4¾ cents per pound at the nets and the price in Toronto was fifteen and sixteen cents a pound. Didn't you realize that that was an important subject for inquiry?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You don't think it was?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—"This means that someone is making a fine profit out of the business, and it appears to me the profiteers are the local company." Do you think that a proper subject for investigation?

A.—Not as far as the Government is concerned.

Q.—Not as far as the people of the province are concerned?

A.—No.

Q.—A spread from 4¾ cents to 15 or 16 cents on the market in Toronto you don't think is an important subject for investigation?

A.—I quoted the figures last session.

Q.—I am not asking you about the facts. I am asking wasn't that an important subject for investigation?

HON. MR. MILLS: It was not a spread from $4\frac{3}{4}$ to 15.

MR. DEWART: Four and three-quarter cents was paid to the fishermen and the fish were retailing in Toronto at 15 or 16 cents a pound.

MR. MILLS: Yes, to the consumer.

MR. DEWART: Don't you think that it was an important subject for investigation as to why there was this difference? Between the cost at the nets in Lake Nipegon and my table in Toronto there was a rise from $4\frac{3}{4}$ cents to 16 cents?

A.—No, having full knowledge of the costs.

Q.—I am not asking about your knowledge. I am asking didn't you think that an important subject for investigation?

A.—No, I didn't.

Q.—Now I only find one reference to you in this letter: "This means that someone is making a fine profit out of the business, and it appears to me the profiteers are the local company. It is stated one of the Department's own officials is interested in the company, and such assertions do not surprise me. The official is Donald McDonald, Deputy Fish and Game Warden for Ontario—" That sentence caught your eye?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And because of that statement you kept these letters in your possession?

A.—My intention was to return them.

Q.—So because of that statement referring to you you kept them in your possession?

A.—I wanted to see you in connection with that.

Q.—Is that the reason you kept them in your possession—to explain the matter?

A.—That is the reason.

Q.—You knew that by keeping the letters you were shutting off investigation?

A.—No.

Q.—You mean to say, as responsible head of the Department that you didn't realize that fact?

A.—These letters were two years old.

Q.—They are not too old yet. You realized that by keeping these letters you were putting it out of the power of others to examine you on these statements?

A.—That was not my intention.

Q.—You didn't realize that?

A.—No.

Q.—Now in the next letter it is stated regarding this Nipegon fishing company that "the Deputy Minister of a member of the company on its

formation was G. H. Rapsey." I am not discussing the truth or falsity of that. I am pointing out the statement made: "The Deputy Minister, D. McDonald, was a member of the company at its formation, as was G. H. Rapsey, inspector of the Department. It was part of Little's plan to have McDonald and Rapsey transferred to the service of the Department, so that matters might be manipulated the better for the company. MacDonald and Rapsey may not appear on the board of directors now, nor on the annual statement submitted to the Government, but they are, nevertheless, part and parcel of the company."

Q.—You read that statement?

A.—I absolutely deny it. It is not correct.

Q.—Didn't you keep this letter in your possession that there might not be references to that. Isn't that the fact, as far as you are concerned?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Can you tell me any other reason why you should retain that letter?

A.—No, I simply held it.

Q.—It was because the reference was to you and not because of what referred to Little?

A.—Absolutely.

Q.—Then there was a reference to Craigie as to his concession. You read that "The Department covered up to the extent of allowing one Thomas Craigie, a local fisherman, to operate to a limited extent." You read that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The whole letter was evidently the basis upon which an investigation might be made into the Lake Nipegon conditions?

A.—It is there.

Q.—Then there was a further letter from Mr. Vigars in March, 1919, saying: "It is well known that some time since the Department gave to J. A. Little and George Rapsey, both of Port Arthur, the right to fish Nipegon Lake."

A.—I read the letter.

Q.—Without going into these matters further—the whole of that letter refers to Little and Rapsey—I see no reference to yourself in that letter. You read the letter over at the time?

A.—I read the letter.

Q.—At the conclusion of that letter was this: "I do not wish to have my name used without first asking me." You saw that?

A.—I read the letter.

Q.—Now, Mr. McDonald, when you came before this Committee, before you told us that you had a statement to make on your own account. No one asked you a question about your own connection with this company?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—No one asked you any question about Little or Rapsey?

A.—There were questions about Little.

Q.—About a connection between Little and Rapsey?

A.—No.

Q.—No suggestions made as might have been made if anyone had had those letters in his hands for examination?

A.—No.

Q.—I see at the time Mr. Pinard asked you—at the bottom of page 119 of the Appendix to the Journals of 1920:

“There is A. McEwan. He got \$15,000. Did he ask for ‘more twine’? and you replied ‘They all asked for more. Col. Little asked for more twine. It has been a thorn in the flesh of the Department, everyone asking for more twine. They are not satisfied.’

“Q.—Is McEwan fishing in the same lake as Little?

“A.—Yes. There is something I want to explain in connection with that. I understand there have been some charges made that I was in with Col. Little. I am on oath, and I am prepared to say that neither myself, nor my wife, nor any relation of either one of us ever got a five-cent piece from Col. Little, that I never had any interest in it, nor have at the present time.

“MR. PINARD: I didn’t hear that from anyone.

“A.—I just wanted to make that clear.

“COL. COOPER: I was not thinking of you in connection with it.

“A.—I cannot tell you anything about Col. Little’s politics. No doubt Hon. Mr. Macdiarmid knew all about it.”

Q.—Your reason for making that statement was because you had read that statement. You had them in your pocket sitting in this Committee?

A.—I had them on the table.

Q.—And that is the reason you made that statement?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn’t think the honourable thing for an employee of the Department would have been to hand these letters over to the chairman, and say, “These letters came into my possession, and I want to clear myself in reference to these charges?”

A.—I suppose that would have been the proper way.

Q.—Mr. Pinard told you he hadn’t heard charges from anyone?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then after the Committee rose you say you saw me?

A.—Yes. I made a remark to the chairman.

Q.—Was the time you refer to as seeing me in your office after this question had been investigated by Mr. Rogers?

A.—No, sir; before that.

Q.—You say you saw me in your office and that is the first time you recollect seeing me in connection with any business of this kind?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that before or after Mr. Rogers investigated?

A.—Before. I think it was the next day.

Q.—The next day after you gave evidence before the Committee?

A.—Yes. I told the chairman—

Q.—I am not concerned about what you told the chairman. When you saw me a day or so after you appeared before the Committee you had these letters in your possession?

A.—No, sir. Not when you were in my office.

Q.—Did you make any reference then to these letters?

A.—No. You were in with Mr. Pinard.

Q.—That was about another matter. At the time when I saw you in your office after this Committee had met you never told me anything with reference to these letters, did you?

A.—No; I didn't complete the story. I told you there was no truth in the statements made against me.

Q.—You never intimated that these letters had been in your possession?

A.—I never thought of it at that moment.

Q.—Now, Mr. McDonald. You thought to repudiate the contents of the letters, yet you say you did not recall having had the letters?

A.—I had more in my mind the charge against myself than anything else.

Q.—More than the fact of having the letters?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were the letters at that time in Little's hands?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You handed the letters to him to read?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then how did he get them?

A.—He picked them up off my desk. I beg pardon, sir, that is not right. Col. Little came in and made inquiries for the letters.

Q.—What letters?

A.—These letters.

Q.—How did he know they were in existence?

A.—Because I told him I was accused of being in the company with him.

Q.—When did you tell him that?

A.—Some time after making the statement to the Public Accounts Committee. Before you were in my office.

Q.—Did you tell him how you knew there were charges?

A.—Yes. I told him the charges were made by letter.

Q.—Did you tell him whose letters they were?

A.—I do not think so. I do not remember that.

Q.—Did you tell him they were private letters of mine?

A.—No. I didn't say they were private.

Q.—You told him they were letters addressed to me?

A.—No. I don't think so—at that time I would not be sure of that fact, sir.

Q.—You were more anxious to protect Col. Little than the public interest?

A.—No. I was more anxious to protect myself.

Q.—You were clearing yourself in handing these letters over to Little?

A.—I spoke to Little for the simple reason that he had a contract, and I was supposed to be in with him.

Q.—So you expected him to defend you?

A.—No, no.

Q.—At any event you told him about them, and he came to your office. Where were the letters when he came into your office?

A.—Locked up in my desk.

Q.—You were taking good care of them—you kept the fact that you had them locked up in your breast, and you kept the letters locked up in the drawer. Isn't that the fact?

A.—The letters were in the drawer.

Q.—What happened when Little came in—the letters being locked in the drawer?

A.—I would not give them to him.

Q.—He didn't take them out of the drawer?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you unlock the drawer and take them out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And read them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You read them to him?

A.—Just certain sections, just the portion where I was involved.

Q.—What happened?

A.—I held the letters in my hand until Little went out.

A.—There is a basket at the end of my desk, and there is a small clock there. I had them folded up with the intention of putting them back in the drawer. I just put them there by the clock, standing on their edge.

Q.—And you want this Committee to believe that you did not leave them out so that Little might come back and pick them up?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—So that if he came in and put his hand on the table and took them you could swear you never gave them to him?

A.—No. A day or two after he came in again, and I handed him the letters, and told him to read them. After he read them I placed them back in the same place, and Little took them from there.

Q.—Without any protest from you?

A.—I told him, "Don't you dare."

Q.—Naughty man, don't you dare, was that it? What did you do to prevent him getting them?

A.—Nothing. He said he would bring them back.

Q.—Did you slap him on the wrist. (No answer.)

Q.—He took them away?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he promised to bring them back?

A.—Yes, he promised to return them.

Q.—You know now that the next thing I found my private letters were floating around in Port Arthur, and the gentleman who wrote them was being threatened with legal proceedings?

A.—I was not aware of that.

Q.—Have you any explanation to make to excuse your conduct as a responsible officer of the Department?

A.—No more than what I have given.

HON. MR. MILLS: In connection with that letter involving you and Little, connecting you, was the information you saw in that letter the first intimation you had of any agitation at the head of the lakes in connection with the Little contract?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—That was not the first intimation you had of it?

A.—No, the papers were full of it.

Q.—That was ancient history you saw there?

A.—Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that is so, why did you bother with these letters at all. Why did you keep them? If they were ancient history there was less reason why you should keep them?

A.—I didn't think the letters were of any great value to anyone.

Q.—Here are letters addressed to Mr. Dewart, and marked "Private" and "Personal." Surely the first thing you should have done after you saw these letters were not intended for you was to put them in an envelope, and send them down to Mr. Dewart's office. Isn't that so?

A.—I didn't do that.

Q.—Isn't that the first thing that should have suggested itself to a man in your position?

A.—There is more in connection with this case that I would like to explain to this Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything you want to explain, we are glad to hear it.

A.—Shortly after the letters were turned over to the Attorney-General's Department, Mr. Hewitt came to me and made certain statements in connection with the papers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we are interested in knowing what took place after you had the letters in your possession and retained them. There is nothing that happened after that that we are interested in.

WITNESS: Hewitt tried to get me to put up money. I personally didn't know where I was at. I thought Mr. Dewart was after me. I thought there was a trap laid for me, because Hewitt afterwards came back and tried to get money.

MR. DEWART: What for?

A.—To settle the case.

Q.—To pay his lawyer, or what?

A.—No, not to pay his lawyer, to have the case withdrawn. I said, "Here, are you trying to get me further involved in this?"

Q.—You know as a matter of fact I had an information against Hewitt for theft, in the police court. While I was away it happened that the witnesses weren't there and Col. Denison said he wasn't going to have the case stand longer unless the evidence was given, and Mr. Corley marked the case "withdrawn." You say you thought I was after you. I tell you frankly that if he had been convicted I intended to prosecute you for receiving. I was after you alright.

Q.—When Hewitt came to you and wanted to get money, it aroused your suspicions? Who did you state those suspicions to?

A.—To my lawyer.

Q.—When Hewitt came to you and wanted money was it to defend himself or to hush things up?

A.—To hush things up.

Q.—What could he hush up?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—What could he hush up with the papers in Mr. Rogers' possession?

A.—I am only giving you what happened.

Q.—Did he think that by getting some money he would be able to hush up the Provincial Police?

A.—No, I don't think that was it.

HON. MR. MILLS : Did he mention the sum?

A.—Yes, \$200.

THE CHAIRMAN : That is ridiculous. You know that all the papers were in the hands of Mr. Rogers in the Attorney-General's Department. What could he hush up?

A.—He wanted to have the case hushed up by paying this \$200.

THE CHAIRMAN : You went to Mr. Rogers and Mr. Rogers told you to pay no attention to it, to Hewitt?

A.—I went to my lawyer as well.

Q.—You went to Mr. Rogers didn't you, to the Superintendent of Provincial Police, and he told you to pay no attention to Hewitt at all?

A.—Maybe I mentioned the thing. Something was said between Mr. Rogers and myself on that. I do not recollect his exact words.

Q.—But that was the effect of what he said. That you were not to concern yourself about any demand by Hewitt?

A.—Yes, I fancy Mr. Rogers would give me that advice.

Q.—That isn't what I am asking. Did he give you that advice?

A.—Honestly, I am not prepared to say his exact words.

Q.—I didn't ask for his exact words. Was that the effect of his words?

A.—Yes, that was the effect.

Q.—Then why hesitate about it?

The witness was then excused, and the Committee adjourned.

March 16, 1920.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The Committee met at 10 a.m., Mr. Curry in the Chair.

WALTER L. HAIGHT called and sworn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got your returns here?

A.—I have a certified copy of them, sir, back to 1906.

Q.—Have you them here for 1919-20?

A.—Yes, sir, they are included, down to date.

Q.—This sheet, Exhibit A, is a complete return of the fines in the District of Parry Sound?

A.—Yes, sir, for the year indicated.

Q.—The year 1920?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does that include a return of all the fines that have been imposed within your jurisdiction?

A.—So far as I know.

Q.—Does that include returns of fines made by inspectors or officials who are also, by reason of their inspectorship, magistrates?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—There are some of that class?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—Do they make their returns to you?

A.—They are supposed to.

Q.—In so far as you are concerned then this sheet should contain a record of all fines inflicted upon anyone within your district by anybody having the authority of a magistrate?

A.—Quite so.

MR. HALL: About the 6th of November a seizure was made of furs by some warden or officer consisting of one beaver, one mink, and two skunk skins. The seizure was made from Mr. Forman of Severn Falls. I am informed that this case was settled without a proper trial. Do you know anything about it? Is that in your jurisdiction?

A.—No.

Q.—You don't know anything about it?

A.—No.

Q.—Magnetawan is in your district?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—On November 12, according to my record here, a seizure was made at Cooper's Camp, Magnetawan, by one of the officers or wardens, who received the sum of \$50 and took the moose. I am informed that this was handed to Ely. I cannot find that any trial took place?

A.—It seems to me there should have been a trial.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us get the date, if you can?

A.—The date was November 12, 1920.

Q.—We haven't anything here on this sheet after the end of October, 1920.

A.—That is up to the date of the last returns.

MR. HALL: Have you had many cases reported to you of infractions of the law, of men being fined by the local magistrates or justices of the peace—are you getting anything like the number that we have reason to believe are being tried, and fines imposed?

A.—That is a pretty hard question to answer, because I am dependent altogether on rumor for what takes place. I hear of other cases that take place from time to time, but I don't appear to be getting returns from them all.

Q.—Did you ever here of a case of a bear in your district?

A.—I did, yes.

Q.—Did you get any information about that?

A.—No, I never got any return or conviction regarding that. That is the case at Nipissing. I have no report on that.

Q.—No return was ever made, no trial took place in regard to it?

A.—No.

Q.—No doubt there are several others we have heard about—it is the common talk of the district?

A.—Yes, it seems to be.

Q.—When Ely came on the job, did he come to see you?

A.—No.

Q.—You are the District Crown Attorney in charge of law enforcement in the district, and he didn't come to see you?

A.—No.

Q.—He didn't come and report to you at all?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Didn't consult you, or anything of that kind?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You know this man Ely—he has been a resident of our town for a considerable length of time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He was able to communicate with you and get advice, or anything of that kind?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—He also had an opportunity of communicating with you in regard to any fines that had been imposed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he didn't come to you with any fines?

A.—No, he didn't.

Q.—He didn't come and report any seizure, or any convictions?

A.—No. Of course he would not be bound to do so.

Q.—But, as a matter of fact, the convictions should be recorded with you as Crown Attorney?

A.—The convictions should have been, yes.

Q.—And if convictions had been recorded you would know that certain fines had been imposed?

A.—I would know it, of course, in that way.

Q.—You didn't get this material to enter in your books?

A.—There has never been any conviction recorded by Mr. Ely. I do not know whether Mr. Ely is a justice of the peace *ex-officio* or not.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of a case in our own town where men were fined and confiscation took place for hunting without a license?

A.—I did, by conversation with the accused and the magistrate.

Q.—And that was within the precincts of our own court?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There was a trial held that you were not at—was there a magistrate in town at that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any idea why it was the local magistrate was ignored, and the Crown Attorney ignored, and another magistrate and prosecutor brought in from Toronto to take your places?

A.—Fortunately the magistrate is here, and he can give you a full explanation of that.

Q.—You were not approached in regard to that matter?

A.—I was not spoken to about it at all. Of course they were under no obligation to speak to me. As a matter of fact, they didn't.

Q.—What I wanted to establish was that there was a magistrate there who has been giving satisfactory service for a good many years?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you were ignored, and two men were brought in to try these cases, a magistrate who was only a magistrate as relating to the game laws?

A.—That is right.

Q.—That was one of the charges I have laid against the administration.

Q.—Have you heard anything of cases in connection with Mr. McNaughton?

A.—He has never appeared officially in my records. I would have no information of him in the records.

Q.—Have you had any reports of seizures by him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever heard tell of him passing as a fur buyer?

A.—Yes, in correspondence.

Q.—People have written to you to that effect?

A.—Yes, two or three, I think.

Q.—Complaining that the game warden had posed to them as a fur buyer, that they had unfortunately tumbled and that he had seized the furs and prosecuted the party on them? Would you consider that a fair and just way of doing business?

A.—I would not like to offer an opinion on that.

Q.—Is there any other information you can give us?

A.—Yes, if this Committee desire to hear a statement in regard to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no objection.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. What I prefer to do is to clear up the situation as far as it affects me and as far as it affects my knowledge of the administration of the game laws of our district are concerned. I know nothing about any charges made. I made no charges against any official and I was not aware I was down here to give evidence as a witness in reference to any specific charges. Nevertheless, I have had, like every one else, knowledge from hearsay as to the administration of the Department, and what I have to say is pretty much what I said to the Public Service Commission. I called attention to the fact that there were one or two provisions in the act which I thought needed to be remedied, provisions in the act which I thought inimical to fair play, which Mr. Hall had evidently tried to get at with perhaps insufficient knowledge. Among those provisions is one which enables a game warden and other named officials to act with all the authority of a justice of the peace and, amongst others, so low an official in the service as an overseer may, if he is authorized by Order-in-Council, act as a justice of the peace, and may convict on view.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long has that provision been in the act?

A.—I cannot say. It seems to me it has been in many years. This convicting on view, it seems to me, is opposed to every principle of British justice. I do not just exactly understand what it is. I have sought to find out if there is any precedent in law for a justice of the peace convicting on view, but neither myself nor the county judge, nor anyone else, was able to trace it back to any decent foundation. In England, apparently, justices under the highways act were able to convict on view, but it seems to have been restricted to some minor offences.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say “decent” you mean well-established?

A.—Yes. Persons designated in the act as qualified to act as justices of the peace are, as I understand it, the deputy Minister, the wardens and inspectors and some others named who are not field men at all, and may never require to use it. If an overseer is given that power then the overseer is also a constable and if, as a justice of the peace, he convicts on view, he cannot arrest on view, because, I take it, he cannot act in both capacities. If he convicts on view he would be bound in bringing in a conviction to have a memorandum of the admission of the accused, if there was such, or a memorandum of his own evidence as to what that view consisted of and what the fine was, and that should get to me in some way as a trial before a justice of the peace. Speaking generally, I have never had such a thing in my possession. If there have been seizures, which I know of only by rumor, there has never been a conviction brought to me. In any case where there has been a conviction on view in our country there has been nothing to appear here in the public records. Then, another thing, in speaking to the Commission, I called attention to the fact that there was no central clearing house for the payment of fines, that

justices of the peace in all their cases under the O.T.A. were required to hand their fines over to me, and by me they were sent to the Provincial Treasurer. The game act has a provision that all fines are to be paid to the Provincial Treasurer. You will see that from the year 1906 down to the last return in 1920 not more than four per cent. of such fines, I should say, have been paid to the Provincial Treasurer. You will find, as I said to the Commission, that the justice of the peace doesn't know to whom these fines should be paid. They are paid to overseers and counsel conducting the prosecutions. The large bulk of them were paid to Mr. Tinsley, and they have been paid to all kinds of people, and I think that in itself is an improper principle. I think these fines should all have gone through some central clearing house and thus found their way to the Provincial Treasurer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that—You consider that they should go to the Provincial Treasurer through you as District Attorney?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. EVANS: You say these fines were paid to all classes of people?

A.—All classes of officials.

WITNESS (continuing)—When the member of our district and others spoke to me about the fines that were being imposed in our district recently, it occurred to me that if that system had been followed there would have been no occasion for that sort of thing, for rumors of that kind. A record of these convictions would be formally made with the fines and the fines would go direct to the Provincial Treasurer, and set these rumors at rest at once.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the position you take is this: That any officer who undertakes to convict on view should make a memorandum of his own evidence, a memorandum of the facts as he found them on view, should make a formal conviction and return that formal conviction, together with the evidence and findings, to you, which should go as of record in your office, and that any fines or confiscation should come to you to be forwarded by you, as the chief officer of the administration of the law in that district, to the proper officer in Toronto?

A.—Quite so.

MR. SINCLAIR: I understand that is the rule?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what he says it ought to be.

MR. SINCLAIR: Is that the law as you understand it to be now?

WITNESS: The law is that fines are to be paid to the Provincial Treasurer. That is what the game and fisheries act says. But as a matter of fact all other fines have to go to the Provincial Treasurer with the exception of the O.T.A. fines which go through me. I see no reason why these should not come from me.

THE CHAIRMAN: There would be a record if they did. If any one desired to come to your office he would be entitled to search and ascertain proceedings which had been taken in any particular case?

Q.—That would set at rest all rumors and they would know exactly what had taken place in respect to any matter that became a matter of public dis-

cussion?

A.—Exactly. I desire to say that I have always been desirous of helping the officials of the Fish and Game Department. I have never stood in their way, and I have the friendliest feeling for the officials.

MR. TOLMIE: Who did you say had power to try these cases?

A.—The magistrate, of course. Then as to the others, all persons designated in the Fish and Game Act.

HON. MR. MILLS: "The Deputy Minister, superintendent, and inspectors and wardens of game and fisheries, overseers authorized by their appointment to act as justices of the peace, and the superintendent and inspectors of the Ontario Provincial Police shall be justices of the peace in and for every county or district for the purposes of this Act." That is section 59 of chapter 53.

MR. TOLMIE: Do you think that is a wise method of handling these cases, that they should have that power?

A.—No, sir. I think from the way it has worked out it is a vicious idea.

HON. MR. MILLS: Do you know whether these so-called convictions were really convictions with fines imposed, or just simply tenders by the person caught in the act?

A.—I know nothing about that.

Q.—You were saying they were convictions?

A.—I am not saying anything against the officials.

Q.—The inference I took from your remark was that such was the case—that they were real convictions?

A.—What I say is this, that from reports I have had some officials, I do not know whether deputy game wardens or overseers, have been in the habit of going to people who have committed offences, or on view finding them guilty, fining them and confiscating the furs and that sort of thing without making any record of it. I do not know whether that is done at the request of the guilty party or at the request of the overseer. I know nothing about the facts except as they were reported to me.

MR. TOLMIE: The very fact that a fine was taken would imply a conviction?

A.—It ought to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your position is this, as I understand it, that in order that there should be justification for any official having in his possession either furs or money which had been taken from any citizen, there should be a record of the conviction?

A.—Yes, there ought to be a trial or something that stands in lieu of a trial.

HON. MR. SMITH: I understood you to say so far as your knowledge went of convictions and fines, that only four per cent. of that amount found its way to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—No, only about four to five per cent. of it had been payable to the Provincial Treasurer by the person making the convictions. The record there speaks for itself.

Q.—I don't understand that. Do I understand you to say that the returns you make here of fines that come through you represent only about four or five per cent. of the fines that come to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—That is an additional statement. I would say that something between seven and ten per cent. may have come through myself. Occasionally, you will see by the statement, they are paid to the Attorney-General.

Q.—Those would be fines imposed by magistrates on convictions?

A.—Yes.

HON. MR. NIXON: Who was this official Ely?

A.—I presume a deputy game warden or some officer of the Game and Fisheries Department.

MR. MAGEAU: According to your view the game and fishery laws should be changed to prevent this kind of unfairness?

A.—If you will look over that record you will see where the justices have made moneys payable sometimes to the prosecuting attorney. I see a fine here payable to John Woods—John Woods was a deputy game warden.

Q.—Your opinion would be that the law concerning game and fishery seizures should be administered in the same way as other laws?

A.—My opinion is that the whole amount in each case should be paid by the justice of the peace to myself and by me sent to the Provincial Treasurer and divided up afterwards if there was any division to be made.

MR. HALCROW: Did you at any time know of any salaried officer who received a portion of the fines?

A.—No, sir, I didn't.

Q.—You don't know of any case?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Either in years past or since?

A.—No, sir. I did not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Referring to your statement of a moment ago. What you meant was this, that of the returns made to you, four per cent. of those returns have been made as having been paid direct to the Provincial Treasurer?

A.—Quite so.

MR. NIXON: There was nothing improper or irregular about the other method of making returns?

A.—It is just as you happen to look at it. The Act says they shall be paid to the Provincial Treasurer. If a payment to J. White and Woods and other people is a payment to the Provincial Treasurer, then it is in accordance with the Act. If not, it isn't.

MR. TOLMIE: If it was paid direct to you and through you to the Provincial Treasurer, you would have in your office a complete record of the whole thing?

A.—Exactly.

MR. HALL: I would like to say at the commencement of this that the matter was brought to my attention by a letter I received from one of my constituents, who had applied for the position of game warden, township game warden, and who had complained bitterly about the depredations by

people and of the game laws being ignored. So he wanted to be a game warden. His name was McGee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I presume that anything brought up here by a member is brought up in the interest of the Province at large.

MR. HALL: This letter contained a letter from the Department, in which this man was offered a position of game warden on these terms; no salary attached, but he gets one-half the fines.

HON. MR. MILLS: Is that game warden or deputy game warden?

MR. HALL: I cannot remember.

HON. MR. MILLS: There is a vast difference. We have one hundred deputy game wardens.

MR. HALL: I will let you call him what you like. But his remuneration was to be one-half of the fines. I am trying to show the connection between this half-fines business and the statements made there.

MR. GEORGE MOORE called and sworn:

THE CHAIRMAN: What position do you occupy?

A.—Police magistrate of Parry Sound in the western part of the district.

Q.—Can you define it any closer than that?

A.—I am police magistrate for the town of Parry Sound and for the district of Parry Sound West.

Q.—And as such have jurisdiction to what extent?

A.—I have the full powers of a police magistrate.

MR. HALL: Do you remember having a visit made to you by one Ely regarding the fish and game laws?

A.—The first time I saw Mr. Ely was somewhere about the middle of October, 1920. Until then he was unknown to me, a perfect stranger. One morning, as I was sitting in my office, Ely came in in company with another gentleman and was introduced to me as a game officer. I motioned to him to take a seat, and there were the usual salutations. He took a seat and went on talking in an informal sort of way. I was busy and there were others in my office. Ely was talking, and I got the impression from his conversation that he was some kind of a permanent officer of the Fish and Game Department. His conversation was very strong on the fines he had imposed, what big fines he had collected, along in that way. I went on with my work; I was busy writing out reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: Tell us as near as you can what he said?

A.—There was nothing particular, he left about an hour afterward. Then he came in another day shortly afterwards.

Q.—Before we get away from that first day, tell us what was said that is material?

A.—There was nothing material that day. The second day he said: "How do you impose fines? What do you do with remittances?" I said, "Well, Mr. Ely, all my remittances are made to the Provincial Treasurer." "Well," he said, pulling out a copy of the fish and game laws, "You know one-half of the fine is given to the person making the information." "All

right," I said, "have it your way, that is what I do with mine. All the fines I get for infractions of the Act are remitted to the Provincial Treasurer." He was talking that morning, telling us about making seizures at different places.

MR. HALL: Do you remember any place where he made a seizure?

A.—I think it was at Sparrow Lake.

Q.—What was that?

A.—Quite a large seizure.

Q.—Did he tell you what it was?

A.—I didn't pay particular attention. He was in my office there talking. I cannot say what it was he got.

Q.—Did he say he seized any boats or fishing tackle?

A.—There was some outfit of that kind. It was a general seizure, some kind of a tourist's outfit.

HON. MR. MILLS: Was Constable Knight in your office at that time?

A.—I think Constable Knight was not in there at that time. I think Mr. Armstrong was there.

Q.—And Constable Knight?

A.—I think now, perhaps, Constable Knight was there too.

Q.—And a man named Armstrong, a deputy sheriff?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: Did he say what he fined these people?

A.—What struck my attention was that he said he fined them something like a thousand dollars, that the man got saucy, so he doubled the fine on him.

Q.—He told you he made a seizure of furs from a certain man, seized his outfit and fined him a thousand dollars, and that when the man got saucy he doubled the fine?

A.—That is the substance of it. He didn't tell it to me particularly. He said it in the office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Give us your evidence in concrete form and more directly to the point. Tell us just what he said?

A.—That is about all I remember of that. Then the third time—

MR. MILLS: Did he say on what date that occurred?

A.—No, I cannot say that.

MR. MILLS: He only got there on the 9th of November, so it must have been since that date?

A.—No, he was there before that. He was there before the deer season opened. That was the 5th of November. It would be somewhere about the latter part of October.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then tell us about the third time—what time was that, can you give us the date?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—Give it as near as you can?

A.—It would be somewhere about the beginning of the deer season, about the 5th of November. That is as near as I can put it.

Q.—Tell us what the material conversation was?

A.—He came in on this occasion and said: “Mr. Moore, regarding fines—do you make all your remittances to the Provincial Treasurer?” I said “Yes.” “Well,” he said, “who do you pay the money to?” I said “It is all paid to the Provincial Treasurer. That is the rule I inaugurated when appointed police magistrate, and that is the rule I intend to follow.” He said, “That is not the way we have been doing it. Where am I going to get my money?” I said “I don’t know where you are going to get your money, but that is the rule I made then and the rule I am going to follow. All the fines and remittances I get I am going to send to the Provincial Treasurer.” I repeated it to him, “I inaugurated that plan when appointed, and I am going to follow it until my superior officer directs me not to follow it; until my superior officer tells me to do the contrary I will follow that. What is more, that is according to the fish and game law.” He says, “If you look at the fish and game law you will find the moiety is to be paid to the person laying the charge,” and it is possible it can be considered that way if you want to do it, according to the reading of the fish and game laws, but in another place it says that all fines must be paid over to the Provincial Treasurer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go on and tell us what took place between you?

WITNESS: He walked to the door and says, “Well, there won’t be many cases come here,” or “There won’t be any cases come here.”

Q.—Is that all?

A.—Yes, that is all.

MR. HALL: Have you had any similar conversations with anybody else?

A.—Never any conversation regarding the matter with Mr. Ely.

Q.—Or anybody else?

A.—Yes I did. When I got through this conversation and Ely went away, I walked into Crown Attorney Haight’s room and told him about the conversation, and asked him what he thought about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not material.

MR. HALL: Did he say anything in your presence in regard to having recently fined or collected in fines something like \$20,000?

A.—Not to me.

HON. MR. MILLS: How many times did he visit you in all?

A.—Three.

Q.—And it was on the first occasion he spoke about Sparrow Lake?

A.—No, that was the second time.

Q.—I understood you to say that was the first time. On the second occasion, it is alleged, he spoke about having collected \$20,000 in fines?

A.—I don’t remember that.

Q.—You don’t remember having made that statement?

A.—You must remember that to these conversations I was not paying much attention. I was the police magistrate and was attending to my work and the others were sitting back there carrying on the conversation.

Q.—If he said he collected \$20,000 you would surely remember that?

A.—I know he was talking in pretty big sums.

Q.—Did he say \$20,000 ?

A.—I cannot say as to that.

MR. SINCLAIR: He was talking about money fines, you heard that but don't remember the amount?

A.—No.

MR. MILLS: The information you got from Ely on the second occasion was that he wanted you to impose the maximum penalties and fines so that he would enjoy the one half portion?

A.—I did not form any opinion other than that he wasn't going to get any portion from me, that he would have to get it from the Provincial Treasurer.

Q.—The inference in his words was that he expected you to put the maximum fine on so that he would get his own out of it?

A.—He made me understand that he expected that I would carry out cases in a severe sort of way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us know what he said from which you drew that conclusion. What was it he said?

A.—I really cannot say. I didn't pay much attention to him. He was a total stranger to me. I didn't fasten him right down.

Q.—Did he ask you whether you would pay the penalties over to him?

A.—Yes.

MR. MILLS: And that you should impose the maximum penalties?

A.—That I would impose heavy penalties. He gave me to understand that. I do not know that he put it in so many words. He gave me to understand I should carry it out with a severe hand.

MR. HALL: Did he say he would bring some other magistrate from Toronto?

A.—He didn't tell me.

Q.—What did he tell you? Did he tell you he would bring in a lawyer—as a fact he did bring in a magistrate?

A.—Yes he brought in a magistrate.

Q.—I understood he brought in Mr. Cox from London?

A.—I didn't know he was a magistrate. I thought he was an inspector. I know I was there at one case. I went into my office at a quarter to nine one morning. I heard a noise and went upstairs to see what the matter was. The chief was in the room and he beckoned to me to come in, that a case was on. I said, no, I won't go in. Then I was informed that a magistrate had been brought from London to try game and fisheries cases pending in town. I felt annoyed because I thought it queer that I as magistrate of the town should be ignored. I thought I was filling the position faithfully and that I was quite capable of dealing with cases of that nature. It seemed to me that it was putting the country to a big expense to send and have a man come all the way from London to Parry Sound to try a trifling case like a fish and game case.

Q.—Did he have anyone with him as prosecutor?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember the man's name?

A.—No.

Q.—Would it be Mr. Coffee?

A.—I would not be sure.

MR. TOLMIE: Was there a man prosecuting?

A.—Yes.

Q.—This man intimated earlier to you that because of your method of handling the fines he would not have any or many cases before you?

A.—That is substantially my understanding of it.

HON. MR. MILLS: Who was in your office on the second occasion?

A.—Only myself and Ely. It was about 11 o'clock in the morning when Ely came into my office.

MR. TOLMIE: Did you try any case brought in by Ely?

A.—No sir.

MR. MILLS: Did you try any cases or have any convictions last year prior to the time Mr. Ely came into the Parry Sound district?

Q.—How many? Did you have more than one case last year prior to Ely's arrival on the scene?

A.—I had one on March 17, 1920, one on May 18, 1920, one on October 4, 1920, and one on the 1st of January, 1921.

Q.—You had three prior to Ely's arrival?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you try every case brought before you?

A.—Yes, and every case brought to the Police Court in Parry Sound in the last five years except when I have been away in Toronto as at the present time, but I have never been away more than a week at a time.

Q.—And you inflicted the penalties you thought it right and proper to inflict under the law?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And no case was ever brought to you that you didn't try it?

A.—No sir.

MR. MILLS: You are aware of the fact that game wardens and inspectors had a right to try cases with the powers of justices of the peace?

A.—I understand certain of them have that power.

Q.—You are aware that the Dominion fishery regulations give the same rights to fishery inspectors under the Dominion Government?

A.—I understand so.

Q.—They have the same privileges?

A.—Yes. I may say that here is a game and fisheries man who brought me a case of a man accused of killing partridges on October 4. There were twenty partridges and I fined him \$100 or \$5 apiece. That money went to the Provincial Treasurer as have all my fines.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not responsible for the law that enables others to inflict fines?

A.—No sir.

Q.—That law has been there for many years?

A.—Yes sir.

MR. MILLS: Then there is nothing in the alleged statement that Ely stated in your presence that he had collected \$20,000 in fines?

A.—He didn't say that to me.

MR. TOLMIE: Did he say he had put on heavy fines?

A.—He didn't address it to me particularly, but he made the statement in my hearing. I would like to say as one interested in and connected with the fish and game for a great many years, as one who has attended a great many conventions, back to the old convention in the University, that the time has come when we must take action. In five or six years time there won't be a deer south of the French River if we go on as we are doing now, there won't be a partridge to be found in a few years, the way the law is now and the way it is enforced. Furthermore if the Game and Fisheries Department does not get busy and be more active than heretofore there will not be any speckled bass within the islands adjacent to the shores of the French River and Moose Point.

JOHN ARMSTRONG, called and sworn.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your occupation?

A.—Deputy Sheriff for the District of Parry Sound.

Q.—And you have been deputy sheriff how long?

A.—About fifteen years.

Q.—As such have you knowledge of the working of the fish and game laws in your district?

A.—Some, sir.

MR. HALL: You saw Ely while he was in town?

A.—Yes. I was in the magistrate's office on the second morning referred to by the magistrate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you fix the date?

A.—I would say about the latter part of October.

MR. HALL: Have you any remembrance of a conversation that took place and what Mr. Ely said regarding his ability to make convictions?

A.—I have a very distinct recollection of what I heard Mr. Ely say on that date.

Q.—Will you tell it to us?

A.—I just dropped in, and at the time I dropped in Ely was telling the magistrate that he wanted him to impose the maximum penalties in cases brought before him by Ely. Then he continued, telling a story of a case he had dealt with at Sparrow Lake.

MR. MILLS: Was this on the same occasion?

A.—The only time I was in there in Ely's presence was then. He went on to say that while he was at Sparrow Lake there was some man who was apparently fishing without a license, I presume an American, although I don't remember him saying anything about what he was. This man, according to the story, had apparently been bragging around that he didn't have a license, and didn't have to get one. About that time the particular party came in where Ely was, and Ely said something like, "Have you got a license?" and

the man said, "No, and I don't need any license, either. I have been here fifteen or twenty years and never had a license, and I don't want a license now." Ely said he forthwith fined him a thousand, and confiscated some things. I cannot remember what they were now.

Q.—This was the same occasion you heard him speak about imposing the maximum fines?

A.—That was the only time I was there in Ely's presence.

Q.—Did he enlarge on that and say how many fines he had imposed?

A.—I never heard him make a remark of that kind? I left him in the office.

MR. MILLS: You didn't hear him say anything about having collected \$20,000 in fines?

A.—No.

HON. MR. NIXON: Did you hear him say he doubled the fine?

A.—No.

MR. HALCROW: Did he say he fined this man a thousand for fishing without a license?

A.—Yes, that was his statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: And confiscated certain property?

A.—Yes.

MR. MILLS: You don't know when that occurred—he didn't give the name of the party?

A.—No.

MR. TOLMIE: You understand it was done without a trial?

A.—I understood he had no trial.

MR. HOMUTH: Is it customary to impose these fines without any trial? Have the wardens that power?

A.—Of course you know about as much about that as I do. I haven't had to bother about that. They apparently appear to have according to the regulations.

Witness excused.

Thomas Spencer called and sworn.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your occupation?

A.—Chief of Police of Parry Sound.

Q.—For how long?

A.—Since the 4th of November, 1920.

MR. HALL: Mr. Spencer, you know Mr. Ely quite well?

A.—I do.

Q.—You had ample opportunity to meet him?

A.—I have met him on scores of occasions.

Q.—How long was he in town?

A.—As far as I understand he came at the beginning of November or the latter part of October, 1920.

Q.—How many days in the week do you meet him?

A.—I suppose I see him five days in every week, that is until recently.

Q.—Did you ever have a heart-to-heart conversation with him in regard to business? You were both in the same line in a way. What was the impression he gave you with regard to his prowess?

THE CHAIRMAN: Give us his words to you. The first time you had a conversation with Mr. Ely in regard to his duties what did he tell you?

A.—The first conversation I had with him I met him in the Mansion House, when he told me who he was. He told me I was the kind of man he wanted, and that the Game and Fisheries Department could find me a better job than the one I had got. I looked upon it as a lump of bull. I told him I was satisfied with the job I had. Then he asked me if I could put anything in his way if I could do so, and if he could put anything in my way he would do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Quite proper, go on.

A.—I gave him some information I had received of a man named Foster, who was supposed to have an otter skin. He investigated the case, but apparently made nothing of it. On the 24th of December I had a telephone message from Ely at the Mansion House. I went there, and he gave me four summonses to issue for him.

THE CHAIRMAN: To serve?

A.—Yes. I served two summonses in town, and one for George Reid and A. Haddad were out of town. I sent the out-of-town summonses to the Chief of Police of Sudbury to be served, and on the 25th of December Ely came to my house for dinner.

Q.—Give us the names of people on whom summonses were served?

A.—A. J. Gentles and George Bosely.

Q.—What was Gentles' summons for?

A.—Hunting without a license.

Q.—And Bosely's?

A.—Hunting without a license.

Q.—Did you serve them?

A.—I did.

Q.—Were they tried?

A.—They were tried on the 29th of December by Mr. H. G. Cox.

Q.—What was the fine?

A.—\$100 in costs in each case.

Q.—To whom was the money paid?

A.—To H. G. Cox.

Q.—Then the other two that were sent out of town? Who were they?

A.—A. N. Haddad. He was at Sudbury, and I sent the summons there.

Q.—Did he appear at Parry Sound?

A.—He did.

Q.—And was tried by whom?

A.—By H. G. Cox.

Q.—What was the fine?

A.—\$100 and costs.

Q.—And who was the fine paid to?

A.—H. G. Cox.

Q.—Do you know whether any return was made of either of these fines?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—That would be three fines?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What about the other—there was another.

A.—Yes. George Reid. I served that at Capewell on the 28th of December.

Q.—Did he appear?

A.—He appeared after the trial, and was fined \$100 and costs at the Mansion House Hotel.

Q.—You say he appeared after the trial, was there no trial in his case?

A.—There was not. Cox told him in the Mansion House that he would impose the same penalty on him as on the others.

Q.—He imposed that there?

A.—Yes. He was given twenty-four hours to pay, and it was paid seven or eight days later to Ely.

Q.—In your presence?

A.—No.

Q.—How do you know it was paid?

A.—Because I got \$5 out of it.

Q.—From whom?

A.—From Ely.

Q.—Ely told you it was paid?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: What position does Cox occupy?

A.—He occupied the position of magistrate in the court at Parry Sound when he tried these cases.

THE CHAIRMAN: He acted as magistrate in these cases?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In the four cases?

A.—In the three cases in court and the one in the Mansion House Hotel.

Q.—What further conversation did you have with Ely?

A.—On the 6th of January I arrested a man by the name of Perucci, an Italian, in Parry Sound, and seized a beaver skin, one muskrat skin, four mink skins and three weasels. I telephoned Ely, and told him I had seized these articles. He came straight to my office and said "I will handle this case." I said, "No, you won't; I will handle it myself." I made the arrest and the seizure." So he went away, and that day he came to my house while I was in at dinner. He never knocked, and came to the dining room door, walked straight in and sat down. He told me he had telephoned to the Department that he had seized these furs. I told him to telephone back that he hadn't, and was not going to seize them. So, after a lot of conversation, he said he was going to take them from me. I told him to "carry on." I told him that I was in legal possession, and that the other man was in illegal possession. While we were in the office before dinner he told me in front of Knight, the

provincial officer, that up to then he had sent in \$20,000 in fines since the first of November.

Q.—Did he say to whom he sent it?

A.—He said he had sent into the Department since the first of November, \$20,000.

MR. MILLS: Did anyone else hear him make that statement?

A.—Constable Knight.

THE CHAIRMAN: You called him a provincial officer?

A.—He is a provincial constable in the Parry Sound district.

MR. MILLS: Did he say it in a joking way or in all seriousness?

A.—He appears to say everything in seriousness.

Q.—A very serious man then?

A.—A very important man.

THE CHAIRMAN: What further did he tell you at that time?

A.—We never had any further conversation.

Q.—Is there anything further you can tell this Committee in regard to the administration of the fish and game laws that came within your knowledge during the time you have been Chief Constable of Parry Sound?

A.—I have got some hearsay evidence, nothing definite.

Q.—We don't want hearsay evidence unless you can give us names of witnesses who can give us evidence. It will be for the Committee to determine whether we will bring them here.

A.—I can give you one name—George or Harry Hall.

Q.—Where does he come from?

A.—Drocourt. It appears there was one of the game and fishery inspectors—I do not know which one—went there and asked him if he had any fur to sell, and posing as a fur buyer. This boy said yes, he had some and showed him three muskrat skins, I think. I am not certain about that. The inspector then seized these articles, told the boy who he was, and fined him \$40.

MR. HALL: Was that Ely?

A.—I don't know whether it was Ely or McNaughton. I think it was him.

MR. MILLS: That is the overseer's name?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: You say that Ely came to your place while you were having dinner and threatened to seize these furs from you? What happened?

A.—Nothing happened, because I told him to carry on with it.

Q.—Meaning that as far as you were concerned you didn't intend to permit it? I certainly didn't permit him. I refused to take a seizure ticket from him. I sent to the Department and asked them for a seizure ticket.

Q.—Were the furs sent to the Department?

A.—Yes, I sent them myself.

MR. HALL: You stated before that he made a dicker to give you any information he had if you would give him information you might get. Did he give you anything along that line?

A.—He told me there were three piano cases full of liquor going into the

Mansion House Hotel in the middle of the night.

Q.—And the cases contained a piano?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused.

Constable Charles Henry Knight called and sworn.

THE CHAIRMAN : What is your position, Mr. Knight ?

A.—Provincial policeman.

Q.—Under Superintendent Rogers of the Provincial Police?

A.—Yes, under Superintendent Rogers.

Q.—Situated where?

A.—Parry Sound.

Q.—With jurisdiction extending where?

A.—Wherever the superintendent wishes to send me in the province.

Q.—Are you also entrusted with the enforcement of the fish and game laws?

A.—Any infractions of the fish and game laws that come before my notice I prosecute.

Q.—How long have you been in that position?

A.—Going on fourteen years.

Q.—During the last fiscal year what knowledge have you had of infractions of the fish and game laws? Can you give us roughly how many prosecutions you have had?

A.—I think just two prosecutions.

Q.—Against whom?

A.—I had one against Henry Sarras.

Q.—For what?

A.—For having one bear skin and four or five muskrat skins.

Q.—Before whom did you bring him?

A.—Before George Moore, police magistrate.

Q.—What happened to the case?

A.—He was fined \$100.

Q.—To whom was the money paid?

A.—To Mr. Moore.

Q.—Did you get any portion of these fines?

A.—No, sir, and never looked for it.

Q.—What was the second case?

A.—The second case was a man from the French River—I have forgotten his name—Silvest, I think.

Q.—For what was he prosecuted?

A.—For having one beaver skin and four rat skins.

Q.—Before whom did you bring him?

A.—Before Mr. Moore.

Q.—What was the disposition of the case?

A.—He suspended sentence and confiscated the furs.

Q.—What became of the furs?

A.—The furs were sent to the Superintendent of the Game and Fisheries

Department here in Toronto.

Q.—What became of the furs in the first case?

A.—They were sent to the Department.

Q.—Do you know Ely?

A.—Yes, sir, since I was a little boy.

Q.—Have you had any conversations with him since he was appointed with the Game and Fisheries Department?

A.—Yes, I have met him several times.

Q.—Do you remember the conversations?

A.—Going back, since I came to Parry Sound last fall, I remember having several conversations with Mr. Ely.

Q.—Going back to your first conversation, can you tell this Committee what took place?

A.—On the 6th of January there was a seizure of furs and the arrest of Peter Perucci, and I assisted Chief Spencer to make the arrest. In the presence of the chief and in the chief's office at Parry Sound, Ely informed us that he had sent down to the Department since the day he came into Parry Sound \$20,000 in fines.

Q.—What further?

A.—That is all that took place at that time. That was since he came to Parry Sound.

Q.—That was in October, 1920?

A.—It was sometime in October he came.

Q.—Had you any conversation at any other time?

A.—No, I gave him information regarding one Hall at Drocourt.

Q.—You gave him that information?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know what was done in regard to that?

A.—I do not, no more than what I was told afterwards.

Q.—By Ely?

A.—No. The man who gave me the information as to a boy carrying a gun on the railway tracks and promiscuously shooting, that man informed me that this boy had been fined.

Q.—You don't know by whom?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you any further information?

A.—No, I think that is all. In reference to the conversation carried on in the magistrate's office I cannot say, I cannot recollect.

Q.—Do you remember being there?

A.—I remember being there on one occasion when Mr. Ely was there.

Q.—Who was there?

A.—I cannot say, other than that Police Magistrate Moore was there.

Q.—Do you remember Mr. Armstrong being there?

A.—I cannot say he was there.

MR. HALL: Do you remember hearing anything with regard to a fine of a thousand on a man at Sparrow Lake?

A.—I cannot bring that to my mind. I will just say this, that any time I was with Ely I got away as soon as I could and let him talk to someone else.

MR. MILLS: Do I understand Mr. Knight that there was someone else with you when Ely made the statement that he had collected and sent down \$20,000 in two months?

A.—The police magistrate.

Q.—You don't remember anything that happened in Magistrate Moore's office in regard to Sparrow Lake?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you remember him speaking about the magistrate imposing the maximum fines?

A.—I remember one time. I cannot state the date, there seemed to be some dissatisfaction with Mr. Moore in regard to the enforcement of the game laws. He mentioned a man named Reid. He was a game overseer, who had a Jew up for having some moth-eaten skins, and the case was dismissed. They were not satisfied with that, Mr. Ely told me so on one occasion. I had always thought Mr. Moore was a good magistrate who, if he erred, erred on the side of leniency, which stand I always took myself. Ely told me on one occasion there would not be any cases come before Mr. Moore.

Witness excused.

Henry R. H. Ely called and sworn:

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your occupation?

A.—Special patrol on game and fisheries.

Q.—Appointed by the Department?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—When?

A.—I think it was about six years, six or seven years ago.

Q.—When did you first go to Parry Sound?

A.—I have been twice at Parry Sound. I came through there once. Then I was going up to Deer Lake, and was called in and went up to Parry Sound on the 2nd of November.

Q.—That was the first time you had been there, lately. You started in on your duties on that date?

A.—Yes, sir.

HON. MR. MILLS: You have been in the room since the examination has taken place—you have heard the remarks of Mr. Moore and the other gentlemen?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember on the first occasion on which you visited the magistrate's office, discussing a seizure made at Sparrow Lake?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You discussed that?

A.—The way that was discussed was simply this. A man came in and said he didn't require a license. I said you had better get one. Mr. Miller had written out a license for this man, and I said you had better look this over.

He took the license because there is a thousand dollar fine printed on the back of it.

Q.—Did you make a statement that you had fined this gentleman on that occasion one thousand dollars?

A.—No.

A.—No, they are mistaken. If anybody took that from it it was a misconception.

Q.—Magistrate Moore says he made that statement in the presence of Constable Knight. Constable Knight says he didn't hear the statement. You deny having made that statement?

A.—I deny making that statement *in toto*. I had had inquisitive people come prying around and interfering. "Well, what have you got to-day—some other poor victim? How much was it this time?" Perhaps I would say "\$20,000" as a bluff.

Q.—The second occasion—do you remember that occasion?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you a distinct recollection of what transpired?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you tell the magistrate that you desired him to impose the maximum penalty, and he as much as inferred that if he did that you would be entitled to one half of the fines?

A.—I will explain that as clearly as possible. Prior to my being in Parry Sound I was told I could not get a conviction there, that some Jew had been taken up with rat skins in his possession, that the skins had been confiscated, but that the Jew was acquitted. I said, "Well, I will go and see Mr. Moore," and I went to see him. I told him there would likely be some cases. I said I had received statements of ten, or fifteen, or twenty deer being slaughtered, and of people killing 100 to 150 partridge. It was stated that in cases of this kind they should get the limit. I said there would be a private prosecutor who would furnish the evidence that would convict and they, according to law, should have one half of the fines. Mr. Moore stated that he would send the money to the Provincial Treasurer and that the Game and Fisheries could look after that themselves. I said to him, "Don't you know that when moneys go to the Provincial Treasurer it takes an Order in Council to get it out, and it would save a lot of trouble to the Game and Fisheries if half the fine went direct to the private prosecutor."

Q.—That is the man who lays the information?

A.—Yes, according to the Act one half goes to the private prosecutor. I have never received one five-cent piece in all my time, nor would I take it.

Q.—So that nothing you stated would leave Mr. Moore to draw the inference that you desired him to impose the maximum penalties in order that you should obtain one half of the fines.

A.—No, he must have imagined it.

Q.—You deny that you stated you had imposed a fine of \$1,000 at Sparrow Lake?

A.—I never imposed a \$1,000 fine at any time. And I never imposed a fine at Sparrow Lake at all. There was a fine imposed for liquor. I had nothing to do with that.

Q.—It is alleged that you said you had made a seizure of boats and fishing appliances at Sparrow Lake, and had fined the man \$1,000.

A.—That is not so.

Q.—Were you in Parry Sound last summer?

A.—I was merely there—just going through.

Q.—Were you in the vicinity of Sparrow Lake?

A.—Yes, all the time last summer.

Q.—In the alleged interview you had with the magistrate did you make a statement that as a result of that interview you were going to have a magistrate and a lawyer brought in from Toronto to try any cases?

A.—I think I said I would report the case to the Department, and it would probably be tried by the Game and Fisheries. I did not know who was going to look after it. It would likely be tried by a magistrate from the Game and Fisheries sent in.

Q.—When you arrest a man in the act, a man whom you know is violating the game laws, it frequently happens that he makes you a tender of a certain sum of money. Has it ever been suggested by you to such a man that he could have a settlement out of court if he would tender you a certain sum of money?

A.—Never, sir.

Q.—Where did the offer come from?

A.—The offer would be like this. We would be fifteen or twenty miles in the bush, and the man would be caught in the act, with the goods there, and the man would say, "How can this be settled—can I settle it with you?" I would say "No, you cannot settle it with me, but if you choose to make a tender, admitting you were guilty of this charge, and making a tender to the Department of Game and Fisheries, and deposit the money with me I will forward that to the Game and Fisheries Department, and they will deal with the case."

Q.—And all the seizures are made out in the proper regulation form?

A.—I think they are.

Q.—Every one you had anything to do with?

A.—Just one minute. When I went up there I was given charge of so many overseers, and they didn't understand the work, and sometimes they sent seizures to the Department. All the seizures I had made were reported to the Department, and there are the checks and receipts and also my own letters. I have them in black and white in my book.

Q.—Apparently from the list of seizures we have you have been a very busy man?

A.—I did my best.

A.—The constable stated that all he had during the past year were three. I find that from November 11 to March 4 you had quite a large number—twenty-eight cases. You were a busy man there?

A.—Well, I worked for my money.

Q.—And all the seizures were turned in to the Department in the proper form?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember the incident where you stated you had turned in \$20,000 to the Department in the two months?

A.—As I told you before I might have made that statement just purely as a shove. In other words, "Mind your own business."

Q.—The statement is made here that you made that statement in all seriousness.

A.—I never did anything of the kind. Do you think that I, a sane man, am going to make a statement of that kind that could be proven?

Q.—What was the amount of your fines? Do they run about \$900?

A.—Somewhere about there. I think the calculation in all is something over \$1,840 and some odd dollars, that is what passed through my hands, more than that was taken in by others.

Q.—You were acting as game warden at Parry Sound, pending reorganization and relieving the game warden at Ottawa?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You understood you had a right to impose fines or try any case?

A.—Yes, but I did not try any case, none whatever, not one solitary case. They would say to me, "How can I settle this?" and I would say, "You cannot settle, but the fine would be so much for each conviction, make your tender, whatever you may say, admit you were guilty, and I will forward it to the Department of Game and Fisheries for consideration, for final consideration."

Q.—Frequently you had these tenders offered.

A.—Every one of these tenders were offered.

Q.—Tenders similar to this: "I hereby tender to the Department of Game and Fisheries, \$50 for violating section 41, subsection 5. Signed, Joseph Dick—, witness Alex. McNaughton, overseer?"

Q.—Is the tender given on your suggestion?

A.—No, I asked the Department, and they said so.

MR. HALL: That is a settlement out of court?

A.—That is a tender until the case is settled.

MR. TOLMIE: In these cases where these men came before you and tendered so much to settle the case, how did they come to fix the amount at \$50 or whatever the amount would be?

A.—If you take the Game and Fisheries Act it states that the minimum fine shall be \$20 and the maximum \$200. All violations in one day will be treated as separate cases, but it is not necessary to make a specific charge for each case. The reason I wrote to the Department was this. We would probably have to go ten or fifteen miles into the wilderness to catch men red-handed, and they would admit it. It would cost \$10 or \$15 to get a rig to go in there, and if we had to come back and make out papers and go back in there with them it would cost another \$25, and that would be an additional expense that would be more than the fine would be, what with costs and fees. They were

quite ready to make tenders. I have letters from people who have given the biggest tenders, and you may read them if you wish.

MR. TOLMIE : The point I want to get at is this : who fixed the amount of the tenders—who suggested the amount?

A.—I could receive what I thought was sufficient.

THE CHAIRMAN : Supposing you caught John Jones red-handed in the bush, that you found him there with a number of deer in violation of the law. He was aware he had broken the law, and you were aware of it, and you told him who you were. Who suggested the amount he should pay in order that the matter should be settled right then and there?

A.—The man would say, "How much is this going to cost me." I would say, "The fine is so much, you know what you are guilty of, make your tender. I will accept it and send it in, if it is only \$5 or \$10, or anything you like." If they didn't want to do it, I had nothing to do with it. I reported to the Department.

THE CHAIRMAN : If I understand the procedure, you as game warden or inspectors, or what ever it is, are out in the bush seeking to prevent offences against the game laws. When you come upon an offence against the game laws, and it was proven there had been an offence, and the man was there who had committed the offence, you advised him of the position you occupied?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who you were and what your duties were?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You called his attention to what the offence was and what the penalties might be, and told him you would have to bring that matter to the attention of the proper authorities?

A.—Yes. I had to arrest him.

Q.—Then there would be a tender?

A.—He would say, "Don't do that, can't I settle it?"

Q.—The man would say to you, "I don't want to go in. I have committed an offence. Can't this matter be settled?" You would say, "Well, what proposition have you to make?" The proposition is made to you and put in writing with the admission on his part, on the forms of the Department?

A.—We had no forms. We had to write that out.

Q.—But it was in writing?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And signed by the party?

A.—Yes, and witnessed.

Q.—In every case you had it witnessed and forwarded to the Department, with the moneys you received?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—And anything you confiscated—what was done with that?

A.—It was sent directly to the Department.

Q.—And that was done in every case?

A.—In every case.

Q.—So that in these cases spoken of—to the number of twenty-eight, if my memory serves me right, that was the procedure in each and every case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Department was made aware at once of what you had done?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In no case did you do anything other than that?

No, sir.

MR. TOLMIE: Did you ever refuse to accept and forward any tender that was offered, as being too small?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—If a man was guilty of something you thought should bring a fine of \$500, and he offered you \$10, would you send that in?

A.—I would not take him by the throat and tell him to disgorge. I would take whatever was offered. There have been no tenders taken, only three that should not have been taken. Duff took three tenders of \$20 since the 15th or 16th of January. A tender was taken in Huntsville by a man by the name of Haines, who had no business to take that. When I found it out I went there and made him refund the money to the man. I had the case tried, and they were fined \$20, and one half the fine went to the informer.

Q.—How many cases did you take yourself—tenders?

A.—I cannot really tell you off-hand. I don't think more than eight or ten.

Q.—And in each of these cases a certain amount of money was put up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You sent that money to the Department?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In these eight or ten cases did the Department accept the tender you had sent down?

A.—They did.

Q.—And that settled it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was settled on that tender?

A.—Yes, with the exception of Haddad. That case was tried and the money was refunded, or rather he was given credit for it.

Q.—They tried the case. The Department didn't accept the tender?

A.—They would not give any tender. Haddad was the only man of the party who gave a personal tender. The balance said they were going to have a run for their money.

Q.—There were several in that party, and the others would not tender? He tendered \$35.

Q.—The others would not tender, and were brought before what magistrate?

A.—Before Mr. Cox.

Q.—Who is Mr. Cox?

A.—He is an inspector of the Game and Fisheries.

Q.—Was he in that district in pursuance of his duties?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At the time?

A.—No, he was not.

Q.—How did he come to be there?

A.—I reported to the Department, and they used their judgment.

Q.—You reported to the Department, and the Department sent Mr. Cox there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the cases were tried where?

A.—In the town hall or court house in Parry Sound.

Q.—By Mr. Cox?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They were in the party Haddad was in?

A.—The Department would not accept Haddad's tender, and he was tried with the rest of them.

Q.—What was the fine?

A.—\$100 and costs.

Q.—And the amount of the tender was handed back to Haddad?

A.—He was given credit for it in his fine.

Q.—That had been forwarded to the Department?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What were the others fined?

A.—\$100 each.

Q.—What was the offence?

A.—Killing deer without licenses. They had a book of licenses unsigned.

Q.—How did they get those?

A.—I cannot tell you.

MR. HALL : Didn't the magistrate find out when he tried the case—Mr. Ely knows exactly how they got them.

THE CHAIRMAN : How did they get this book?

A.—I will tell you what was told me.

Q.—What did they say as to where they got the book?

A.—They said they got the book from an overseer by the name of Jones.

Q.—Had they paid for them?

A.—No, they had no receipts. I sent a man up at once and collected what stuff Jones had.

Q.—You went up and got whatever material he had?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL : Who was Jones ? An issuer of licenses ?

A.—I think he was.

MR. MILLS : When you asked these men, have you paid for the licenses they said no ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How many deer had they ?

A.—We saw a deer in two parts.

Q.—And they had this book of licenses unsigned ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How many men were in that party ?

A.—As far as I can tell, about ten.

Q.—How many were fined ?

A.—I think five, if I am not mistaken. Mr. Cox tried them. I did not have that money, only \$200.

Q.—Mr. Spencer said you tried these men in the Mansion House ?

A.—I did nothing of the sort.

THE CHAIRMAN : He said one man.

MR. SPENCER : Yes, Mr. Reid.

WITNESS : I was authorized by Mr. Cox to have Mr. Reid pay the \$100 to me. They were going to get out a bench warrant but that if he would pay \$100 the same as the others Cox said the Department would accept that with costs, and he paid it.

Q.—What did you do with the money ?

A.—I sent one to Cox and one to the Department and I have the receipts for it. On the 18th these men were caught and on the 20th there was a case in Parry Sound. These men went to Jones and said, "We owe you \$30, we will pay you." They handed him the \$30 and got a receipt dated the 28th of October and it was on the 23rd of November that the money was paid.

THE CHAIRMAN : Jones gave him a receipt for \$30 and dated it back.

MR. HALL : What happened to Jones ? What was done to him ?

A.—I didn't have anything done to him.

Q.—Is he in the employ of the Department now ?

A.—I can't say.

MR. TOLMIE : When you would come across these men red-handed they would want to settle and they would offer you a tender ?

A.—Yes, or offered to me for the Department of Game and Fisheries.

Q.—You never suggested to them what that tender should be, the amount of the tender ?

A.—No, I can say that. I need not accept a tender at all. As I told you before, I would say, "How much, make your statement. There is the act." Supposing a man had three deer, the minimum is \$20, that would be \$60. But they were never fined that. It was always \$35 or \$40, or \$100 at the most, and in that case the man had killed quite a number of deer.

Q.—And when a tender was made you accepted it ?

A.—I sent it in to the Fish and Game Department.

Q.—And the Fish and Game Department accepted it ?

MR. HALL : And \$100 from a man who was killing moose and everything else in contravention of the law—you accepted \$100 from that man ?

MR. TOLMIE : As I have understood from what you have said, these men would offer a tender ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You would not tell them the amount ?

A.—No.

Q.—The tender was never as much as the fine?

A.—No, not nearly.

Q.—You would send that tender in, would you make any recommendation with that tender?

A.—In some cases where the men were poor I did. In some cases I did not.

Q.—And in every case the tender was accepted by the Department with the exception of this Haddad case?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand it you stated this; when you came upon an offence like that you called the man's attention to what the game laws provided, what the punishment might be under the game law. And after the man made a tender with knowledge of what the law said, you submitted the tender to the Department?

A.—Yes.

MR. MILLS: In connection with the case, Mr. Spencer spoke of this morning. You heard him say in connection with a fine that was imposed that he knew it had been imposed because he got \$5.00 of it. Did you pay him \$5?

A.—I paid him \$5. He had that much costs for serving summonses. That was one of the cases that was supposed to be tried before Cox.

Q.—Then this receipt, "Received from H. R. Ely the sum of \$5 being costs in the case of R. Orr convicted under the Game and Fisheries Act, T. Spencer" is the receipt for that money?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that clears that \$5. He received that for expenses incurred?

A.—He didn't enumerate his expenses.

Q.—That was no portion of the fine—it was his costs?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about the other case. He received \$5 from Ely in the case of George Reid and this \$5 in the case of R. Orr—what about George Reid, have you a receipt for that?

A.—Yes there should be a receipt there.

Witness excused.

NEIL McNAUGHTON called and sworn.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your occupation?

A.—Overseer in the Game and Fisheries Department.

Q.—How long have you occupied that position?

A.—Since the 11th of October, 1920.

Q.—Where have you been stationed?

A.—In Parry Sound.

Q.—All of that time?

A.—That is my headquarters. I haven't been there all that time.

Q.—You cover what district?

A.—Parry Sound and Muskoka.

Q.—You have been in Parry Sound and Muskoka during all that time?

A.—I have.

Witness excused, Mr. Ely recalled.

MR. MILLS: Is this the receipt from Spencer in respect to the \$5 paid him for expenses in the case of George Reid?

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: I the case of the man who was fined \$100, were the costs added?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the total amount of the costs against this man?

A.—\$5, \$105 altogether.

MR. HALL: We only have tenders handled here by Mr. Ely in January. Am I to understand you only did business in January?

A.—I did business in November.

Q.—Where did you do business?

A.—There is the list there.

Q.—I would like to have the dates. Where were you on November 5th.

THE CHAIRMAN: What case does that refer to?

MR. HALL: I have information that one of the inspectors or overseers made a seizure from a party and took a tender for \$20 in settlement of the case.

WITNESS: That is the tender of A. M. Marshall. I do not know where he killed the deer, somewhere above Parry Sound, but we caught him at the Ragged Rapids.

HON. MR. MILLS: Is this the tender; "I hereby pay the sum of \$20 as guarantee that I will appear if called upon to answer a charge of breaking the game and fish laws, A. M. Marshall, Barrie?"

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: Did that man appear later in court? Was there any trial?

MR. MILLS: No, that was accepted as a settlement. He obtained a license after he violated the game laws.

THE CHAIRMAN: What would be the fine for that?

MR. MILLS: \$20 for each offence.

MR. HALL: They fined them in my town \$100 and costs for shooting without a license.

THE CHAIRMAN: They had in their possession a book of licenses unsigned. That certainly would add materially to the offence.

MR. HALL: On November 6, where was Mr. Ely.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has told you where he was on the 6th. He told you he was at Ragged Rapids.

MR. HALL: On November 6th there was a seizure made from a man named Frank Forman of one beaver, one mink and two skunk skins.

WITNESS: There is no such man, the man's name was Frank Tremblay. He offered a tender of \$35.

Q.—And you accepted it?

A.—Yes, and sent it to the Department the same as the rest.

Q.—Now again, I am bringing these cases to show he is forgetful. He

said he had only ten cases in our district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Twenty-six cases.

MR. HALL: Only ten tender cases.

WITNESS: They weren't all taken by me. Others took these cases.

MR. HALL: He was at Torrance on November 8th on a gunning expedition, I do not know how many guns he discovered, but I do know three people paid him \$5 each for having guns in their possession.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that an offence against the law?

WITNESS: Yes sir, under the law that guns cannot be kept in any construction camp or any railway company camp.

MR. HALL: At Torrance three men found with guns were fined \$5 each.

A.—Not fined, they offered tenders.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were those tenders sent in?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the guns were seized?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is that the minimum fine as laid down by law?

A.—In special cases, that is the minimum.

MR. HALL: There should be no special cases.

A.—Well that is the law, I am not making the law.

MR. SINCLAIR: You speak of special cases—are they statutory special cases or what?

A.—Under section 69, the fine is so much for violating the game and fishing regulations and other things and then there is another for cases not specified.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean there is a general section in the act which covers cases not specified?

A.—Yes.

HON. MR. NIXON: This \$5 tender was not a fine?

A.—No, just tenders. I never tried a case at all.

MR. HALL: It seems quite common in these cases to accept a tender. I find that either Mr. McNaughton or yourself accepted a tender on November 11th. And here is one on November 11th, and this one was taken up in different fashion, no tender, no fine and no prosecution. Do you remember that case?

A.—It wasn't my case, sir, Mr. McNaughton will clear that up.

Q.—This was not McNaughton's case.

MR. McNAUGHTON: It happened to be yes.

MR. HALL: Now we come down to Cooper's Camp.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you know about Cooper's camp?

A.—Nothing sir, I was not there.

MR. SINCLAIR: Was there any report of trouble there?

A.—No, I don't know the case at all. I got the money handed to me by Mr. McNaughton and that was sent to the Department.

MR. HALL: Do you know what that was for?

A.—Yes, for killing a bull moose.

Q.—Do you think that a proper tender for killing a bull moose?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not for him to say, that is for the Department.

MR. HALL: You say your duties were in the bush?

A.—My duty is to oversee the reports of the overseers. I cannot do that very well in the bush.

Q.—I thought you told us your reports were made monthly?

A.—I send a report on the work done by these men, once a month.

Q.—How many times were you in the bush in a month?

A.—Every Saturday I had to be there to accept these reports and to make them out.

Q.—Had to be where?

A.—At home.

Q.—Is that the only time you were there? Will you tell us any time you were out of town?

A.—Dozens of them.

Q.—How many times in a week—in a month. I can bring a hundred people to tell you where he was every day. And he said he was in the bush. Do you remember the occasion, during the hunting season while you were in Parry Sound, of receiving information of a man who was making a business of slaughtering deer to sell to unsuccessful hunters?

A.—I cannot say I did.

Q.—If I produce a witness who says he told you that a certain man in our district had seven deer hanging in his barn waiting for unsuccessful hunters who before they would face the disgrace of going home without a deer would pay \$30 or \$40 for one, what would you say. Have you any remembrance of that?

A.—I may have had that information. I think it was given to me and I sent one of the officers to look after it. Everything we found out has been reported to the Department.

Q.—If you were so anxious about the administration of the law don't you think a flagrant case like that should positively have had your personal attention? Did you go after that man when you had that information laid before you?

A.—I think possibly I did. People come in and say so and so, but they won't give us names, they won't sign anything.

Q.—Not give you names? You were given the full particulars.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any recollection of that?

A.—I don't remember. If you listen to what everybody says you would be kept busy. Why didn't you write me a letter.

Q.—Write nothing. I am not a thief catcher. I sent a man who told you where you could go and see the deer hanging up, but you didn't go after it.

MR. MILLS: Why didn't you write it?

MR. HALL: Why didn't I go and seize the deer myself.

MR. SINCLAIR: You spoke about this \$20,000 item. On the evidence given you said you had sent down \$20,000 to the Department.

A.—Sometimes people would come around after I made a seizure and say, “Well how much did you get this time,” and, perhaps, I would say \$20,000 or \$40,000 which no one would have believed if they had sense. In other words, a polite way of saying, “None of your business.”

Q.—You don’t wish this committee to think that you go around giving that impression when you are making statements?

A.—No.

Q.—You want to pass as a man whose word would be accepted. Where all the statements which you made that day in the police magistrate’s office on a par with that \$20,000 statement?

A.—That was misconstrued.

Q.—There was evidence given here of conversations that morning. We want to know if everything you said was no nearer the truth than this \$20,000 statement.

A.—I said there that the fine was \$1,000 printed on the back of the license. The man took the license. The man fined there was not for that. There was no tourist fined.

MR. HALL: You said you fined him \$1,000 and confiscated the outfit.

A.—No.

MR. SINCLAIR: The other witnesses swear you did. Are these men lying before this committee when they give us this evidence?

A.—I do not say they lied. They have misconstrued it.

MR. TOLMIE: It was stated by the police magistrate that you had said as you were leaving his office that you would take care that no cases, or very few cases came before him. Is that correct?

A.—I think I may have said that. I do not know I did. I may have said that I did not know that there would be many cases to come before him if they were going to be treated like these other cases were.

MR. SINCLAIR: How many cases were taken to other magistrates apart from Mr. Moore?

A.—I think Mr. McArthur tried two or three. There was a man in Huntsville tried a couple of cases and Mr. Duff at Sundridge had five or six.

Q.—Were these offences within the districts for which these persons were police magistrates?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. MILLS: In connection with the man who issued those licenses I suppose you are personally acquainted with J. Jones?

A.—No, I am not.

Witness excused.

MR. McNAUGHTON recalled.

MR. HALL stated that he wished to make a statement:—“What I wish to state to the committee shortly, is this. I had been given the impression by communications from all over the district that McNaughton and Ely and other men, both the present overseers and those lately discharged had been in the habit of holding court and receiving fines and my objection to the whole

business was that it was not constitutional and that accused persons should be tried by a proper magistrate in a proper court. I am satisfied from what has been said here to-day, that there is an established rule in the Department by which these men can accept a tender by allowing the culprit to set his own fine and it shall be accepted. So under these conditions I have no questions to ask Mr. McNaughton. I believe he has been doing his duty in a first-class manner.

HON. MR. MILLS: to witness: It was alleged in Mr. Hall's statement on the floor of the House, that you represented yourself to be a fur buyer. That you went around among the settlers seizing furs they had in their possession and passing yourself off as a fur buyer. Will you tell me the names of some of the settlers you took these furs from?

A.—With pleasure.

Q.—Who is the first one?

A.—I took a tender from George House of Hamilton. He is in the Hydro Commission. He is the one who killed a bull moose. He shot a bull moose without a license. He told me he had shot the moose thinking it was a deer. It was his first time in the bush. At that time I was accompanied by Reid, who was a special patrol officer at that time. Reid was the one who suggested a tender. We had a magistrate right in the camp and he was going to sit on the case. House was very anxious about his moose and after he gave me the explanation of how he came to shoot it I knew it was my duty to seize the moose. He said, "I am willing to pay anything," I thought, "well, the tender leaves it open for both sides. House can appeal the case if he wishes or the Department can state that it is not satisfactory if they do not wish to take the House's word. Then there was the Ed. Dutton case that Mr. Hall mentioned. I visited the C.N.R. station at South Magnetawan. There was a party of hunters there. I went up to them and said, "I am representing the Department of Game and Fisheries. I want to see your licenses. He produced the licenses. Then just to trick him I said, "What about the deer in the bush?" He said, "Yes, I admit I ate one." I asked, "Have you a license for that, and he said "No." "Then Mr. Dutton," I said, "I will have to seize your deer." I seized the deer and sent it in to the Department. Mr. Dutton came to me later and said that he would accept all responsibility for the club. There were fifteen in the club. I could have made them bring out the fifteen deer if I had wanted to, but I thought it would be a hardship to seize the fifteen, as I really should have done. As I said I seized Mr. Dutton's deer and sent it in to the Department. He came down to the Department and had the deer released, paying the Department \$20. On November, 13th, I visited Albert Cooper's camp between the South and North Magnetawan. He was in possession of a moose. I asked him for his license and he presented a license two days old. I said, "When did you shoot this moose." He said, "yesterday." I could see that the eyes were sunken into the head, proving that it was not a one-day previous kill. I said, "I will have to seize your moose" and placed a seizure tag on it. He said, "I am willing to take an affidavit to the effect that I shot that moose after I got the license." I said, "Give me the affidavit, but how can you give me an affidavit that you shot that moose yesterday, when the fact is that when I came

up here on Saturday I heard talk about you getting a moose!" I took his note that he signed, saying that he had a license before he shot the moose. I got half way to the railway before he came up to me and asked me if \$50 would make the thing square. I said, don't you try to bribe me or that will be two charges, one of bribery and one of shooting the moose without a license. I said, what you can do is this; you can pay me \$50 as an acknowledgment of guilt, that you shot the moose before you got the license, and he was very anxious to do so.

MR. TOLMIE: You took a written tender?

A.—Yes, then there was Joseph Dick of Magnetawan. I received information that he was in possession of furs without a license. I hired a car and went sixteen miles to his home. I rapped at the door and he met me. I said, "Are you Mr. Dick—information has been given me that you are in possession of furs without a license." He says, "I am not." I looked about and saw a fox fur near the stove. I said, "I am here and I am going to search your house, but in the first place I am going to give you a chance to bring the fur before me." He went away and brought me an otter skin. "Now," he said, "You can search the house." In my procedure I found two skunk skins which he didn't produce. I said, "I guess you will have a car ride back to Magnetawan." He said, "Can't I settle the thing some other way?" I said, "Only by tender." He said, "What will that tender be?" I said, "The lowest can \$20 and the highest \$200." I think the Department would be satisfied with one-quarter of the amount it could be and you can take the deputy's address and write him. By no means were they wealthy people and he had to go out and get the money. I was told he had a bad reputation and I knew I had to have something to square myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: What tender did you take from him?

A.—\$50.

MR. SINCLAIR: This man Dickie didn't have a license?

T.—No.

Q.—What would he have to pay for a license? ..

A.—\$15.

MR. TOLMIE: These tenders you take, do you, in any case, suggest the amount of the tender?

A.—Well, let me see. I presume I do. Whatever I thought the Department would be satisfied with, would accept.

Q.—And the tender was received by you always in writing?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And forwarded to the Department with other information?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did the Department accept the tender?

A.—They did, sir.

Q.—In every case?

A.—Yes, because it was always accompanied by a letter showing that it would entail too much hardship if the man was brought in for trial.

Q.—In sending down these tenders and other information you recom-

mended, did you, that the tender be accepted?

A.—As a rule, where they were poor people, and I believed, that every \$5 meant something taken out of the house.

Q.—And in not one case was the tender returned?

A.—No sir. Mr. Hall at Drocourt, stated that I passed myself off as a fur buyer. I went up on the early morning train to Mowat, having had information that there was a man working on the section who was shooting along the line. I got up there at 4.30 in the morning and crawled into a box car until morning. I interviewed the section boss and he told me that George Hall had violated the law. Before breakfast I walked six miles up the track. I went into the station where I asked the lady to make me my breakfast. While I was waiting I walked up to Hall's door and rapped at the door, when he came to the door, I said, "I understand you have some furs to sell." He said, "Yes, I have." He could have said, "Are you a fur buyer," and I would have been trapped.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see that it would have been a serious matter if you had said you were a fur buyer.

WITNESS: I said I would like to see them and he brought me two muskrat skins. I said, "What is the number of your license?" He said a number in five figures. I knew the Department hadn't issued a license in five figures. I told him he was guilty, in fact, he had been shooting muskrats out of season. Then he told me that Peter McElroy had seven muskrat skins. He gave me a statement to that effect. I seized McElroy's fur on those grounds. When I went back to get an affidavit he told me he had been lying. Another case where they may try to say I passed myself off a fur buyer, was sometime in November when I called on Joseph Malcolm at Sprucedale.

MR. MILLS: Who is he?

A.—The magistrate. I understood he had bought fur the year before, so I went to him with the seizure I had made from Dickie. I went into Malcolm's and I said, "Are you buying fur?" He said, "How much have you got." I said, "An otter, a fox and two skunk," and so I had though they were under seizure. Just then it struck me I was almost doing a certain thing so I said, "I am representing the Department of Game and Fisheries. Have you a license?" He told me that he did not, but that he would write right away and get one. He said his brother was in possession of fur and that he had a permit. I said, "Take a young fool's advice and get one, good evening," and away I went. Ely asked me if Malcolm had a license and taking his word for it that he would send for one right away, I said, yes. Ely found out that Malcolm didn't have a license and came back to me. I told him what had taken place. I said, "I guess there's crooked work." I went back and went to Thomas Malcolm's house and asked. "Have you any furs to sell?" He said, "I don't think I will sell at present." I said, "Let me see it, can't you?" I went in and he had eighteen beaver and twenty-one muskrats. I said, "A fine collection, have you a permit?" He said, "What are you, a spotter?" I told him I represented the Department of Fish and Game. I seized what he had and came back to Sprucedale and went to see Joseph Malcolm and told him that he

had lied to me when he had said he was sending for a license and that he had lied when he told me his brother was in possession of a permit to carry his fur over.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you did right.

WITNESS: I did not say I was a fur buyer. I simply asked if he had any fur to sell. If he had asked me if I was a fur buyer I would have been compelled to say I wasn't.

The witness was then excused, and the committee adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

March 23rd, 1920.

The Committee met at 10 a.m., Mr. Curry in the Chair.

R. P. Fairbairn called and sworn. Examined by Mr. Hill.

Q.—What position do you occupy in the public service?

A.—Deputy Minister of Public Works.

Q.—And as such are in charge of repairs and furnishings in the Parliament Buildings?

A.—Yes, the goods are ordered and the accounts paid through the Public Works.

Q.—You have been asked to produce vouchers and receipts in connection with the account of the Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., \$1,015.98. Have you those here?

A.—Yes (accounts produced).

Q.—Have you the Vivid Electric Lamp account—\$304.77?

A.—Those are just bulbs used in the buildings from time to time.

Q.—Who is the Vivid Lamp Co.?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Is it a Toronto concern?

A.—I don't know. The account will show (accounts produced).

Q.—The Adams Furniture Company? (accounts produced).

Q.—Mr. Fairbairn, in this account of the Adams Furniture Co., dated January 12, 1920, there is an item of \$90 for a wardrobe, a mahogany wardrobe—who was that for?

A.—The Minister of Public Works, a wardrobe for his office or his apartments, I can't say which.

Q.—What do you mean by his apartments?

A.—When this building was designed first there were apartments designed for the Ministers. A room adjoining the Minister's office has been occupied by him when he was in the city.

Q.—Then this mahogany wardrobe is for his private living apartment?

A.—Either one, the office or the apartment.

Q.—Which is it for?

A.—I cannot say it is for the office; it is for the room adjoining the office.

Q.—The living apartment?

A.—The sleeping room; the room adjoining the office.

Q.—That is where he lives while in Toronto?

A.—As far as I know.

Q.—This wardrobe is for that purpose?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In this account of October 4, 1920, there is a purchase of jardiniere stands; what is that for?

A.—For flowers for the Speaker's apartments.

Q.—Now, the account of the Canadian General Electric (account produced). I have here an account of Grand and Toy of September 10, 1920, for one oak wardrobe, \$67.50. Do you recall what that was ordered for?

A.—That is for the Inspector of Theatres, Mr. Elliott.

Q.—Does he live down there?

A.—No, that is just an office wardrobe.

Q.—I have an account here of the T. Eaton Company, dated November 27, 1919—one brass bed, duplex springs, mattress, down pillows—do you recall who all this was purchased for?

A.—Mr. Lee, the housekeeper, brought in a requisition for those. I do not recall what they were for, now.

Q.—We will have to get Mr. Lee here then?

A.—He has charge of the Speaker's apartments and the furniture in this section of the buildings.

Q.—This tapestry Chesterfield—you don't know for whom that was purchased?

A.—No, I don't.

Q.—That was \$250—or this one for \$129?

A.—I don't recall the particular item. Mr. Lee would know. If I were to refer to the requisition I probably could find it.

Q.—The requisitions are not here?

A.—No.

Q.—I have an account here of Muray-Kay, dated Nov. 20—two pair of blankets, \$25 each. Do you know for whom those were purchased?

A.—For the Speaker's apartments.

Q.—I have an account here of the Murray-Kay Company, dated June 23, 1920—Axminster carpet \$151.25, one Wilton rug \$84. Do you know for what purpose those were purchased?

A.—I cannot say definitely what room they were for. The carpet taken from Dr. Preston's room was used to fit up other offices, and that was the carpet for that room, the one that replaced it.

Q.—Who occupies that room now?

A.—The Minister without portfolio, Mr. Carmichael.

Q.—There is an account here of the T. Eaton Co., dated June 28, 1920, "one tapestry rocker, \$83.50." Who wanted the tapestry rocker?

A.—I really cannot say whose office that was for.

Q.—Office? You didn't require a tapestry rocker for an office. Can't you tell us what that was for?

A.—It indicates it there—the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. MR. SMITH: Can you tell us whether any preceding Ministers removed any articles out of the rooms when they went away?

A.—There were some of the preceding Ministers who wanted to get some of the articles that they were attached to, and in every case when an article was taken they paid the full price. That would account for some refurnishing.

MR. HILL: The former Ministers paid for what they took out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is this tapestry rocker in Mr. Smith's office?

A.—I really cannot say.

Q.—I have an account here of Murray-Kay, dated January 15, 1920; another Axminster carpet \$121.13, another \$133, border \$93.38—for whom was that purchased?

A.—Without the requisition I cannot say.

Q.—Can you bring the requisition here?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That would show exactly for what office or private apartment these were purchased?

A.—They may or may not. Mr. Lee would explain at that time what was wanted.

Q.—Here is a T. Eaton Co. account dated September 13, 1920. Can you tell us for whom these articles were purchased?

A.—Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Agriculture.

Q.—One box mattress for mahogany bed, \$32; one mahogany bed, \$92; mahogany chair, \$185; mahogany rocker, \$190; mahogany chiffonier, \$88.50; mahogany dresser, \$139; one silver brown rocker, \$52.50; one walnut table, \$52.50; one mahogany somnolent, \$9; one Chesterfield, \$160; slip covers for Chesterfield and three chairs, \$11.25; total, \$904.75. Mr. Doherty doesn't live in the building, does he?

A.—He has a room adjoining his office, originally designed for the Minister's use. It had been used as an office during the last few months or year, but was returned to Mr. Doherty. Although he lives in Toronto, his home was closed during the summer time. He was not in good health and needed his room, so he refurnished it. It is really an adjunct to his office, a room where, if he is not feeling well, he can go and lie down.

Q.—And I suppose all this mahogany makes him feel better?

A.—The room Mr. Duff occupied was occupied by the Minister of Education, so this had to be returned and was furnished for Mr. Doherty.

Q.—I see there were also two screens, \$30; a pair of curtains, \$41.26; poles, fittings, etc., \$8.70; window shades, \$3E6. He has a pretty nice room?

A.—Yes; it is fitted up right.

Q.—There is another account here of the T. aton Co. of March 5, 1920, can you tell for whom that was purchased?

A.—That was for the Board of Censors on Richmond street west. When the lady censors were appointed they fitted up a room for them there.

Q.—One mahogany Chesterfield, \$210; one mahogany arm rocker, \$45; one rug, \$165. They are still there for the lady censors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who is O. Elliott, who certifies that this is proper?

A.—He is the inspector of theatres. It is also certified by Mr. Heakes.

Q.—Who is Mr. Heakes?

A.—The Provincial Architect.

Q.—This account of January 8, 1920, who was that purchased for?

A.—I think that was for the Minister of Public Works.

Q.—One chiffonier—that is for his apartment?

A.—For his office. It is practically his office, adjoining his office

Q.—It is where he lives?

A.—No, he conducts a great deal of Government business there.

Q.—His bed is there. What I mean is that that is his living apartment?

A.—I would not call it a living apartment. When he stays here at night attending to Government business, he sleeps in that room. When he is in the city he lives there.

Q.—What is “one plate glass top, \$52”?

A.—That is a plate glass top that was put on the office desk to protect it from injury. Also they keep memorandums under it.

Q.—T. Eaton Co., June 8, 1920, “one scarf, \$6.50; centrepiece, \$7.25.” Goods received, G. Forester. What were they for?

A.—Those are for the Minister of Public Works.

Q.—Why is he buying scarfs?

A.—He certified to the goods being there.

Q.—But why should the Minister of Public Works buy a scarf at the expense of the Government?

A.—It is not a scarf to wear, it is for furniture.

Q.—For the chiffonier, perhaps?

A.—Perhaps.

Q.—There is another account of Eaton's, of August 11, 1920, “one screen, \$18.50; one Wilton rug, \$92.50.” For whom was that purchased?

A.—Mr. Lee would know that.

Q.—Would the same thing apply to the account dated August 20, 1920, “tapestry, \$24.05?” Would we have to get that from Mr. Lee?

A.—Yes, unless there is something on the account to indicate.

Q.—There is the account of Grand and Toy, January 6, 1920, for the Minister of Labor, one mahogany wardrobe, \$67.50; one oak wardrobe, \$55.

A.—That would be in the office of the Minister of Labour. He has no sleeping apartments.

Q.—Does he require two wardrobes in his office ?

HON. MR. SMITH: He has two offices, hasn't he?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In one office they had mahogany furniture?

A.—Yes; it was in 15 Queen's Park. One of the rooms furnished in mahogany when Mr. Riddell first furnished it. This mahogany wardrobe was to harmonize with the furniture in the room.

MR. HILL: Here is an Eaton account of May 20, 1920. Who was that ordered for?

A.—There is nothing to indicate, except that Mr. Lee certified to it.

Q.—One davenport, \$111; one tapestry chair, \$59.50; one tapestry chair, \$62; one smoker's stand, \$7.75; tax on smoker's stand, \$1.55. Then here is a T. Eaton account of November 11, 1919. For whom was that ordered?

A.—That was for the Department of the Attorney-General.

HON. MR. SMITH: That was during the regime of the late Government?

A.—Yes; an old account that was not paid then.

MR. HILL: None of these supplies for the buildings are purchased by tender, are they?

A.—They are purchased by tender, practically. When a requisition comes in to the department the secretary of the department knows where the goods can be bought most cheaply, and he gets prices, and places the order accordingly.

MR. WARREN: In the case of this furniture taken away by the late Ministers, were there vouchers to show what money was paid for it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—We can get them?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: That was furniture purchased by the Government for the different rooms and offices?

A.—I can only recall one particular case and I am not sure whether it was a floor covering or curtains, but the full price the Government paid was paid by the Minister.

MR. HILL: Here is an account of the T. Eaton Co. dated February 21, 1921: Mahogany couch, \$125—for whom was that purchased?

A.—I am not sure. Mr. Lee can tell you.

Q.—Have you given all the accounts of the T. Eaton Co.?

A.—Yes.

MR. WARREN: Might it be true that where a Minister has a furnished room in connection with his office, where he can sleep, he would be putting in longer hours at his duties than he would if living outside?

A.—There is no doubt about it. The Minister of the Crown is not an eight-hour-day man. He is a 24-hour-a-day man. ?

Q.—With his sleeping room there he is right in touch with his work all the time?

A.—Yes.

MR. HILL: There is another account of the T. Eaton Co., dated March 2, 1920—for whom was that ordered?

A.—The Minister of Public Works.

Q.—That is for his sleeping apartments?

A.—For his office.

Q.—Is that for his sleeping office then, or his day office?—carpets, \$157?

A.—I am not sure which office it is.

Q.—There is another on March 2, 1920—the same thing applies? It was either for his night or his day office?

A.—That is for the Minister of Public Works.

Q.—Shadow cloth, \$112.50; poles, brackets, curtains, etc., \$159.71. In connection with the Standard Sanitary item, was any bathroom fitted up for any Minister's room?

A.—No.

Q.—No new bathroom installed?

A.—No.

Q.—If it had been installed it would have been done under you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there a bathroom installed in the Minister of Mines room off his office?

A.—Possibly there was in the Minister of Mines' room. The plans were changed so frequently I cannot say what was installed.

Q.—Who did the work?

A.—It was our own plumbers who did the work.

Q.—Can you give us the cost of that?

A.—I could look it up if necessary.

Q.—There is an account here of W. H. Steele dated June 14 1920. Was any tender called for that?

A.—Yes there is a written tender attached to it.

Q.—He was asked for an estimate and gave it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—No other concerns were asked for an estimate?

A.—The work is distributed among those in that line.

Q.—If tenders had been called for they would be attached to this?

A.—No; only the one would be attached to the voucher. The others would be filed in the office.

Q.—You can say this was the successful tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You don't know whether others were asked to tender for these particular awnings or not?

A.—Possibly there were. We get different prices from those in that line.

MR. PINARD: There are many items here. I have one here of \$90—two vertical filing cabinets four single flat-top desks. Was there any tender asked for those?

A.—There was a quotation given to the secretary of the department for

every one purchased.

Q.—By different merchants?

A.—Yes; we purchased from the lowest offer.

Q.—Can you tell me where the furniture placed in the Prime Minister's room was bought from?

A.—From Eaton's.

Q.—Have you got the Eaton bills here?

A.—No. They were not purchased last year. They are in this year.

MR. HILL: Purchased since the 31st of October, 1920?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Goldie and McCullough account of \$250, have you the voucher for that?

A.—That was for desks. There were just two, as far as I can recall—one for the Factory Inspector and one for the Boiler Inspector.

Q.—The account of the W. R. Brock Co., three rugs, \$22.50. What can you tell us about them?

A.—Nothing further than that they were requisitioned, purchased, certified to and paid.

Q.—What were they purchased for?

A.—They were purchased for the automobiles.

MR. PRICE: Were they for the garage or the automobiles themselves?

A.—For the autos.

MR. HILL: Have you the Cuttem and Foster account? (account produced).

MR. FAIRBAIRN: I notice that in the accounts we have been looking at there are accounts for repairs to automobiles. Don't you do the repairs to your own cars in the garage?

A.—The repairs in the garage are done by our own mechanics.

Q.—Some of these bills are for supplies, but a great many are for repairs.

A.—Repairs to headlamps, fenders and so on, that sort of thing is done in the garage. All minor repairs are supposed to be done in the garage. There may be occasions when we require work to be done quickly and they may not be able to do it. Some outside repairs are done sometimes like that.

MR. WARREN: Wouldn't these be repairs to cars of the engineers on the roads?

A.—No; these are in Toronto.

Witness excused.

A. E. Dunlop called and sworn. Examined by Hon. Mr. Henry.

Q.—You are in the Provincial Secretary's Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is your occupation?

A.—Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities for the Province.

Q.—You are responsible for the purchases for the public institutions?

A.—Largely so.

Q.—You purchase all meat and such articles?

A.—I do.

Q.—Some years ago there was an abattoir operated at the Ontario Reformatory that was not in operation during the last stages of the war?

A.—I think we closed the abattoir either in September or in August of 1918.

Q.—Were you operating in the last fiscal year?

A.—When the D. S. C. R. took over the plant at Guelph, we continued the abattoir for a little while after that, but found it was unsatisfactory trying to operate a part of the plant like that, so we closed down.

Q.—You hadn' it in operation during the fiscal year of 1920?

A.—No.

Q.—You opened it since?

A.—Yes, approximately two months ago.

Q.—It has been running from the 1st of January?

A.—No; I would say from about the middle of January.

The Committee then adjourned.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE,

March 30, 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a.m., Mr. Curry in the chair.

R. P. Fairbairn, called and sworn.

MR. HILL: Mr. Fairbairn, you were asked to produce further accounts? Accounts produced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fairbairn, I saw in the papers some reference to a \$100 coal scuttle; do you know anything of that account?

A.—That was not asked me. It was just some conversation in the room. I know nothing about it.

Q.—Do you know anything of such an account?

A.—No, I know nothing of it?

Q.—To your knowledge no coal scuttle at \$100 was ever purchased?

A.—I never heard of it at all.

Q.—As far as you are concerned nothing of that kind went through your department?

A.—No.

Mr. Lee called and sworn; examined by Mr. Hill.

Q.—Mr. Lee, you are the housekeeper, I understand, did you order furniture and supplies?

A.—Partly.

Q.—We have an account here of Murray-Kay, dated November 28, for \$54, and certified correct by you. For whom were those goods purchased?

A.—For the Ministers.

Q.—Which Ministers?

A.—I cannot swear positively which one. I remember getting them for the Ministers.

Q.—Three quilts at \$18 each? For which Ministers?

A.—I cannot recall which.

Q.—Cannot you recall any one?

A.—I might have an idea, but I am on oath.

Q.—What is your idea?

A.—The three Ministers in the west end.

Q.—Give me those three?

A.—The weather was cold, and they were asking for more bedclothing.

Q.—Who were they?

A.—I believe Mr. Bowman, Mr. Grant and Mr. Mills were the three; I am not positive.

Q.—I have here the account of the T. Eaton Company of May 20, 1920, which you have signed for. Can you tell me for whom those goods were ordered?

A.—The first item, of course, is for the house, and the davenport chair is for Mr. Grant's office.

Q.—The others were for Mr. Grant's office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—One davenport, \$111; one tapestry chair, \$59.50; one tapestry chair, \$62; one smoker's stand, \$7.75; one parlor table, \$19.75. Was this for his business office or his retiring office?

A.—His business office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why was that necessary—hadn't it been furnished before?

A.—No, not that particular room. It was originally a bathroom adjoining his office. He had it made into a little retiring room where he might lie down.

MR. HILL: You told us it was for his regular office.

A.—This was a bathroom off the office.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is not now used as a bathroom, but as a retiring room for the Minister?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—For him to lie down in, and it was so furnished?

A.—That it so, exactly.

Q.—Where are the bath fixtures?

A.—They were removed.

MR. HILL: When was this done?

A.—Immediately before we got this.

Q.—That would be in May, 1920?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was a bathroom fitted up for Mr. Mills?

A.—No—yes there was, on the ground floor?

A.—Adjoining his business office.

Q.—Is that where he sleeps?

A.—No.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was the bathroom off the Minister of Education's office? Who was that used by?

A.—That is the room we were speaking of.

Q.—It was used as a bathroom?

A.—Yes. The room was always there. It was changed, the bath was removed and the davenport was put there, so the Minister could lie down.

Q.—The present Minister is using it as a retiring room?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—Here is the account of Grand and Toy of March 25, 1920, "one double wardrobe, \$120."

A.—I don't know anything about that, it was not purchased by me.

Q.—Then the account of February 23, 1920, \$324.90. Tell us for whom that was ordered?

A.—The Speaker's apartments.

Q.—The account of the T. Eaton Company, one mahogany couch, maroon leather, \$125?

Q.—For his retiring office?

A.—No, for his office proper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why was it necessary to furnish the Speaker's apartments. Hadn't they been furnished before?

A.—These were replacements, every year goods are replenished.

Q.—Here is the account of the T. Eaton Co. of January 28, 1920, "One tapestry rocker, \$83.50," who was that purchased for?

A.—I didn't buy that, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the one placed in Mr. Smith's office?

A.—Yes, that is the one.

Q.—Do you know when that came in?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you know if it came in before Mr. Smith came in?

A.—No.

MR. HILL: There is the T. Eaton account of December 24, 1919, the day before Christmas, "one footstool, \$9.75; one scarf, \$5.75—for whom was that purchased?

Q.—The office or the retiring room?

A.—The office.

Q.—The office proper?

A.—The room adjoining.

Q.—Then it is the room adjoining the office, not the office?

A.—No.

Q.—One footstool, \$9.75; one scarf, \$5.75; two centrepieces, \$1.70; two scarfs, \$3.00.

A.—Those are not scarfs—merely table covers.

Q.—Then the account of the T. Eaton Company dated January 8, 1920, curtains, \$11.58, for whom were those purchased?

A.—I believe they were for Mr. Bowman's private room.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many?

A.—Three pair.

Q.—They would not be expensive curtains at that?

A.—No, very inexpensive, just pieces of net to cover the nakedness of the windows, that is all.

MR. HILL: Murray-Kay, Ltd., an account of January 25, an Axminster carpet, for whom was that purchased?

A.—I think one was for Mr. Grigg's office, and the other—at the time there were many changes in the office, and it is hard to remember. Mr. Gibson's office was taken by Mr. Grigg, and the carpet was lifted and placed in the stenographers' room. I placed a new carpet in the Deputy's office for Mr. Grigg, and I placed another carpet in the new office for Mr. Gibson, but which is which I am not positive, but those two carpets were ordered about the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be replenishing?

A.—Oh, yes.

MR. HILL: There is an account here of the T. Eaton Co., dated February, 9, 1920, one Wilton carpet, \$143. Who was that for?

A.—That was a carpet for Dr. Waugh of the Department of Education. A new office was created there, and it had to be furnished.

Q.—What is that memorandum in lead pencil there "MM?" Did you lay a carpet in Mr. Mills' office. Isn't that Mr. Mills carpet?

A.—No. I got one carpet from the T. Eaton Company and two from Murray-Kay about the same time.

Q.—That looks like Mr. Mills' carpet—you have written his name there.

A.—That may be what I thought at the time. It might possibly be that.

A.—That may be what I thought at the time. It might possibly be that. It may be the one for his office. I am not positive.

Q.—Is that his office or his retiring office?

A.—His office proper.

Q.—Here is another account of the T. Eaton Co., January 23, 1920, apparently carpets, \$488. What offices were those for?

A.—There are two carpets there. That was for Col. Carmichael's office.

Q.—The both of them?

A.—Yes, there are two rooms.

Q.—That is the bedroom and the office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the amount of these two carpets was \$488.26?

A.—Yes. I don't know whether you have been buying carpets lately—

Q.—We are not asking you that.

HON. MR. SMITH: Was there any carpet in that room when Col. Car-

michael took over the office?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Who had occupied that room previously?

A.—Dr. Preston. After Dr. Preston left the room was used for other purposes. We took the carpet up and used it in other offices. When Col. Carmichael took the place the room was bare, and we had to furnish it.

Q.—When you say the room was bare do you mean the office or the bedroom?

A.—Both of them were bare. When the room was discontinued, instead of buying new carpets and furniture we used those there.

THE CHAIRMAN: What were these two rooms used for before?

A.—They were used for Dr. Preston, the Whip.

Q.—One as an office and one as a bedroom?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What happened to the furniture in Dr. Preston's bedroom?

A.—We have part of it in the storeroom, the most of it was used in other places.

MR. HILL: Why didn't you put that furniture back in the room?

A.—It wasn't suitable. It was a folding bed, and I didn't consider it safe and didn't use it again.

DR. GODFREY: It was a pretty fine bed wasn't it?

A.—It was in use many years.

MR. HILL: Couldn't it be repaired?

A.—I did not think it was safe anyway.

Q.—What sort of bed did you put in its place?

A.—A brass bed.

DR. GODFREY: Didn't it suit Dr. Preston?

A.—Oh, yes, it suited Dr. Preston well enough, but I had to have it repaired more than once.

Q.—It suited any ordinary person?

A.—I don't know about any ordinary person. It suited Dr. Preston.

MR. HILL: What happened to the chairs in the room. Are they still in the storeroom?

A.—No, they were distributed in different places.

Q.—The only article of furniture left is the folding bed?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it your notion that you did not put that in—Col. Carmichael had nothing to do with it?

A.—He knew nothing of it.

HON. MR. SMITH: In the old days the Whip had an office and room here?

A.—Yes, sir.

DR. GODFREY: Wasn't the Whip, Dr. Preston, Minister without portfolio?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And in the same position as Col. Carmichael?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. HILL: Did the entire Cabinet sleep in the buildings?

A.—Most of the Ministers slept here at times.

Q.—How many bedrooms were there under the old Government?

A.—Nine I think.

Q.—Furnished bedrooms?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where were they?

A.—The different Ministers, with the exception of the Premier—six in the east end and two in the west end.

Q.—Bedrooms fitted up?

A.—Yes.

MR. WARREN: A considerable amount of furnishings were taken away by the late Ministers?

A.—No, not a considerable amount. One of the Ministers took some furniture, or rather, purchased it.

MR. HILL: Just go over those rooms and enumerate them.

A.—The Minister of Agriculture—

Q.—We were told the other day there was no bedroom for the Minister of Agriculture.

A.—That is easily explained. The late Mr. Duff could not sleep well downstairs, and asked to have a room upstairs. He gave up the room he was using as a bedroom for office use and in exchange got a room upstairs, but he still had a room.

Q.—Where was this room?

A.—At the back of the Minister of Agriculture's office. It is now used as a bedroom again.

Q.—You said Mr. Duff didn't use that room?

A.—Since Mr. Duff's death there has been no bedroom there.

Q.—There was no bedroom on the ground floor there until it was furnished for Mr. Doherty?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—How long is it since Mr. Duff died?

A.—He has been dead three or four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where was the Minister of Agriculture's room after it was changed?

A.—Upstairs.

MR. HILL: Where is that now?

A.—At the present time Mr. Grant is using that particular room.

Q.—What other rooms were there?

A.—The Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Crown Lands, the Provincial Secretary.

Q.—Where is the Provincial Secretary's bedroom?

A.—Adjoining his office.

Q.—Had that been used?

A.—I don't know whether it was at that time. The bedrooms were used generally by the Ministers when they were kept late. They didn't use them all the time. They were there for their convenience. I noticed that that was how they were used.

Q.—That was the only way they were used under the Hearst Government?

A.—They were at the convenience of the Ministers.

Q.—You have given us three—Agriculture, Crown Lands and Provincial Secretary.

Q.—I am talking about the old Government.

A.—There was the Minister without portfolio, Dr. Preston.

Q.—Mr. Grant is now using the bedroom that was occupied by the Minister of Agriculture?

A.—Mr. Grant is using that room. Mr. Doherty is using his own room.

Q.—You are getting confused. I am trying to find out what rooms were used by the Ministers under the old administration.

A.—I have already told you. The only difference is that the late Mr. Duff's room was changed to upstairs, and when Mr. Doherty came it was taken back and put in the same place again.

Q.—Under the old administration there were rooms for the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Crown Lands, the Provincial Secretary, the Provincial Treasurer and Dr. Preston?

A.—Yes.

A MEMBER: Mr. McKeown had a room?

A.—Yes.

MR. WARREN: Was he a Minister?

A.—No.

Q.—Which was his room?

A.—That used by the Hon. Mr. Mills at the present time. I might explain that Mr. McKeown used his room as an office. It was the only office he had in the building.

MR. HILL: An office with a bed in it?

A.—Yes.

MR. SMITHS: Did the late Attorney-General not have a room?

A.—Yes. I overlooked that.

DR. GODFREY: Where was Mr. Lucas' room?

A.—It was just off the passage as you go down to his office. Right on the same floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is the room occupied as a law office.

A.—Mr. Elliott had it last year. It is used now as an office.

MR. HALL: Didn't the Premier have a room?

A.—No, sir.

MR. HILL: Where was the furniture from Mr. McKeown's room taken?

A.—It was placed in the storeroom.

Q.—And you ordered entirely new furniture for Mr. Mills?

A.—I don't remember. I think it is the same bed. You see the furnishings were the usual office furniture. It was an office with a bed in it?

Q.—That was all it was?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—What rooms of the Ministers were entirely or largely refurnished when the new administration came in?

A.—Mr. Mills, the Minister of Agriculture's room, and Mr. Bowman's.

Q.—Mr. Bowman's, Mr. Doherty's and Mr. Mills'?

A.—Yes, and Mr. Carmichael's.

Q.—And the furniture in these rooms was taken out and put in the storeroom?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. JOHNSON (LANARK)—Why was it necessary to furnish Mr. Bowman's room?

A.—Because there was no furniture in it of any kind.

Q.—I understood you to say the former Minister bought some of the furnishings?

A.—We sold Mr. Ferguson some of the furniture there.

MR. HILL—All the furniture taken out had been paid for?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was taken out?

A.—If my memory serves me right, there was the bedstead, the bedding and curtains. He bought the bed furniture, the curtains and carpets.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the mattress and pillows?

A.—Yes.

MR. HILL: What happened to the furniture?

A.—The furniture was removed.

Q.—It was taken and put in the storeroom?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you positive the bedstead and fittings were taken out and purchased by the retiring Minister?

A.—I am satisfied he bought some and I think those are the articles mentioned.

Q.—If I told you that all he purchased was the curtains and rugs, what would you say?

A.—My impression is that he bought the bed with the curtains and rugs. I am not sure.

MR. JOHNSON: Can you tell us how much was paid for these articles

A.—Yes, I have a statement in my pocket.

MR. WIDDIFIELD: How does that correspond with the present prices?

A.—It is a fair valuation. I was fourteen years in the furniture business and I know something about it. They asked for these goods, they were attached to them. I took it up and placed a fair valuation on them, and my assistant put another valuation on them. We differed \$15, so we put on that

extra \$15 to the price.

Q.—In that valuation did you consider the advance in prices, that these were purchased when prices were considerably lower?

A.—I considered the value of the worn furniture. The furniture had been used for a number of years. In fact I knew very well that if another person came in he probably would have the furniture renewed.

DR. GODFREY: You would have had to put that much less stuff in the junk pile. It would not suit the other man coming in?

Q.—When you move into another room there are always changes. We expect that. I never knew anyone yet who, if they could afford it, would not buy rugs or something. It is so with the Ministers. If they see something they don't want they naturally say so.

MR. JOHNSTON (Simcoe): It has always been the practice here?

A.—Surely. One of my duties is to look after the Ministers in that respect, and naturally I am in close touch with them.

MR. WARREN: Do the Ministers do anything in the way of suggesting what is wanted?

A.—Not at all. It is generally left to myself.

Q.—You buy without consulting the Ministers?

A.—I need never consult them. I get what appeals to me as making up a harmonious whole.

Q.—You were apparently correct in saying he got more than the curtains. This statement here is for \$240. Surely that is more than would be required for the curtains and rugs?

A.—We made him pay a fair price for what he got. When he asked permission to buy them, I said of course we would have to put a valuation on them and see what they were worth. I made a valuation and my assistant made another valuation.

Q.—When you spoke of taking goods out and putting them in the storeroom, do they stay there or are they used again?

A.—They are continually being taken out again. When a requisition is put in for a piece of furniture, the Deputy naturally says: "Has Mr. Lee got anything?" The storeroom is visited, and they get the piece of furniture wanted if it is there. We use all we can in that way.

Q.—You don't charge the storeroom with what you take out?

A.—No, sir.

MR. HILL: Did any of the old Ministers live permanently in this building?

A.—I cannot say they did, sir. They used them whenever they thought proper. I would not like to say who did and who did not.

DR. GODFREY: They were residing in different places in Toronto. Mr. Lucas had his own home?

A.—Yes. Sometimes they would go to a hotel and then they would get tired of the hotel and move back to their room. I know that for a positive fact from remarks made. I have heard them saying they were sick and tired of hotel life and had to move back.

MR. WARREN: These rooms were always at their disposal?

A.—Yes, the rooms were always there.

DR. GODFREY: Did the Prime Minister have a room here?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—He had a house in town?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—Did Sir James Whitney have a room here?

A.—No.

Q.—He had a house in town?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—During the session, was it not a fact that Mr. Ferguson and Mr. McGarry and others stayed at the Queen's Hotel?

A.—Part of the time.

Q.—They didn't make this an apartment house, did they?

A.—They used the rooms when they saw fit. I know they largely used the hotels during the session.

MR. TOLMIE: As I understand the situation these men had their houses in town, the Prime Minister and so on, and they also had rooms at the hotel and occasionally they stayed here if late at night?

A.—The rooms were always at their disposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: They stayed here at other times than when working late at night?

A.—At any time they thought fit.

Q.—They would be here at different times?

A.—At any time they saw fit to remain the rooms were there for them, just as they are now.

MR. HILL: Not just as they are now. The rooms have been re-arranged.

MR. WARREN: Dr. Godfrey says this has been turned into an apartment or boarding-house. Do the Ministers get free board here?

A.—No.

DR. GODFREY: The Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario was down at the Alexandra Apartments last year, isn't that so?

A.—I heard so, I believe he was.

Q.—He comes up here and gets a room, a palatial place, and saves what he would otherwise spend?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a conclusion, not evidence.

DR. GODFREY: Does the Prime Minister pay anything for the apartments he has in the Buildings?

A.—No.

Q.—Does the Prime Minister save his rental at the Alexandra Apartments?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a conclusion. You cannot ask him to draw a conclusion.

MR. TOLMIE: I was going to ask, is it correct that nine bedrooms were used by the former Cabinet Ministers and others?

A.—Including the Speaker's, I think there were nine.

Q.—How many rooms are there now?

A.—I think, perhaps, one other.

MR. TOOMS: Do the Ministers take these apartments in the Buildings in order to facilitate business?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a conclusion. He cannot answer that.

MR. TOLMIE: Have any of the Ministers more than one room, one retiring room, or whatever you call it?

A.—I don't think so.

MR. HILL: Oh, yes, they have. You told us of one who has a retiring room and also a bedroom?

A.—If you call that a room. I don't call it a room. I call it an adjacent to the office.

MR. WIDDIFIELD: We understand that some of these former Ministers entertained themselves down town at their own expense. The Department was under the same expense in each case whether they did or not?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—The apartments were there just the same?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What difference did it make in public expenditure whether they did or not?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—The apartments were there just the same?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What difference did it make in public expenditure whether they entertained themselves down town or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: That, of course, is a conclusion. He cannot answer that. You can put the question in this way: Mr. Lee, was anything charged to the Province in addition to what you say. The rooms are there to be used and whether they are used or not, does it cost the Province any more or any less?

A.—I think not.

Q.—The dining room has been there how many years?

A.—Since the House was built.

Q.—And to your knowledge has been used as a dining room how long?

A.—Sixteen years.

Q.—The kitchen, pantries, etc., have been in continuous use those sixteen years?

A.—Always.

Q.—And the expense of that is borne by whom?

A.—The Government finds the fittings and utensils. The caterers find what the people put in their mouths and charge for it accordingly.

Q.—The caterer charges enough to pay for the food?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Whether you use it or not it doesn't cost the Government any more than the more you use the equipment the quicker it wears?

A.—No.

Q.—And that has been running for sixteen years to your knowledge

A.—Since Confederation.

MR. TOLMIE: Was there not originally a dining room for the members?

A.—There was, and there was not. At the time they remodelled the west end, Col. Hendrie was chairman of the Building Committee, and he conceived the idea that there should be a room for the members only. He apportioned this very room where we are now for that purpose. It was never used by the members. Perhaps one or two would straggle in and perhaps not. Therefore it was discontinued and used for other purposes. The members didn't appreciate it, for they seldom used it.

MR. HILL: Who makes up these rooms, the maids?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you had to engage extra maids on account of the Ministers living here permanently?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—The same number of maids?

A.—Yes, each maid has thirteen rooms they clean every day, rooms or offices.

HON. MR. SMITH: Do the present Ministers live here permanently?

A.—No, sir. None of the Ministers to-day live here permanently.

MR. HILL: What do you mean?

A.—They come and go.

Q.—Have they any apartments in the city?

A.—I haven't any idea—I never asked them.

Q.—There is an account here of the Murray-Kay Company for a carpet, \$257.31, who was that purchased for?

A.—I think that was for the Hon. Mr. Rollo.

Q.—What room is he occupying—has he a bedroom?

A.—No.

Q.—Where does he live?

A.—I believe he lives in Hamilton.

Q.—He hasn't a room in the building?

A.—He has a room, but not a bedroom.

Q.—This carpet at \$257.31 was for his office?

A.—I believe that is correct.

Q.—I have another account here, of the T. Eaton Company. Who was that purchased for?

A.—That was for the room now used by the Hon. Mr. Bowman. I saw in the paper that a chair was bought for one of the Ministers at \$129. Nothing of the kind, that chair was returned.

Q.—This is an account for one brass bed, \$43.50, duplex spring, \$10.75, mattress, \$22, in addition to pillows, \$7.50, one tapestry chesterfield, \$250, one reposing chair, \$129, 50 yards of towelling, \$51, two pair of blankets, \$39?

A.—Excuse me, that \$129 chair was returned.

Q.—Two comforters, \$30; two spreads, \$16.50; one dozen towels, \$18; six dozen towels?

A.—Those are for the general use of the House, not for Mr. Bowman.

Q.—Here is an account of the T. Eaton Co. of December 16, 1919. For whom were those purchased?

A.—Those are chairs I got for Mr. Bowman instead of the one at \$129.

Q.—That is, one rocker, \$35.50, and one arm-chair, \$35. Then the account of the T. Eaton Co. of December 6, 1919, for whom were those purchased?

A.—The library table for Hon. Mr. Raney's office. The linoleum was generally for the house. I could not tell you if you if you gave me a million which rooms they went into.

Q.—The library table at \$85 was for Mr. Raney?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why was that necessary for Mr. Raney's office?

A.—Mr. Raney required it to put his books and different things on. He had not enough room for papers and required a table, so I got a table to match the furniture in his office.

Q.—You chose the table?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He required it for office purposes?

A.—Yes.

MR. HILL: The account of the Murray Kay Company, one Axminster carpet, \$198.

A.—I think, if I remember right, I think that must be the carpet in Mills' office, on the ground floor. I think so. I know these carpets were purchased at the time of the changes but I don't remember exactly which was which. But a carpet was got at that time for Mr. Mills' office.

Q.—Is there one carpet or are there two carpets there?

A.—There was only one carpet in Mills' office.

Witness Excused.

R. P. FAIRBURN recalled:

MR. DEWART: I am anxious to find out what rooms or accommodation in the buildings previously used for office purposes is not so used for the same purposes now, since the first of January, 1920. What quarters in the buildings have been vacated by any particular branch of the service?

A.—The License Board went down to 46 Richmond Street.

Q.—Yes, when was that?

A.—I don't know the exact date. It was to provide accommodation that was sadly needed in the buildings.

Q.—A year ago last June?

A.—About that time.

Q.—Any other board?

A.—The Railway and Municipal Board went out about January of this year, to 47 Queen's Park. The Motor Vehicles Branch of the Highways Department went to 15 Queen's Park.

MR. DEWART: By what branches of the service had 15 Queen's Park, been used before?

A.—The Department of Labour.

Q.—Then the moving picture branch, the Board of Censors, were they moved?

A.—They were moved earlier than that.

Q.—When did they move?

A.—They moved about February, 1919.

Q.—Are those the only ones?

A.—There were one or two single offices. Mr. Dane who has charge of settlers' loans, under the northern development work has an office at 46 Richmond. He was formerly in the building. The chief officer of the Parole Board also has an office there. I think those are all.

Q.—Was there any room occupied by the motion pictures or any room used for that in the buildings during the last year?

A.—There was a room occupied as an office and occasionally used for showing pictures.

Q.—Upstairs?

A.—Yes, there was one upstairs.

Q.—What use is that room now put to?

A.—That is a room used by the Premier as a room for himself.

Q.—It is a double room?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Corresponding to the one across the hall downstairs?

A.—Yes, the one the Liberals have now. One is a dark room, there is only one light room.

Q.—Take the quarters that were occupied by the License Board here. For what purpose are they used now?

A.—The northern development branch use several offices and the colonization roads have three offices. The fish and game department have one office, and the highways department have one office.

Q.—What about the quarters formerly occupied by the Railway and Municipal Board?

A.—Those rooms are occupied partly by the sessional stenographers, one by the law officer's department, one by the assistant Clerk of the House, and one by the Highways department.

Q.—This room here you say is the one formerly used by the Motor Vehicles Branch?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the quarters Mr. Dane had—what are they used for?

A.—Mr. Zavitz, who is in charge of forests in the Departments of Lands and Forests has it—that is, the one he left when he left the buildings.

Q.—Where is he now?

A.—Who, Mr. Zavitz?

Q.—Yes.

A.—He is in the buildings.

Q.—Who has the quarters formerly occupied by the Parole Board?

A.—The inspector of Prisons and Public Charities.

Q.—Would it be possible for you to make up a statement of the buildings outside the Parliament Buildings, that are used for departmental purposes?

A.—Yes, there is an order of the House that will be ready in a day or so on that.

Q.—I don't know whether the floor space or the rentals charged were asked for in that order?

A.—No, it was not asked for in the order.

Q.—We can get that?

A.—Yes.

LEONARD C. PARKIN, called and sworn; examined by Mr. Price.

Q.—Where do you carry on business?

A.—Dundas, Ontario.

Q.—What is your business?

A.—Machine shop and garage.

Q.—You are the L. C. Parkin mentioned in the Public Accounts, as having got a contract for five ton chain driven dump trucks, 8 at \$9,100 or a total of \$72,800, and three and one-half ton sterling worm driven trucks as per contract—6 at \$7,516.50, or a total of \$45,099, making a total for the two contracts of \$117,899?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are the same L. C. Parkin mentioned on page 751, of the Public Accounts; “auto storage, repairs and supplies \$1,157.20”?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And a touring car, McLaughlin, \$1,500?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Making a total of \$3,957.28?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—These items as far as the descriptions and the amounts are concerned are correct?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have been paid this amount of money?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I want to go into the details of how you got this contract. Who spoke to you first about this contract, the contract, for trucks at \$117,000 odd?

A.—I got it from the engineer, to the east of Grimsby, that the Department were going to get trucks, in the first place.

Q.—What time would that be?

A.—That was getting on towards the Fall of 1919.

Q.—We will just skip that for a moment. Early in December, 1919, the Hon. Mr. Biggs, called upon you in your garage in Dundas?

A.—Yes, I saw him there.

Q.—On that occasion he spoke to you about these trucks?

A.—Not specifically, no.

Q.—Never mind about specifically or anything else. He spoke to you about the contract?

A.—Oh yes.

Q.—He told you they would be ordering trucks?

A.—He told me the Department were going in for trucks.

Q.—How long did he say it would be before they would be able to place an order?

A.—I do not think he mentioned anything of that nature.

Q.—Does Mr. Biggs live near Dundas?

A.—Yes, about three miles away.

- Q.—You had known him for a considerable time?
- A.—Oh yes.
- Q.—How long?
- A.—I presume six or seven years.
- Q.—Had he done business with you?
- A.—Yes, off and on.
- Q.—What kind of business would that be?
- A.—Fixing for his car and such like.
- Q.—How long after this first occasion was it that Mr. Biggs came in again?
- Did you tell him you would like this contract?
- A.—No.
- Q.—You didn't want the contract?
- A.—I didn't tell him I didn't want it. Anyone would want a contract.
- Q.—Did you tell him you would like to fill that contract?
- A.—I told him I would like to tender, yes.
- Q.—What information did Mr. Biggs give you?
- A.—I don't think on that date there was anything mentioned in that light at all.
- Q.—How long was it after that first occasion that he came in the second time?
- A.—I think it was just at the week-end.
- Q.—He was down here in Toronto at the week-ends and would go and see you as he went through?
- A.—Yes, as he went through.
- Q.—I see here, by the evidence in a suit against you by a man named Reynolds, that the contract was entered into on December 30, 1919?
- A.—I think it would be about that date, yes.
- Q.—How many times did Mr. Biggs come in to see you about it, during the month of December when these conversations were being carried on?
- A.—I cannot say.
- Q.—Did he call in to see you at each week end. In your evidence I think you say half a dozen times?
- A.—I might not have been present some times he was around there.
- Q.—How many times during that month did Mr. Biggs see you about these trucks?
- A.—Do you mean specially the trucks?
- Q.—How many times did he see you in your garage or any place else? In your evidence here you say half a dozen times.
- A.—He has been in there. He came in week-ends and on one or two occasions he has been up for the night.
- Q.—I am asking you definitely how many times he saw you about these trucks. Don't try to flim-flam this Committee because we are not going to have it.
- A.—I am not trying to flim-flam.
- Q.—How many times did he see you about it?
- A.—I think half a dozen times.
- Q.—Then why didn't you say so at first. Then after Mr. Biggs had seen you half a dozen times about these trucks you got down to the contract?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—What did he say to you about the contracts—about how many trucks they would need?
- A.—He said they would need twelve trucks.

Q.—The twelve trucks mentioned in here? You supplied twelve trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he say the amount that would be paid for them?

A.—No.

Q.—Did he ask you?

A.—No, he didn't.

Q.—He just told you you could put in a figure on the contract?

A.—He told me I would have to put in a tender.

Q.—Did anyone else put in a tender?

A.—I am not aware of the fact.

Q.—No one else ever heard of a tender. On what occasion was Reynolds, the plaintiff who sued you, in there with Mr. Biggs?

A.—I think Reynolds overheard Mr. Biggs and myself talking.

Q.—I am not interested in the commission matter. On what occasion was he there?

A.—He was not there, specifically at all.

Q.—Never mind specifically or any other way. On what occasion was he there?

A.—He was there once in the shop and once in the Buildings here.

Q.—This Reynolds was there once when you and Biggs talked about this contract?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In your garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He was here in the Parliament Buildings when you and Biggs talked about the contract, or came down to sign up the contract?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now then, how did you make up this contract. Mr. Biggs told you how many trucks they would need and you started to make up a contract after Mr. Biggs left—that was on the 27th of December?

A.—Yes.

Q.—After Mr. Biggs left?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You knew you were going to get the contract?

A.—No.

Q.—He told you you were going to get the contract?

A.—He didn't tell me.

Q.—But you started to make up your tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and Reynolds sat down and tried to make it out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Just describe what you did?

A.—Well there was one clause in my contract I was not clear about so I went to my lawyer to see whether it was absolutely all right.

Q.—Let me see, you were not quite clear about the contract—did Mr. Biggs leave a contract with you?

A.—No, it was my own contract form.

Q.—A form you had because you were an agent for trucks?

A.—It is just simply an ordinary contract form.

Q.—It was a contract form you used, partly printed and then you filled in certain things describing the truck?

A.—It is all printed.

Q.—What were you in doubt about, in this form?

A.—About the acceptance in ten days. There were fluctuations in prices at that time and differences in exchange on the money.

Q.—Then you went to your lawyer and asked his advice on the printed part. You got that advice?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How did you write it in—from what information did you write in the description of the trucks and what was going to be the contract. How did you get that information to write in the printed form?

A.—Just from the regular price list, the catalogue.

Q.—I see here in your evidence that you say you got it out of your head?

A.—Naturally it would have to come from that source.

Q.—You said in your examination here you got it out of your head?

A.—I think you will find further on that I said I got it out of the catalogue.

Q.—You say now that you didn't get it out of your head, that you referred to some document?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And after you got this tender made out how did you get it to Toronto?

A.—I think Mr. Biggs brought it to Toronto.

Q.—Did you arrange with Mr. Biggs that he was to call and take it to Toronto?

A.—No, I did not.

Q.—How was it he called on the Monday morning of the 29th of December?

A.—I think there was a heavy snow at that time. He drove down to Dundas and I had a car take him to the C.P.R. station.

Q.—He drove to Dundas and called at your garage on the Monday morning after the Saturday on which you fixed up your tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You drove him into the C.P.R. station in Hamilton?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You took your tender?

A.—I took the tender.

Q.—And handed it to Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Driving to Hamilton with Mr. Biggs, what did you talk about in reference to this contract?

A.—I do not know that the contract was talked about at all.

Q.—No mention of it?

A.—No, I don't think so.

Q.—You just said "Mr. Biggs you are going to Toronto and being Minister of Public Works would you please take this tender down?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he took it to Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he tell you when he would get in touch with you again?

A.—No, I don't think he did.

Q.—Just at that point—the evidence of Reynolds is that you told him Mr. Biggs said he would call you at 8 o'clock, and that he did call you that night at 8 o'clock.

A.—I would not swear as to the time, but as regards Reynolds making that statement, it is absolutely untrue.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs say he would call you that night at 8 o'clock?

A.—I don't think there was anything to that effect.

Q.—Now Mr. Parkin—Mr. Biggs did call you Monday night at eight o'clock?

A.—I would not say it was exactly eight o'clock.

Q.—But he called you that night?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Reynolds says you told him that Mr. Biggs was to call you?

A.—That is absolutely untrue.

Q.—Did he call you about eight o'clock?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did he say to you?

A.—He said that if I wished to come down the next morning he would like to have me talk the trucks over with the engineers, which I did.

Q.—Again Mr. Reynolds says—I am going to bring Reynolds here but in the meantime this may facilitate matters—Reynolds says in his examination that you told him Biggs said over the phone that the coast was clear and to come down next morning and be at the buildings at 8 o'clock?

A.—No, sir. It is absolutely untrue.

Q.—You did come down the next morning?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What time did you leave Dundas?

A.—I think about 5.30.

Q.—Reynolds says 5 o'clock—you drove down?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You reached the buildings here at what time? 8 o'clock?

A.—I think I went down town and had breakfast before I came to the buildings.

Q.—You all seem to agree you got here about 8 o'clock?

A.—I think it would be after 8 o'clock. We got to Toronto at 8 o'clock. It would be after 8 o'clock when we got to the buildings.

Q.—When you came to the buildings who did you look up?

A.—I went to Mr. Biggs' office.

Q.—You went to his apartments in the buildings?

A.—No, I went to his office.

Q.—Where was that?

A.—Right at the end of the corridor at the other end of the buildings.

Q.—In the East end of the buildings?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and Reynolds went along there—did you find Mr. Biggs waiting at the door?

A.—No. Mr. Biggs was away at breakfast at the time.

Q.—When Mr. Biggs came along you went into his room?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Into his bedroom?

A.—Well, of course it is a sitting room and a bedroom both.

Q.—There is a bed in the room?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who went in there—Reynolds, yourself and Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long were you in the bedroom?

A.—Oh, probably half an hour, or forty minutes.

Q.—During that half hour or forty minutes what did you discuss? You came down here to clean up this contract, what did you discuss?

A.—What did we talk about?

Q.—Yes?

A.—I don't think anything specially, we talked about the drive down.

Q.—You talked about the drive down—and whether it was raining that morning perhaps?

A.—I don't think it was raining.

Q.—You never mentioned the contract?

A.—Yes the contract was mentioned.

Q.—What did you say about the contract?

A.—He said Hogarth was not in the buildings and we would have to wait until he came.

Q.—That he hadn't reached his office?

A.—No.

Q.—It was a little early?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You waited for Mr. Hogarth to come?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you sign a contract in that room?

A.—No.

Q.—What did you say about the contract when you were in that room?

A.—I do not think, any more than a casual reference that the contract was talked about.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs say then that you would get the contract?

A.—No, he didn't.

Q.—Did you read over the tender with Mr. Biggs?

A.—In which room are you referring to now?

Q.—In the bedroom.

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't have out the contract there?

A.—I didn't have the tender there.

Q.—Did you have any other paper or document there?

A.—No.

Q.—You came down from Dundas at the Minister's suggestion that you come and fix up the contract?

A.—I said I came down to talk the matter over with the engineer.

Q.—The Minister didn't tell you whether you would get a contract or not?

A.—No.

Q.—Then after leaving this room where did you go?

A.—Do you mean the bedroom?

Q.—Yes?

A.—We went through into Mr. Biggs private office.

Q.—Did anyone come into that bedroom before you left it, any other person?

A.—No.

Q.—Then when you left it, it was to go into the sitting room?

A.—Into Mr. Biggs office.

Q.—Did the three of you go into that office?

A.—No.

Q.—You left Mr. Reynolds behind?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He remained in the bedroom?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you got into the sitting room who did you meet there?

A.—Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Who is he?

A.—I understand he is the chief engineer.

Q.—Who was it produced the tender?

A.—Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Tell us just what occurred between Mr. Biggs, Mr. Hogarth and yourself there?

A.—Mr. Hogarth went over the equipment. I think he said he had been down to the distributing office, the wholesale place which was then the Grace Motors. They were Sterling Truck distributors. He said he was looking the trucks over or had a man looking them over. I won't swear which. He just went over the equipment and specified exactly what he wanted, the painting and such like.

Q.—He went over the equipment, looked over your tender and said he had already called down to see Grace Motors?

A.—To see the trucks.

Q.—And you discussed the painting of the trucks—how he wanted them painted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What about time of delivery?

A.—That was specified by March 1st.

Q.—That was written in your contract?

A.—My contract reads: "We intend to deliver on or about." We couldn't go to work and tie ourselves down to one day, so it was put in that they wanted these by March 1st.

Q.—The contract was signed there—the tender was accepted that morning?

A.—Yes.

Q.—After your tender was accepted what did you do?

A.—I went down to the wholesale house.

Q.—The Grace Motors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You saw the manager of the Grace Motors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You took Mr. Reynolds along with you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Reynolds says you were out of the buildings here about 9.30 o'clock?

A.—It would be later than that, about 11 o'clock when we went down to the Grace Motors, and it is only three blocks East of Yonge.

Q.—Then having received this contract—have you the contract there (contract produced by W. A. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways) I see here there are two contracts and that they are dated, the 27th of December, 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The 27th of December was the Saturday that you worked on this in Dundas at your garage?

Q.—The contract reads: "F. C. Biggs, Department of Public Works—The undersigned hereby proposes to furnish six Sterling dump trucks 3½ ton capacity, the price for which, F.O.B. Dundas with catalogue equipment is each \$7,516.50. The following extra equipment will be furnished as described at the following prices. . . . These trucks to be standard worm driven with all-steel body and Woods' hydraulic hoist, cab and storm curtains, electric light equipment. . . . 6 trucks \$7,516.50 making a total of \$45,099. Terms ten per cent. on execution of contract, the balance, settlement on delivery as follows": Then there is this "It is our purpose to deliver these trucks by March 1, 1920. . . . This proposal becomes void if not accepted within ten days from date. Your signature at the foot of this proposal would constitute an order. Respectfully submitted, L. C. Parkin." Was this the form you took to your lawyer—Lawrason wasn't it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that the Lawrason who acts for the Roads Department of the Province?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—That is accepted on the 30th of December, 1919, "Ontario Provincial Government, by F. C. Biggs, Minister of Public Works." I see on the margin of this contract appears "Prices appear satisfactory, George Hogarth, December 30, 1919" and "Approved" with Mr. McLean's signature. Now let us understand, Mr. Parkin. Mr. Biggs got this tender from you on Monday morning the 29th of December, 1919. He brought it to Toronto and then telephoned you that evening?

A.—I asked him to arrange an appointment with Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—And he asked you to come down the next morning, which was December 30th?

A.—He said to come down to-morrow.

Q.—He didn't say for you to be there by 8 o'clock?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Reynolds says you told him that was the purport of the conversation?

A.—That is absolutely false.

Q.—But you did get down and get down early?

A.—I did.

Q.—Then when you got to see Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth, what time would that be? You were with Mr. Biggs and Mr. Reynolds for about 40 minutes. What time would it be that you met Hogarth?

A.—It was around 10 o'clock.

Q.—And you were at the Grace Motors at 11 o'clock?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that you would probably be about half an hour with Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth?

A.—About that.

Q.—And during that time, did you see Mr. Hogarth write this upon the contract, "Prices appear to be satisfactory, George Hogarth, December 30, 1919"?

A.—I think that was written on.

Q.—While you were there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Or was that written on before?

A.—I don't think it was written on before.

Q.—And Mr. Hogarth thought it satisfactory—was Mr. McLean there?

A.—I did not see Mr. McLean in Mr. Biggs office.

Q.—Did you take this contract away with you?

A.—I took a copy of it. The copy was filed as an exhibit in the suit.

Q.—This is the other copy?

A.—That is the duplicate.

Q.—Now I have read you one contract. The terms of this other are just the same with some differences. It is dated, December 27, 1919, and is addressed to Hon. F. C. Biggs and it provides for six Sterling trucks of five ton capacity for \$9,100. each.

A.—Yes, that was a special job for road work.

Q.—The total of that contract was \$54,600?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was also approved by Mr. Hogarth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And approved by Mr. McLean?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Both these contracts were taken up and discussed by Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth while you were there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And in the half hour or so you were in the office with Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs sign in your presence?

A.—He signed the contract on behalf of the Province.

Q.—In your presence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And then you knew you had the contract?

A.—Yes.

Q.—A nice fat contract?

A.—Very nice, yes.

Q.—Tell me how you arranged the commission on these contracts? What was the total commission you got on this deal?

A.—I might state here that it is 15 per cent. on truck equipment but on dump equipment it is 7½ per cent. I didn't get 15 per cent. on it all.

Q.—What total did you make on this?

A.—I think something in the neighborhood of \$13,700.

Q.—Now Mr. Parker, you are an agent in Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the distributors also get a commission?

A.—Oh yes.

Q.—Do you know how much the total commission is?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—You don't know exactly what the Grace Motors, distributors of the Sterling trucks would get?

A.—No, I don't.

Q.—Have you any idea of what they get, do you know from discussing it?

A.—I might say something that would not be correct.

Q.—You are in business, you know these things pretty well.

A.—The Grace Motors, if they handled it would certainly get a good commission.

Q.—Would they get 20 per cent.?

A.—I imagine perhaps they would.

Q.—The commission on this contract of \$117,000. at 20 per cent. would be \$23,400 or so?

A.—No, not figuring on the dump equipment.

Q.—You have altogether \$13,800, what did the distributors get?

A.—I cannot swear to what the distributors got.

Q.—You were in the business, taking this matter up with them?

A.—I was selling the trucks three years previous to that.

Q.—You cannot say specifically what Grace Motors got?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—Now Mr. Parkin, you had a contract without any competition?

A.—I don't know as to that.

Q.—Without anyone else tendering—pretty secret affair wasn't it?

A.—Nothing secret about it as regards my part.

Q.—You didn't tell anyone about it around Dundas?

A.—No.

Q.—Can you tell me anyone you told? Can you name one single person you told you were going to tender on these trucks?

A.—No, I would not swear I did.

Q.—You and Reynolds on the Minister's invitation slipped down early in the morning without competition, and got this contract?

(No answer).

Q.—Mr. Parkin, after you got this contract you and Reynolds went down to Milwaukee?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You arranged to go to Milwaukee to get delivery of the trucks within the time?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—What did you go for?

A.—I went there on other business and to look over the plant. I had never been there before.

Q.—So you just went down to look over the plant?

A.—I went down to see their plant, yes.

Q.—The fact that you had an order for \$117,899. didn't weigh in it at all?

A.—I couldn't send that order to the factory. It had to go through the head office.

Q.—You had the sales agent of the head office down there too?

A.—No I didn't. He left on the Sunday, and I didn't get there until later.

Q.—When?

A.—On the Monday.

Q.—How long after signing the contract, on the 30th of December, was that?

A.—I think it was the first week in January.

Q.—At any rate, however you got there the agent or representative of the Grace Motors went to Milwaukee, and you went to Milwaukee with Mr. Reynolds?

A.—Reynolds went with me.

Q.—Then you met the agent down there?

A.—No we didn't meet him at all.

Q.—You didn't see him at all?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Who did you see in Milwaukee?

A.—We didn't see anyone.

Q.—You went down just to look over the plant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you take this tender along with you?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Where had this accepted tender gone?

A.—It was in my safe in Dundas.

Q.—You didn't take it with you?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What did you show Grace Motors. Did you give anything to Grace Motors when you went down to see them?

A.—I showed them the contract.

Q.—You didn't leave it with them?

A.—No, I didn't.

Q.—Who was it arranged for the filling of this contract?

A.—The wholesale department at Grace Motors.

Q.—You simply gave them the information about it, said I have this order for \$117,000?

A.—No, I wrote an order out to them for this equipment.

Q.—You gave them the order?

A.—I let them take the ordering on that contract.

Q.—Having the contract yourself from the Government of the Province for this \$117,000. you went down to them and gave them an order to fill your contract?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—It is rather peculiar isn't it that you went down to Milwaukee just a week after this contract was signed, just to look over the plant?

A.—There is nothing peculiar about it.

Q.—Did you see the general manager or the sales manager?

A.—No.

Q.—Who did you see?

A.—I think he was the assistant.

Q.—Did you tell him about this wonderful piece of business you had?

A.—They knew of it, because the order had gone through from Grace Motors.

Q.—Did they say they were going to fill the order?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Wasn't that one of the reasons you went down, to see if they were going to fill this order?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You just went down to look over the plant and this order had nothing to do with it. Is that what you want us to believe?

A.—I went down to look over the plant.

Q.—And the order had nothing to with it?

A.—If I can explain that; Mrs. German the wife of the wholesale manager of Grace Motors called me on Saturday and told me Mr. German had left on the afternoon train to go to Milwaukee and that he would like me to meet him there. I left on the evening train Sunday night. When I got to Milwaukee Mr. German had left that afternoon for New York and I didn't see him. That is the reason I didn't see him.

Q.—You intended to see him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you didn't see him did you ask to see anyone in his place?

A.—There was no one else there from Toronto.

J.—So that you did not make any progress in Milwaukee so far as this contract was concerned?

A.—No.

Q.—Just let us go back to the meeting with Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth. You are sure Mr. McLean didn't come in?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—That is your best view point on it?

A.—I think I did see Mr. McLean.

Q.—Mr. McLean did come in?

A.—I think so.

Q.—Did you see Mr. McLean sign this?

A.—I would not swear to that.

Q.—You cannot say whether that was signed prior to Mr. McLean coming in, or at that meeting?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—Now as to this Reynolds, Roy A. Reynolds who was working for you—

A.—He was a salesman.

Q.—He sued you for agents' commission over a year?

A.—He was only working for me for five or six months.

Q.—He claimed you owed him for so much commission?

A.—He had his commission paid by certified cheque.

Q.—He included in that commission the Government contract?

A.—No.

Q.—He claimed you should give him commission on this Government contract—in the suit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It covered this contract and a number of other contracts?

A.—He claimed commission of 5 per cent. on all the business that went through my place.

Q.—He claimed that this contract was part of his work and you claimed it wasn't.

A.—Yes.

Q.—You claimed that it was Mr. Biggs and yourself who handled it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You claimed that Reynolds had nothing to do with it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were the one who negotiated with the Minister?

A.—I was the one who negotiated with Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Yes, for about twenty minutes. It took you a month to negotiate with the Minister.—

Mr. Price refers to Reynolds evidence in respect to a statement that Parkin had to pay something to Mr. Biggs.—

THE CHAIRMAN: I rule that you may ask Parkin as to whether there was any arrangement between himself and Mr. Biggs.—

MR. PRICE: Reynolds says, Mr. Parkin, that you would not settle with him, that you told him to wait until you settled with Mr. Biggs. Is that right?

A.—That is absolutely false.

Q.—You contend that that was not the reason you gave Reynolds?

A.—There was no arrangement whatever.

Q.—When were you paid your commission on this contract here?

A.—I simply gave the Grace Motors my cheque and got the cheque from the Department.

Q.—What bank do you do business with?

A.—The Royal Bank of Canada.

Q.—At Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you make any disbursements out of that \$13,000. commission you got?

A.—In what way?

Q.—You say you got \$13,000. commission. Did you make any payments out of that to anyone?

A.—No, only through my general business. If you would like to see the bank book with these deposits you can have it.

Q.—You are still doing business at the Royal Bank, Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the manager's name?

A.—Sidney Hughes.

Q.—There is another account here, "L. C. Parkin, auto storage, repairs and supplies \$1,157.28.

A.—That is mostly oil and supplies for the work on the road at West Flamboro. They are operating on the road there. These were supplied for the use of the trucks.

Q.—Where does the Minister live?

A.—I think either in Beverley or close to Beverley.

Q.—In West Flamboro?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You supplied gasoline and repairs and accessories for the trucks used on part of that highway?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On these same trucks you sold to the Department—did they use some of these on that road?

A.—Some were used there.

Q.—How many?

A.—I think there were some at Ancaster and some at West Flamboro and later in the year there were two or three more brought to West Flamboro for about two or three weeks.

Q.—I see you sold the Government a McLaughlin touring car, \$2,800?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who got that car?

A.—Do you mean what person got it?

Q.—Yes.

A.—I cannot swear to that.

Q.—Who did you deliver it to?

A.—I delivered it to Mr. Johnson in the garage.

Q.—Is that the car Mr. Biggs uses?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Does he keep any car at your garage?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You see Mr. Biggs driving past your garage to Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You know he drives a McLaughlin car?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—It never occurred to you this might be the same car?

A.—No, I think the car Mr. Biggs drives is another car.

Q.—You said Mr. Biggs had done business with you for years—I see in your evidence here you speak of having received a cheque from him for supplies or gasoline as late as January, 1920?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does he still do business with you?

A.—I think there is an account of \$3 or something of the kind against Mr. Biggs.

Q.—You haven't received a cheque since 1920?

A.—We expect some.

Q.—Is the Royal Bank the only bank you do business with?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused. The committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE. APRIL 1ST. 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a.m. Mr. Curry in the chair.

Roy Action Reynolds called and sworn; examined by Mr. Price.

Q.—Mr. Reynolds where do you live?

A.—In Dundas, Ont.

Q.—How long have you lived in Dundas?

A.—I was born in Dundas.

Q.—Have you always lived in Dundas?

A.—No. I have been away at different times.

Q.—What is your business?

A.—Since I came back from the war I have been selling cars.

Q.—Where have you worked since you came back from the war?

A.—I have worked with L. C. Parkin from the 10th of June 1919, until the 6th of March, 1920. Then I was selling for Mr. Sparks, of the Chevrolet

Company.

Q.—You worked for L. C. Parkin in Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Parkin carried on a garage in Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Under his own name?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been acquainted with Parkin?

A.—Four or five or six years—ever since he has been in Dundas.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you known Mr. Biggs?

A.—I haven't known him personally a great length of time. I have known the family and I have known him to see, practically all my life.

Q.—You know where Mr. Biggs lives?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Where does he live?

A.—Christie's corners.

Q.—How far is that from Dundas?

A.—I would judge about four miles.

Q.—When was it you started to work for Parkin?

A.—The 10th of June, the 10th or 12th, 1919.

Q.—You were working for Parkin in December, 1919?

A.—Yes.

MR. RANEY: Was that on a salary or a commission basis?

A.—That was on a commission basis.

Q.—A commission on whatever you sold?

A.—A commission on whatever went through the garage.

MR. PRICE: Then in working for Parkin you were there in the month of December, 1919.?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And during that month, will you tell us if Mr. Biggs was in the garage while you were there?

A.—Yes, he was in there.

Q.—Can you tell us about the date Mr. Biggs was in the garage?

A.—He use to call there about every Saturday, when he motored up from Toronto for the week-end.

Q.—Give us the first time during the month of September you saw him in the garage, the first day?

A.—I cannot say, I think he was there about every Saturday.

Q.—We are examining you here to find out something about a truck deal or contract for the sale of trucks given to Parkin by the Government. We are anxious to get down to something about that. Now what was the first occasion that you knew anything about that truck deal?

A.—I think on Saturday, December 20.

Q.—Just tell us what happened on Saturday, December 20.

A.—I saw Parkin in the garage talking to Mr. Biggs and about a few minutes after he left he came to me—

Objection by Mr. Raney:

MR. PRICE: You saw Biggs talking to Parkin in the garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On the 20th of December?

A.—I think it was the 20th.

Q.—Were you talking to Mr. Biggs on that date?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Were you talking to Biggs and Parkin when they were discussing that day?

A.—No, not at all.

Q.—Then what did you do, what did you and Parkin do after that interview?

A.—Parkin just told me. . .

Q.—Never mind what Parkin told you. What did you and Parkin do after the Biggs interview?

A.—We just talked about the Government getting trucks.

Object:ion by Mr. Raney that witness should not tell what took place between himself and Parkin when Mr. Biggs was not there.

MR. PRICE: What did you and Mr. Parkin do after that interview that related to this truck contract?

CHAIRMAN rules that witness cannot tell what took place between witness and Parkin by way of conversation. Argument by Mr. Dewart, Mr. Price and Mr. Pinard, that witness should be allowed to tell of conversations with Parkin. MR. Price, proceeds:

Q.—You have told us of a meeting on the 20th of December. Now what was the next time that you saw Mr. Biggs in this Garage?

A.—The following Saturday, the 27th of December, I think. I would not be certain about the exact date.

Q.—On the 27th of December you saw Mr. Biggs on the second occasion? In Parkin's garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Tell us what occurred on that occasion?

A.—Well, the three of us—just inside Parkin's office there is a little cloak-room. We sat in there and talked about the trucks which Parkin had been talking about all week, and speaking of the trucks Parkin told Mr. Biggs he would like to tender on them. He said "But I can't tender against those other truck concerns like the National that can give discounts of 25 and 30 per cent. I can't do any better than ten" and he said, "I will give you ten per cent. discount."

Q.—Where were you at that time—in the private office?

A.—It is just a little cloakroom between the stock room and the office. You have to go through that to go into the office.

Q.—What was it Parkin said to Biggs?

A.—He said he couldn't tender against those other concerns that could give 25 and 30 per cent. discount, which he couldn't as he was only a sub-agent. He said "The best I can do is to give you 10 per cent. discount.

Q.—What other concerns?

A.—He just mentioned the National Truck.

Q.—That is that he could only give ten per cent?

A.—Yes, and make money himself.

Q.—What occurred after that?

A.—I spoke up and said, "Why give the Government ten per cent. We can

go out and sell to individuals at 100 per cent., why should we sell the Government trucks at ten per cent. discount? I said we should rather charge them 105 per cent. Mr. Biggs turned to Parkin and said, "Listen to Reynolds, let him fix up this deal and get some money."

Q.—What was it Biggs said?

A.—"Listen to Reynolds, let h'm fix up this deal."

Q.—Parkin was not in a position to give more than 10 per cent.?

A.—That is what he said.

Q.—Then what occurred after Biggs said "Listen to Reynolds?"

A.—That pretty near closed it there.

Q.—Was there any other talk at that time?

A.—Biggs said there would not be any tenders in if we knew enough to keep our mouths shut.

HON. MR. BIGGS: Who did I say that to?

A.—You said it to us, Parkin and I.

MR. BIGGS: I am sorry Parkin is not here yet.

MR. PRICE: Did anything else occur there?

A.—Then he told us to get the contract ready—he was going to bring it down Monday morning.

Q.—What time was that?

A.—I would judge between three and five, between four and six o'clock, probably about five o'clock.

Q.—Was there anything else said at that meeting that you recollect?

A.—Nothing I can remember.

Q.—What happened after Mr. Biggs left?

A.—We drew up to the table to make out this tender.

Q.—You say "We drew up to the table." Who do you mean?

A.—I mean Parkin and myself.

Q.—What did you do?

A.—We had just got started to make up the tender when I said . . .

Objection by Mr. Raney that witness was about to refer to conversations between himself and Parkin, which was hearsay evidence.

MR. PRICE: continuing: After Mr. Biggs left the garage what did you and Parkin do?

A.—We drew up to the desk to draw up this tender. Miss Boyle was sitting at the desk and we asked her to go back. We drew up two chairs and started to make this tender up.

Q.—And as a result of that was the contract drawn up.

A.—No I advised Parkin . . .

Q.—Never mind what you advised. What did you do?

A.—We didn't draw it up. We sent it to the lawyer's to be drafted. I said to Parkin . . .

Objection taken and sustained by the chair.

MR. PRICE: What else did you do, Mr. Reynolds, at that time?

A.—We simply sent a blank to the lawyers. We did not put any heading on it so the lawyer would not know where it was going. The way the lawyer made it out it was practically a long letter asking for a tender. We just drafted it out of his letter and it was re-written on one of Parkin's headings.

Q.—Do you recollect if these were the tenders? (tenders "A" and "B", as

identified by L. C. Parkin and filed as exhibits with the Committee—shown to witness)?

A.—I am pretty sure those are the tenders. That (pointing to endorsement of Chairman of Committee of exhibits) was not on them, when we got them.

Q.—What was the next thing that happened in connection with this truck contract?

A.—Biggs came in Monday morning for the tender.

Q.—Nothing happened before that time—between Saturday and Monday?

A.—I don't remember anything.

Q.—Then on Monday morning, December 29, Biggs called at the garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And what happened then when Mr. Biggs called?

A.—He just came in and Parkin drove him in to Hamilton.

Q.—What occurred—did anything occur that morning in connection with the tender?

A.—I just saw Parkin take it out of his safe and put it in his pocket.

Q.—Then what did Parkin do after that?

A.—He drove Mr. Biggs into Hamilton.

Q.—When he took the contract out what did he do?

A.—That was before Mr. Biggs came along. He put it in his pocket, his car was standing out in front waiting for Mr. Biggs.

Q.—He was waiting for Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there anything happened before Parkin and Mr. Biggs drove away?

A.—We just talked for a few minutes. We never even mentioned the contract.

Q.—You don't recollect what the conversation was?

A.—No.

Q.—What was the next thing? We have got down to the morning of December 29. What was the next thing that happened in reference to the contract?

A.—He was to call up at 8 o'clock that night.

Q.—Who was to call up?

A.—Mr. Biggs.

Q.—Did he call up that night?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At 8 o'clock?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What happened then?

A.—We were in the garage.

Q.—You were in the garage and Parkin was in the garage when Mr. Biggs called up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What happened then?

A.—I could not hear what Mr. Biggs was saying. Parkin said to me "We will have to go to Toronto in the morning."

Q.—Did you hear Parkin talking over the telephone?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember what he said over the telephone?

A.—I heard him say, "I will be there on time" or "I will be there early" or something like that.

Q.—What was the next thing that happened after that?

A.—Do you mean that day?

Q.—Yes, that night.

A.—Nothing.

Q.—Getting down to the next day, Tuesday, December 30, tell us what happened that day?

A.—Well, I was to meet Parkin at the garage, at 5 o'clock in the morning. We borrowed Dr. Laughlin's closed car as it was snowing and very cold. Parkin was a little late. It was about 5.30 when we got there. I had the car ready and waiting for him. We left and came to the City of Toronto.

Q.—What time did you arrive in Toronto?

A.—I would judge a little before 8 o'clock. We went and had breakfast. It was twenty minutes to 8 or a quarter to 8 o'clock.

Q.—What kind of a day was it?

A.—It was snowing when we left home. I don't know whether it was snowing when we arrived or not.

Q.—You had breakfast and then what did you do?

A.—We went straight to the Parliament Buildings.

Q.—Then tell us about coming to the Parliament Buildings, where you went. What time did you reach the Parliament Buildings?

A.—I would judge 8.30 or 8.40.

Q.—Then you came into the Parliament Buildings, where did you come in?

A.—The front door, the south door. We came in the front door. I don't know whether we took the elevator or came up the stairs, I think we came up one flight. There were some painters working and I asked the painters if they had seen Mr. Biggs, and they said, "No." Then some person else came along and I asked him if he had seen Mr. Biggs and he said Mr. Biggs had gone to breakfast. We walked up and down the corridor and shortly Mr. Biggs came along. He said "I see you are here alright." He took us to the end of the hallway and walked south.

Q.—Which end of the Buildings?

A.—That was the south-east end. We walked through the hall south to Mr. Biggs' office and to the left into another office which he said was his private office. We went from there through a bathroom and then to a bedroom off his main office. We went through the bathroom into his bedroom.

Q.—What did Biggs say to you after entering?

A.—We just talked about different things. We never mentioned the tender or a deal of any kind. We may have just mentioned it. I cannot remember anything particular that was said about it there. We were sitting around and he was telling us what a nice position he had, what a nice place he had. We were admiring his office and bedroom. We went on like that.

Q.—Do you recollect anything that occurred about the contract, anything that was said about the contract while you were in there, in the bedroom?

A.—He said that Mr. McLean and Mr. Hogarth weren't there yet but would be in in a minute.

Q.—What was the idea of seeing McLean and Hogarth at that time?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—You didn't know whether you were going to get the contract or not?

A.—I didn't know anything about the Deputy or the engineer having to

sign it. I thought Mr. Biggs was the only one who had to sign it.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs say anything about the contract, whether you were going to get it or not?

A.—No, I don't think he did. We sat there and he heard some one out in the hall. He said, "I think that is them now" or "him now." He got up and went out and left us in the bedroom.

Q.—How long was he away, how long in the other room?

A.—I would judge about five minutes.

Q.—Then what happened?

A.—He could see Parkin where he was sitting, from his office but he couldn't see me. He said, "Come here."

Q.—The doors were open?

A.—Yes. He said, "Come here" and beckoned Parkin to come in. Whether Biggs came into the bedroom or not I don't know, I didn't see Biggs. I just heard him say "Come here" Parkin said, "Sh" I sat still and he went into the other room.

Q.—Then, Mr. Reynolds, how long were you in the bedroom?

A.—Altogether?

Q.—Yes.

A.—I would judge a half hour or so, probably three-quarters.

Q.—You didn't go in to the main office?

A.—Only when I went through in the morning at first.

Q.—How long were they in the main office—Parkin and Biggs?

A.—I would judge probably five minutes or ten minutes, not very long.

Q.—When did you see them next?

A.—Parkin and Biggs came back into the bedroom and Parkin had the contract or tender and was wrapping it up in his pocket. Mr. Biggs let us out the side door. There is a door from his bedroom to the hallway. He let us out there.

MR. BIGGS: You mean the front door of the bedroom?

A.—Yes.

MR. CLARKE: That is the nearest way of getting to the hall?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Parkin had a contract in his possession?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where did you go after that?

A.—To Grace Motors.

Q.—What did you do there about this accepted tender?

A.—We wanted to get some parts for Fulton trucks and I went to see the manager of the repair department to get those parts. Parkin went upstairs and then came out of the garage with Mr. German, who I think is the sales manager, and a Mr. Holt I think. The three of them came out of the garage and then we went along with Mr. German to the St. Charles for lunch.

Mr. Raney stated to Mr. Price that Mr. Biggs wanted him to bring out any evidence of consequence, that he did not want any rule of evidence to stand in the way. The Chairman stated that it was a matter for the Committee to determine.

MR. PRICE (proceeding) How long after this was it that you went to

Milwaukee?

A.—The following Sunday.

Q.—Who went?

A.—Parkin and myself.

Q.—Anyone from the Grace Motors?

Mr. German of the Grace Motors was to be in Milwaukee. He went on Thursday, Friday or Saturday I think. He was to meet us in Milwaukee but he had to go down to New York. He got out before we got there or rather, on Monday afternoon.

Q.—What did you go to Milwaukee for?

A.—To get assurances that we get the trucks. In the contract or tender it said by March 1st, or soon after. I think those are the words used. They put on it that they must be delivered by March 1st. We went to Milwaukee to get assurances right from the factory that we were going to have them in time.

Q.—Did you get that assurance?

A.—Well, yes. The manager was't there but the advertising manager was there.

Q.—What was his name?

A.—I forget his name. In the catalogue they called him "Driver Dan".

Q.—How long were you at Milwaukee?

A.—We landed Monday afternoon about 3 or 4 o'clock and left there Tuesday afternoon.

Q.—Was this the advertising man you got to?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the idea in talking to him about it?

A.—The other manager was away—the manager of the factory. He took us up and entertained us while we were there, took us to the club.

Q.—Parkin has told us that you just went down to look over the plant. Now you say you went down to arrange about the date of the contract, about the delivery of the trucks?

A.—I don't think I would go to look over the Sterling plant at Milwaukee, because that isn't an automobile plant.

Q.—Tell us what happened when you got in touch with this advertising man.

A.—He spoke of the manager and mentioned his name. We asked him what the chances were of getting the trucks. He said, "You are going to get them allright."

Q.—Did you talk anything about the contract?

A.—Oh yes we had it with us.

Q.—What did you say about the contract when Parkin and you were there talking with this advertising man?

A.—He just showed him the contract and he said that would be a good thing to advertise, to give us some advertising in Canada. We said, yes, it was a good order and everything. He said he would like to get a copy of it to put in his catalogues.

Q.—Did Parkin say anything, or did you say anything?

A.—Parkin said this was just the first order "I have just the small end of the wedge in and I am just beginning to drive".

MR. DRURY—Did this have reference to the general situation in Canada or

did it mean government contracts?

A.—I took it that he meant he was going to sell the government more trucks.

MR. PRICE—Then how long did you work for Parkin after this contract was signed.

A.—Until the 6th of March.

MR. CLARKE—You are not working for Parkin now?

A.—No, sir.

MR. PRICE—You claimed a commission on all business that went through the Parkin garage while you were there?

A.—Yes, not on all the business, but on all sales.

Q.—What attitude did Parkin take on your claim?

Objection by Mr. Brackin that the stenographic record of the action was available setting out of all the facts in the suit.

MR. PRICE—In any event, you did sue Parkin for a commission?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that case has been up and is now waiting for decision?

A.—Yes.

Hon. MR. BIGGS stated that the judgement had been issued and that a copy of it was there for the information of the Committee.

MR. PRICE—But as a matter of fact your claim was paid and you did sue Parkin.

A.—Yes.

Q.—You sued Parkin and that case has been up and considered and apparently judgement has been given upon it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you asked Parkin to pay your claim was there a discussion?

Objection by Mr. Raney. Mr. Price stated that he wanted to bring out the substance of a discussion between Parkin and Reynolds; at the time Reynolds pressed his claim. The chairman suggested that this had all been threshed out in the action, but Mr. Price maintained that this evidence had not been given. The Chairman quoted from judgement handed to him showing that the Court had found against Reynolds in his suit. A discussion thereupon ensued during which Dr. Godfrey appealed against a ruling by the Chair that this conversation could not be related in evidence. This motion was not put and finally upon a suggestion by Mr. Drury a motion was made and carried that conversations between Parkin and the witness should be admitted whether Mr. Biggs was present at the time or not.

MR. PRICE, proceeding; Mr. Reynolds, we are down to the meeting of 6th, what occurred at the meeting on March, 6th. What occurred when you asked asked him about your commission?

A.—That happened in the office. He said "Come on out here." We walked out back of the garage. At the end of the garage is a machine shop and a place where they store cars. We went out and stood there talking over some trucks that we had sold at cost at St. Catharines. He said, "What do you expect on the Government deal?" I said I expected my five per cent. that meant 3½ per cent.. Canadian prices. He said "What do you figure we will have to give Biggs?"

Q.—That is what Parkin said to you?

A.—Yes. I said I figured we should give him about \$3,000. I said "You can

take my share out at the rate of five per cent. but you will have to give at the rate of twenty per cent., four times as much as me." He said they trimmed me down at Grace Motors" I said, "How did they do that" and he said, "They stuck up the price on me, they trimmed me" I said "You know me Len, I am fair. I am willing to meet you half way." I was going to Buffalo and he asked me not to go. I said I had to go to Buffalo that I could not get this party by phone, I could not put it off. He said "Well, we will talk it over when you come back. I said alright but I wouldn't be back until Tuesday. Going out to the front of the garage I got thinking and I said "Len, I think you are going to double-cross me." He said, "Well, I don't think you should have five per cent. on that Government contract. I said "I have been here eight or nine months. When I started to sell cars you were up against it. Different times you said "Carry on Roy the luck will turn and we will get square" I had never asked for a cent until this time.

Q.—Not until you wanted to go away?

A.—No that was just for a week end. No, I wanted a settlement. It had been running for eight or nine months and I thought I should have a settlement. I said "You are going to double-cross me" and he said "I don't think you should have the 3½ percent. on the Government deal. He explained about the Toronto people cutting him out of three or four thousand. I again stated I would meet him in any way that would be fair.

Q.—Was that all that occurred there?

A.—When I mentioned the \$3,000 he said we couldn't do it right now over that trouble in the papers, that we would have to wait for some future time to approach him, until things quieted down.

Q.—What was the trouble in the papers?

A.—They were full of stuff about the order.

MR. BRACKIN: You said "Some future time?"

A.—We will have to wait until some future time to approach him about the \$3,000.

MR. BRACKIN: He said "have to wait until some future time when things quieted down.

A.—If I said that I will stick to it. It is a long time ago.

MR. PRICE: To approach whom?

A.—Mr. Biggs.

Q.—Is that all you talked of, that time, with Parkin?

A.—Well, I left and went to Buffalo. When I came back he gave me two cheques, a cheque for \$459.62, commission on cars that he said that I actually sold myself. Also he put another cheque in an envelope of \$400, "just as a tip for being a good fellow." He handed me the \$400 and my lawyer advised me not to take it.

Q.—What was your total claim for commission? What did you sue for?

A.—Five per cent. on all sales.

Q.—What would that amount to?

A.—Close to \$5,000.

Q.—Just to shorten this; you did sue Parkin, the case came up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you know judgment had been delivered, when you came in here?

A.—No, sir, that is the first I heard about it.

Q.—When did you see your lawyer last?

A.—Yesterday.

Q.—Who is your lawyer?

A.—A. L. Shaver.

Q.—Of Dundas?

A.—Yes, and C. W. Bell.

Q.—He didn't tell you judgment had been delivered?

A.—No.

Q.—Well, when this case came up for trial I believe you subpoenaed Mr. Biggs to attend?

A.—Yes, when I first offered him the subpoena he would not accept it.

Q.—You went to serve it yourself?

A.—Yes, I was going to serve it myself to save expense.

Q.—What happened when you went to serve it?

A.—He wouldn't take it from me.

Q.—What did you do then?

A.—I got the chief of police and my lawyer to go to his house and give it to him.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs appear at the trial?

A.—He appeared on the first day on that subpoena. The trial was laid over different times and they were just notified when to appear again. He may have appeared on the second day, I am certain about that, but he didn't appear after that.

Q.—Where was the trial?

A.—At Hamilton.

Q.—You said he appeared on the first day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that in Dundas?

A.—No, in Hamilton.

Q.—During that time, did he see your lawyer?

A.—The morning the case came up he came to my lawyer's office.

Q.—Mr. Biggs came into your lawyer's office on the day of this trial in the morning?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What happened?

A.—He came through and asked what I would take to settle in cash.

Q.—Mr. Shaver was there, Mr. Biggs was there and you were there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did you say?

A.—He said, "What would you take to settle this thing. I said I would settle for \$3,000 cash. I had got about \$500. and would settle for \$3000. cash.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—He said he would talk to Parkin.

Q.—Was there any other discussion you had? The Committee have ruled that you can give any evidence you think bears on this. Is there anything else that you would like to tell the Committee?

A.—I am not here to tell the Committee anything. I am here to answer questions, just here to tell the truth. I am not here to bring anything particular out unless you want it.

MR. BRACKIN: How many trucks were sold to the Government on that particular order?

A.—Twelve.

Q.—For example, if John Smith went to the garage or to you as an employee and wanted to buy a truck, or say a man in Dundas wanted a truck at that time in December, what would he have had to pay for it? What was the price?

A.—I could not say off hand. These trucks had special equipment such as the body and the hoist.

Q.—But suppose you are selling an ordinary truck, is there a standard price from the factory?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who fixes that?

A.—I guess the Grace Motors of Toronto.

Q.—Grace Motors—what have they to do with Sterling trucks?

A.—I think they have the selling agency.

Q.—Who appoints Parkin as agent in Dundas?

A.—The Grace Motors.

Q.—Who tells Parkin when he gets the agency, the price at which he is to sell these trucks with standard prices?

A.—I don't know that.

Q.—Did you have a price list?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were selling trucks as well as autos?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You would have to get familiar with the price list?

A.—Yes, I carried one all the time.

Q.—Where did it come from?

A.—From Parkin.

Q.—Where did it come from to him?

A.—I do not know that.

Q.—Whose heading was on it—you can't find a liquor price list without the name of the firm on the outside. Didn't they put their name on it and so forth?

A.—I didn't see it. I had one of my own.

Q.—You had a price list of your own?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That you got from Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What on that indicated that it was a price list for Sterling trucks?

A.—It just gave the prices of the different trucks, 2, 2½, 3 ton, and so on.

Q.—All Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Whose name was on it—what is the name of the company that makes it?

A.—It didn't have any name on at all.

Q.—What is the name of the company that makes that truck, in Milwaukee?

A.—The Sterling Motors.

Q.—Was there nothing on that price list to indicate that it was put out by Sterling Motors?

A.—Not on mine.

Q.—Have you got it yet?

A.—No.

Q.—Can you get one?

A.—I would have to get it from Parkin. He would give me a dandy.

Q.—Why do you say that?

A.—I don't have to tell you why.

Q.—Just a moment Mr. Reynolds—you mean you haven't confidence in Parkin any more?

A.—Not any more.

Q.—You don't feel pleased towards him?

A.—I speak to him.

Q.—You sued for \$5,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So you have lost confidence in him?

A.—I don't think he is on the level, and I will tell him so to his face.

Q.—You don't think he is on the level—not honest?

A.—I certainly do not.

Q.—You are very strong in that opinion?

A.—I am now.

Q.—You were before you sued him. You must have come to the conclusion after that he was dishonest?

A.—Yes, I told him in the office he was double crossing me.

Q.—From that time on you didn't have any confidence in him?

MR. PRICE: That is not what he said.

MR. BRACKLIN: Very, well. My idea was that what you intended to convey to the Committee about Parkin was that when this man refused to pay you what you thought he honestly owed you, you had to go to court and sue him trying to get it, and that from that time you lost confidence in him?

A.—I certainly did.

Q.—That has been the situation ever since and still is, as far as your feelings toward Parkin are concerned and the relations between you and Parkin. You are off him for life. This is what I want to get at. That is your attitude toward Parkin. I suppose when you told us about the things you say Parkin said, that you think are true, making it look bad for Parkin before this Committee you still have, while you are saying these things, in your mind this feeling toward Parkin?

A.—I understand what you are trying to do. You are trying to discredit me.

Objection by Mr. Price to the manner of cross-examination.

Ruling by the Chairman that Mr. Brackin was quite within his rights in his questions.

MR. BRACKLIN: You have told us what your feelings are toward Parkin, that you didn't think he was honest and had no confidence in him. What I ask is this: when you were telling this Committee about the conversations you had with Parkin and telling us of the things Parkin said which, if true, were rather discreditable to Parkin you had in your mind this feeling you have told us about toward Parkin, that he isn't honest and that you hadn't confidence in him. You still have that feeling?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Let us go back, seeing we have the stage set as between you and Parkin. You had a price list?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do I understand this to be true, that everybody who buys these cars has got to pay the same price, supposing they are buying standard equipment?

A.—Yes, unless you are making a deal and they want something extra. There is one price.

Q.—It is just like an agency for Ford cars. The man who gets the agency has got to stick to the price the company sets?

A.—I think that can be very easily fixed.

Q.—It would not be honest with the people from whom you were taking the agency would it?

A.—If you wanted to get a cut price you would take it up with the Grace Motors.

Q.—You would not cut a price without seeing whether that was satisfactory to the people from whom you got the agency?

A.—Well Parkin was willing. He said, "The best I can do is a ten per cent. discount", without going to Grace Motors. He told Biggs that whether he came to Grace Motors or not.

Q.—That being the case, unless he saw fit to cut the price ten per cent. the Government, taking the standard truck would have to pay the same as anyone else, unless you could get some special arrangement with Grace Motors by which you could give a discount.

A.—I do not know anything about that, what they could do with Grace Motors, they might make an arrangement or something like that.

Q.—As a matter of common honesty between you people, Parkin and the Grace Motors who gave him the price list he couldn't cut the price of the standard truck without the consent of Grace Motors?

A.—Well he did. He told Mr. Biggs he would give him ten per cent. without asking Grace Motors.

Q.—If Grace Motors would not consent he would have to take that out of his commission?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—How much did he get under the arrangement with the Grace Motors?

A.—Twenty-five per cent. on the American price list.

Q.—What is that in Canada?

A.—Fifteen and one-half or 16 per cent.

Q.—What was the price of the standard Sterling truck, those that were bought—the 3½ ton truck?

A.—I can't tell you that.

Q.—Is it that you don't remember?

A.—I don't remember. The order was that the six were to cost so much.

Q.—What I am trying to get at is this. The average individual in Dundas or Toronto goes into a garage and says: "I want a two and a half ton truck." He gave a cheque on it, and bought it. What would the total commission on that be?

A.—25 per cent. on the American price. We take off the duty and it then amounts to about 15½ per cent.

Q.—Can you tell off-hand what the Canadian price would be on the 3½ ton truck?

DR. GODFREY: Would it not vary according to the exchange?

A.—Yes. I could not tell the price on the dump trucks.

MR. BRACKIN: You were selling trucks. You would be entitled to 5 per cent.

wouldn't you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you never figure out that “If I sell a truck I will get so much”?

A.—Probably you have never been in the motor game and worked for men like Parkin.

Q.—I have been in a good many games. It strikes me—I do not know whether it strikes you or not, that if you were selling on a 5 per cent commission that when you went out in the morning you would have it in your mind that if you sold a truck you would get so much money.

A.—Well if you hadn't been giving a lot away when you got an order. You cannot tell how much you are going to get out of it.

Q.—Assuming you didn't give anything away and sold at the list price, what would you get for yourself?

A.—We only sold about six or seven trucks besides this Government order and they were trucks on which we took in cars, every one of them. We never had one clear deal.

Q.—What you mean is that you would sell trucks and take in second hand cars on them. What you would get out of it would depend on the price you got for the second hand cars?

A.—Yes. These things were running along and were never cleaned up.

Q.—There was never a time when you sold a truck outright and got your commission?

A.—No, I never sold a truck outright myself.

Q.—You have told us about Mr. Biggs having been in the garage several times in December. Was he there any oftener in December, going through and coming home, stopping in for gas etc., was he there any oftener in December than in October or November?

A.—I think he stopped there every week-end.

Q.—He wasn't there any oftener in December than he had been in the previous months?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—He came nearly every week-end—his home is how far away from the garage?

A.—About four miles.

Q.—Is it the nearest garage of repute, where they have got reliable workmen and all that, is it the nearest place of that description to his home?

A.—It is the nearest McLaughlin station, and that is what Mr. Biggs drives.

Q.—He was there quite often?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then on December 27th, you told us there was some further talk and a question of a cut. Parkin said he would only give a ten per cent. cut?

A.—He said he couldn't tender against these big firms—he mentioned the National—who could give a 25 per cent. cut. Their trucks were made in Hamilton and they could sell direct to the vendor.

MR. DEWART: What truck is that?

A.—The National.

MR. BRACKIN: Was there any special reason why, if the Government determined to buy Sterling trucks, they should be bought in December instead of later?

A.—I do not know of any reason.

Q.—Did you ever hear from Parkin alone, or Parkin and Biggs together, any talk about the need for getting in the order in December if they were going to buy Sterling trucks?

A.—I never heard them mention that.

Q.—I want you to be sure of that. Did you ever hear it mentioned by Parkin that an increase in the price of Sterling trucks was going to come into effect in January?

A.—I never knew that.

Q.—Either from Parkin or anyone else?

A.—No.

Q.—So that if there was any discussion of that kind it couldn't have taken place in your presence?

A.—No.

Q.—Are you quite sure? You didn't have any idea about there being need for haste to get the purchase through before the 1st of January?

A.—No I didn't hear anything.

Q.—Why did you come to Toronto with Parkin?

A.—I was working on the deal with him.

Q.—What were you doing on the deal. What had you done in connection with this deal before you came to Toronto?

A.—I talked it over.

Q.—What did you say? What did you say to Mr. Biggs about the trucks?

A.—Do you want me to go all over it? Mr. Biggs was in the cloak-room between the office and the stock room, on Saturday, the 27th.

Q.—The first time you ever talked about the trucks. Tell me all you told Mr. Biggs about the trucks?

A.—We got into conversation about how many trucks they were going to need and he said ten and then he said twelve. Parkin started to quote a price and said he couldn't tender against those other concerns. I spoke up to head off Parkin, and said, "Why should we sell cars to individuals at 100 per cent. and to the Government, which has lots of money, at 90 per cent. That was when Biggs turned to Parkin and said, "Listen to Reynolds and he will get you something."

Q.—Did you take it that he was joking or kidding you?

A.—I didn't take it as a joke.

Q.—You took it that Biggs was putting it up to Parkin that you would be able to make a better deal than Parkin would?

A.—I think so.

Q.—That is, that he would prefer to make a deal which you would make which would result in the Government paying more money for the trucks rather than take Parkin's proposition which would give the Government the trucks at 10 per cent. less?

A.—Well, when Parkin offered the 10 per cent. discount he didn't grasp the idea and try to get it. He didn't say "I will take that."

Q.—What we want to get at is this: do you want us to believe that you understood from Mr. Biggs that Mr. Biggs preferred to deal along the lines that you advised, which would result in the Government having to pay the full price for the trucks rather than the deal which Parkin was proposing which would result in them getting 10 per cent. discount?

A.—That is what it looked like to me.

Q.—You believe that was Mr. Biggs' mental attitude?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In spite of the fact that Mr. Biggs seemed to prefer a deal such as you suggested, rather than the one which the man with whom he was dealing suggested, did Mr. Parkin persist in offering the 10 per cent. discount?

A.—He didn't see how Biggs could get through the deal alone. He said, "What does he do. Is he the boss. Is there any person over him or not?"

Q.—What I want to get at is this: after that was said and Biggs said "Listen to Reynolds and he will get you some money" did Parkin still persist in offering the 10 per cent. discount?

A.—No, Biggs left shortly after that and we drew up to the table to draw up the tender.

Q.—When you sat down to draw up the tender did you draw it up on the basis of a 10 per cent. discount?

A.—We did not, no. We didn't draw it up. We just got started.

Q.—When you started to figure were you putting in a tender and making the price the regular standard price without any discount?

A.—No discount at all. We didn't have the price of these dump bodies to be put on, we had never sold one.

Q.—Are those made in this country?

A.—You get the chassis from Milwaukee and someone else puts on the dump body. The factory puts them on.

Q.—What factory?

A.—The Sterling factory.

Q.—Go ahead: then you were figuring out on the standard chassis and this dump body?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you started to figure the price out, at what you would make your proposition, who fixed that, you or Parkin?

A.—Parkin did. He called up the Grace Motors about the price of the bodies.

Q.—Parkin had a conversation with Grace Motors who said the price was so and so?

A.—For that class of truck.

Q.—How much did he say it would be?

A.—I don't think he said how much it would be.

Q.—He didn't let you know what price he was going to put his tender in at?

A.—The tender wasn't made out.

Q.—Did you see it after the price was put in before it went to the Government?

A.—I looked at it, yes.

Q.—Where did you see it?

A.—In his office.

Q.—That was all you did, and Parkin determined after the conversation with the Grace Motors the price at which he would tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then, did you come to Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Why did Parkin bring you over to Toronto to see the Minister?

A.—I was working on the deal as much as Parkin was.

Q.—You had fixed the price, had put in a tender and it had gone to the Minister of Public Works, and Parkin was going over to Toronto to sign the contract if he got the sale?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn't have to sign that contract?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Then why did you come to Toronto with Parkin?

A.—Well, every truck deal that went through Parkin's garage I worked on it with Parkin, not this sale alone.

Q.—You went to Toronto and simply sat in the room. After the engineers came and Parkin went into the other room he didn't take you in?

A.—No, he didn't take me in.

Q.—Why did you come. What were you to do?

A.—I came simply to work on the deal. Look at Parkin and if you think he is a clever man, I don't.

Q.—You thought it would take a man with more brains than Parkin had to put this deal through. Is that what you mean?

A.—It didn't need any brains at all to put it through.

Q.—Whatever brains were required to put it through, if it did take any brains to put it through it was better that you should be along than that Parkin should be there. Is that what you mean, that you were more likely to possess them?

A.—No, I haven't all the brains there are.

Q.—What was it you came for—because Parkin was not clever enough to put it through himself?

A.—I am not saying that.

Q.—You did say that?

A.—It was not a deal that was so easy to put through that you didn't have to have someone there who had brains enough to talk and who knew something about trucks. You had to have someone of that kind to convince the Government engineers. We had never done any business with the Government before and we didn't know what we were running up against. We thought probably we would have to go up against a committee or something.

Q.—You said someone had to be there who knew something about trucks?

A.—I had worked on every other deal that went through the garage and do you think when this came I was going to stay home.

Q.—But you would get your money anyway, if you were entitled to it. You knew more about the mechanism and the talking points of trucks than Parkin?

A.—No, I don't say that. Parkin is a mechanic.

Q.—So that it was not for the purpose of discussing the good points of the trucks with the officials whom you would meet and convince them of the merits of these trucks that you came to Toronto. Parkin could do that better than you?

A.—No. When he got the telephone message he said, "We have to go to Toronto in the morning." We talked over what time we would leave and he said we would have to leave early. We made an arrangement to leave at 5 o'clock.

Q.—When you got here and went up it was early?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You went into the room off the Minister's office, the bathroom and into the other room. I suppose the chairs were more comfortable there than outside?

A.—I don't know anything about that.

Q.—You waited a while and finally Parkin went out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he go into the office where Mr. Biggs and the officials of the Department were?

A.—I could not see, but apparently he did. There apparently were more people in the room for after Parkin went in I think I heard him introduce Parkin to Mr. Hogarth. I am not positive.

Q.—Up to that time Parkin didn't have any contract. He had just put in a tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then he went out and met Mr. Hogarth and somebody else. How long did these gentlemen remain in the outside room discussing the matter before Parkin got the contract?

A.—I would judge about five or ten minutes.

Q.—Then Parkin came back and you and he went away?

A.—Parkin and Mr. Biggs came back.

Q.—And then you went out the door into the hall and it was all over?

A.—Yes, do you want me to tell you what Mr. Biggs said before we left?

Q.—Just a minute. During the whole discussion whatever it was in the outside office between Parkin and Hogarth and whoever the other official was, you were not seen at all?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you hear the conversation other than Parkin being introduced to Hogarth?

A.—I heard one say they must be delivered by March 1.

Q.—Who said that?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Did you hear anything else. Did you hear Parkin explaining the type of truck, anything of that kind?

A.—No.

Q.—If you were interested to the extent of 5 per cent. commission and came over on account of your superior ability in handling deals of this kind don't you think you would have listened intently and closely to the conversation?

A.—No, I didn't see any occasion for listening.

Q.—In other words, Parkin was outside trying to make a deal with the Minister and two other gentlemen from the Department and you weren't sufficiently interested to listen to what was said?

A.—There was a room between the outside room and myself. I didn't go and put my ear to the door and listen.

Q.—What I want to get at is this: you apparently did hear some of the conversation.

A.—I heard Parkin introduced to one of them, I believe it was Hogarth.

Q.—And you heard something said about the 1st of March?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You could have heard the conversation if you had listened. You were sitting there with both doors open, you could hear the conversation?

A.—Sometimes when a man was facing the door I might hear him. I couldn't hear the conversation distinctly.

Q.—You mean you did not try to?

A.—No, I didn't pay much attention.

Q.—You sat there until they had done their business and came in and then you went away?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said you sold other trucks before, I don't suppose you ever sold trucks with this particular dump body?

A.—No, we didn't sell any of them.

Q.—Can you tell me whether they were sold at standard prices or were sold at a cut price?

A.—No, in fixing the price of these dump bodies when he got the thing made out I said "Did you make it good enough?" and he said "Yes, I am charging the Government \$59. each to drive them to Dunnville.

Q.—From where?

A.—From Toronto to Dunnville.

Q.—That is what Parkin said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So he got the price indicated and put on that charge?

A.—When I said "Did you make it good enough?" he said "Yes." We did not know the price of these dump bodies and had to get that from Toronto.

Q.—What did you think about that, did you think it was honest?

A.—I can't say that that part of it was honest.

Q.—When he told you he was doing this thing you as an honest man mixed up in the transaction immediately protested didn't you?

Q.—That being the case, after that was all fixed up you went down to Milwaukee?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And in Milwaukee did you make any inquiry as to what the price of trucks was going to be after the first of January?

A.—Not that I remember. The sales manager was not there, just the advertising manager.

Q.—You said he entertained you for a day. Did you see the sales manager at all before you left—did he get back?

A.—No.

Q.—You still stayed on working for Parkin after the 1st of January?

A.—Yes, until the 6th of March.

Q.—Will you tell me, please, what happened after the 1st of January with regard to the standard price of these trucks. Did they go up or down or remain stationary?

A.—I can't say. I didn't hear they went up. My prices didn't change.

Q.—You still kept the old price list?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you sell any after the 1st of January?

A.—Not a Sterling I may have sold another.

Q.—So far as the price was concerned you had no actual experience of what it was from an actual sale?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you know how Parkin got his commission. Did he get the money and pay Grace Motors or did Grace Motors get the money and pay him?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—I am told he got it in February?

A.—If he did he must have kept it from me. He didn't tell me. He told me he hadn't got it.

Q.—You had nothing to do with the office with keeping the books or handling the cheques?

A.—No.

Q.—Up to the time you left on March 6, you were under the impression from what he had said to you that he hadn't got anything out of it? z

A.—He told me there were two trucks in Toronto and that he expected to make delivery of the others at any time.

Q.—Did you have anything to do with the delivery of the trucks?

A.—I left before the trucks were delivered.

Q.—They hadn't got actual delivery by the 1st March?

A.—No. Parkin told me there were two in Toronto, that is all I know about it. They expected the others along any time.

MR. McCRAE: When were they in Toronto?

A.—That would be March 6, when they got there I couldn't say.

MR. BRACKIN: You spoke of a conversation on March 6, that would be the time you left?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said Parkin asked you "What do you figure we have to give Biggs? You know who Biggs was?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Minister of Public Works?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The man who was giving the contract?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Representing the Government, a member of the Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—"Parkin said "What do you figure we have to give Biggs and I said we should give him \$3,000"?"

A.—First we spoke of a new car.

Q.—I don't think you told us about that before. "We first spoke of a car and I said 'give him \$3,000.'" Is that it?

A.—I said \$3,000 would be about right. I said "You can take my share."

Q.—Do you mean that was to pay the Minister of Public Works money for giving the contract to Parkin?

A.—That is the way I looked at it. That is what I believed.

Q.—Parkin said "What do you figure we have to give Biggs?"

A.—What we should give Biggs.

Q.—The way I took it is this: "Parkin said what do you figure we have to give Biggs?" I said "We should give him \$3,000 and you can take my share up to 5 per cent." What I want to get at is this, that was \$3,000 which you understood was a bribe going to the Minister of Public Works for giving this contract to Parkin. Is that what you understood?

A.—He had the money.

Q.—Just a moment. Is that what you understood? When you said "I said

we should give him \$3,000. did you mean that you and Parkin between you should give the Minister of Public Works \$3,000 as a bribe for giving this contract to Parkin?

A.—I was not going to approach Biggs myself.

Q.—I am not asking you that.

A.—I know what you are trying to do. You are trying to discredit me.

Q.—I would not think of discrediting you. Here is your own evidence “Parkin said “what do you figure we have to give Biggs?” and I said ‘we should give him \$3,000, you can take my share at 5 per cent.’” What do you mean that you and Parkin should give him that money for?

A.—For putting the deal through.

Q.—Did you understand it that this \$3,000. was a bribe which was to go to the Minister of Public Works for having bought these cars from Parkin?

A.—I think we both figured he had something coming to him.

Q.—When Parkin said “What do you suppose we have to give Biggs” you didn’t say you should not give him anything, that it wasn’t right?

A.—No. I said “We should give him \$3,000, but you take it up with Frank.

Q.—Do I understand you to tell us that while you were not willing to approach him yourself you intended that Parkin should do that. Were you willing to be a party, to the extent you have told us, to an attempt to bribe the Minister of Public Works for \$3,000.?

A.—Do you mean was I willing to give my share to go to the Minister?

Q.—For the purpose of paying the Minister \$3,000. for having given this contract to Parkin—were you willing to be a party to that?

A.—Yes. I was willing to give my share.

Q.—You were the person who proposed it. You are the person who proposed the amount you thought should be given?

A.—We spoke of the car before the \$3,000.

Q.—Who spoke of the car?

A.—Parkin. I said “If we gave him a new car it would look bad. We have to be careful of what we do.”

Q.—You said “If we gave him a new car it would look bad.” You mean it would be seen every day?

A.—I said “\$3,000 would be a good share but you take it up with him first.”

Q.—Why do you say it would look bad if you gave him a car?

A.—I thought there would be trouble.

Q.—In other words—would this be a fair way of putting it—You thought there would be trouble because it would be crooked? You thought it would be a crooked thing to do?

A.—I thought that if it got down here to these buildings they would make trouble out of it.

Q.—What I want to get at is this: is it fair to say that the reason you didn’t want to give him a car, the reason you didn’t want that known was because that would be a crooked thing to do? You knew that?

A.—I knew the whole thing was crooked.

Q.—Then you didn’t want him to be given something that could be seen?

A.—I was working to protect him.

Q.—What about Reynolds. Did you want to protect yourself?

A.—How do you mean, protect myself?

Q.—What did you mean “Protect the Minister”?

A.—That if the deal went through and the thing was heard of down here, the party down here would make trouble.

Q.—Did you want to protect yourself?

A.—All I wanted was my money.

Q.—And you wanted to protect yourself?

A.—No, I wanted my money. The three of us worked together on it. When the deal started we were told to keep our mouths shut. I did and Parkin didn't. When he got the order, on the way home he stopped at Oakville and showed a man the order. I said, “Len, keep that in your pocket.” Still, he swore in court that we didn't talk about the truck order on the way to Toronto, as if he was putting a thing like that through every day.

MR. McCRAE: Is it a fact that you didn't discuss it?

A.—Oh, we talked about it. We couldn't get it out of our heads. We couldn't sleep.

MR. BRACKIN: Let us go back a little. Parkin first suggested that you should give him a car and you said, “No, there may be trouble about that.” Now you have told me you thought the whole thing was crooked—

A.—I wouldn't exactly say crooked.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did say it.

A.—Well, I stick to it.

MR. BRACKIN: You didn't want what was going to be given to the Minister to be given in such shape that it could be easily found out. That was your idea?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were the one who suggested the cash?

A.—Yes, I suggested \$3,000. When I made that suggestion I said, “You must take this up with Frank.”

Q.—You knew it was crooked. You didn't want to give a car because it could be easily found out. You suggested cash. Now at the time that you made the suggestion that Parkin should see the Minister and see about the \$3,000 cash you knew that was crooked and dishonest?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were the fellow who proposed it?

A.—I didn't propose it at all. We were talking about it every day. We talked about it all the time.

Q.—But you proposed the \$3,000. cash?

A.—He asked me. We talked of a car and he said, “What do you figure we should give Frank. What do you think he wants?”

Q.—You suggested the \$3,000.?

A.—I said that \$3,000. would be fair.

Q.—What we want to get at is this, to enable us to come to a conclusion about you. You say you knew that was crooked, you knew it was dishonest?

A.—Yes, I did.

Q.—And you were the one who proposed the \$3,000. cash?

A.—Yes, I said \$3,000. would be about right.

Q.—Well, I want to ask you this: I think you told me that would be crooked and dishonest and that you were willing to be a party to it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your willingness to be a party to it arose from the fact that you thought you were going to get a commission out of that sale?

A.—I think I did.

Q.—If you had thought at that time that you weren't going to get any money out of the sale to the Government you would never have suggested giving anything to Biggs at all?

A.—The two of us worked on the whole thing from start to finish. I wanted what was coming to me.

Q.—You, yourself, would never have suggested something which you have told us you knew was crooked and dishonest if it hadn't been for the fact that you were going to get some money out of the transaction?

A.—If I didn't work on it at all. If Parkin had put the deal through himself, if I didn't have anything to do with it I would not have had the right to talk about it at all.

Q.—Now come back and answer the question. Is it so that the reason why you were willing to be a party to what you have told us you knew to be a crooked and dishonest deal was that you expected to get some money out of it yourself. Is that the reason?

A.—I answered that. I see what you want to do. You want—

Q.—Never mind that. I will repeat the question—

A.—I can answer the question. You asked me if I expected to get my share out of it.

Q.—I asked you if your reason for suggesting something which you have told us you knew to be crooked and dishonest, your reason for suggesting that and your willingness to be a party to it, was because you expected to get some money out of the transaction for yourself?

A.—I talked and worked over every point of it with Parkin. I was not in doubt at all about getting my money. I fully understood I was getting my money.

Q.—You have told this Committee you suggested something you knew was crooked and dishonest and that you were willing to be a party to something crooked and dishonest. That is what you told us, and we are entitled to know why you fell from grace. I am asking this, whether your reason for being willing to enter into a deal you say you knew was crooked and dishonest was that you hoped or expected to get some money out of that sale to the Government.

A.—I was asked for a suggestion and said \$3,000. He said, "What do you think is fair"? This car cost \$2,800. I was asked for a suggestion and I suggested \$3,000. He suggested a car and I was asked for my suggestion and I gave him my answer \$3,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Brackin wants is this: you are asked if your reason for being willing to do that was because you expected to get some money out of it. Answer yes or no.

A.—Because I expected to? It was understood I was to get some money.

Q.—Was that the reason?

A.—No. I was working for Parkin and Parkin understood—

Q.—Was it one of the reasons?

A.—That is a hard thing to say "yes" to. I was working for Parkin, and Parkin understood I was to get something.

MR. McCRAE: At the time this talk took place between yourself and Parkin

as to what, if anything, should be given to the Minister, had the transaction been consummated as between the Government and Parkin, had the deal been made?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that at the time you were talking about a possible something for the Minister, in your mind was the knowledge that the deal was already closed and it was a question of whether you should give anything to the Minister out of a transaction that had been completed and out of which you expected to get some money?

A.—I expected to get my share. I thought there was no doubt about it.

MR. BRACKIN: You have told me you were willing, that you proposed a thing you knew to be crooked and dishonest?

A.—I was asked to propose it.

Q.—You were not asked to propose anything crooked.

Mr. Price objected to the nature of questions but the Chairman ruled that the question was being put fairly, that Mr. Brackin had not had an answer to his question and was entitled to it.

MR. PRICE: If Parkin suggested a car, what was the difference between giving a car and giving \$3,000?

Objection by Mr. Brackin, that Mr. Price was putting the answer in the mouth of the witness. A question being raised by Mr. Drury as to whether the suggestion of a car came after or before the suggestion of the \$3,000, the evidence taken was referred to and read.

MR. BRACKIN: You have told us that you suggested something you knew to be crooked and dishonest and that you were willing to be a party to it. I suppose it is true that that was the first time you ever expressed a willingness to go into anything crooked or dishonest? You never before indicated a willingness to go into anything crooked or dishonest?

A.—I would not say that—all through my life. I am not an angel.

Q.—What you say is that when you said you were willing to go into something you knew was crooked and dishonest, you are not prepared to say that that was the first time in your young life that it happened to you?

A.—No.

Q.—That was the first time you were ever mixed up in a deal of that size, in which there was so much dishonesty and crookedness. The others were mere piker deals compared with this?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you said that you were willing to do a thing that was crooked and dishonest do you mean to tell us that the fact that you expected to get some money out of it yourself had nothing whatever to do with your being willing to do a thing that was crooked and dishonest?

A.—No, it was not because I was going to get money out of it. That was understood from the start to the finish. I didn't think for a minute that I was going to be double crossed.

Q.—Do you mean to say that when you were expressing a willingness to be crooked, to do a thing that was crooked and dishonest, you were willing to do that in the interest of Parkin and not of yourself?

A.—In the interest of Parkin and myself and everything else. It was not just because I was getting mine out of it.

MR. DEWART: You thought Biggs was entitled to it?

A.—Yes, sure.

MR. BRACKIN: Be perfectly frank. You don't want us to believe you would have suggested this crooked and dishonest thing and express a willingness to be a party to it if there was not a cent coming to you?

A.—If there was not a cent coming to me I would not be in the case at all.

Q.—You wouldn't be suggesting that Biggs should get \$3,000?

A.—If I hadn't worked on it they wouldn't have been talking about it to me at all. I must admit I expected my money.

Q.—You would not have been making that suggestion of \$3,000 to the Minister if you didn't expect to get yours?

A.—I thought I was going to get my share.

Q.—Was it in Dundas, or Hamilton, that you were in Mr. Shaver's office?

A.—Dundas.

Q.—Was that the day of the trial?

A.—The morning of the trial.

Q.—And Mr. Biggs was there?

A.—He came in.

Q.—Were you and Shaver in Shaver's private office.

A.—They were in the private office. I was outside.

Q.—Biggs talked to Shaver—who spoke first? Biggs was in the office. You were there and Shaver was there with Biggs in Biggs' private office. Who spoke first?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Who opened the conversation?

A.—Biggs said, "Let's get these fellows together. What will you take to settle."

Q.—You knew Biggs well—you called him Frank—and had known his family, and Biggs knew Parkins pretty well?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had this trouble, and I suppose one of the biggest items in the trouble was this purchase from the Government?

A.—I had a private talk with Biggs in his private house. He told me the Saturday night I would get my money, that he was going to see Parkin and get a settlement.

Q.—He wanted Parkin to make a settlement with you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He said to Shaver "Why can't we get these fellows together." What did Shaver say?

A.—I don't remember: "You should do something, Frank" or something like that.

Q.—He wanted to get you out of the lawyer's hands, he didn't want you to spend your money in law costs? Was anything said about getting together and making a deal rather than spending your money in the courts?

A.—I don't think he would tell the lawyer that.

Q.—Was anything said about that?

A.—He just said, "Can we get these fellows together? What will Reynolds take to settle?" I said, "I will take \$3,000 to settle."

Q.—He was to see Parkin?

A.—Yes, he said he would see Parkin.

Q.—Did he succeed in getting you two together?

A.—No.

Q.—Was Parkin home?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you know whether he did see Parkin?

A.—I saw them in the court-house talking together.

Q.—You don't know if Parkin's lawyer went to your lawyer and said, "Let's sit down and fix this thing up"?

A.—No. I went to Parkin and said, "Let's settle this, let's talk it over and settle.

Q.—You were friends and didn't want to throw your money away in law costs. Did you succeed?

A.—No. He said that if I wanted a fight we would go ahead and fight it out.

MR. McCRAE: The transaction was completed between the Government on the one hand and Parkin on the other for the purchase of these trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—A month or two after that deal was completed a conversation took place between you and Parkin as to giving something to the Minister?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who mentioned giving something to the Minister first and what was said. Who first mentioned the need for giving a donation to the Minister?

A.—I cannot say the first, Parkin and I worked together day in and day out. We worked from St. Catharines clean around to Oakville, and we were talking about it at different times.

Q.—Was the car suggested first or the money suggested first?

A.—On that especial day the car was mentioned first. The first occasion was previous to that. When the Toronto Star reporter came there he asked me about the deal. That was the time the notoriety started in the papers. I refused to talk to them, only that the deal was for twelve trucks. He wanted to know where Parkin was and I said I didn't know. I didn't get a chance to get Parkin and tell him to keep quiet before this man got him on the phone. He called Parkin up on the phone.

Q.—You did come down to a day when you had a discussion at which the Minister was not present?

A.—He was not present.

Q.—A discussion as to the amount you two fellows thought should be given the Minister. Which was proposed first on that day, the car or the \$3,000?

A.—The car.

Q.—Parkin proposed a car and then asked you to suggest what you thought was fair. Your contra advice was that it should not take the form of a car because it would be liable to cause talk?

A.—Yes, I stated that.

Q.—That whatever was done should be in the form of money?

A.—Yes, he said we should have to leave it until some future time.

Q.—Was there an agreement at that time between you and Parkin as to what your share of the commission should be?

A.—No, not signed.

Q.—Approximately what was the arrangement between you and Parkin?

A.—He told me that they had trimmed him out of three or four thousand, jumped the price on him or something. I said, I told him to be careful, that that man Holt was too tricky for him. I told him to be careful of this man Holt, that he was a cleverer man than he was. I said I was sorry I didn't go up with him. When we went there I said, "Don't tell them you have an order, ask what you can get them for if you can put a deal through for twelve trucks. You can get a better price than if you go in and say, here is an order."

Q.—What should your share of the commission have been?

A.—It would amount to about 5 per cent., about \$3,500. It might be a little less on account of not getting such a commission on these dump bodies.

Q.—So the \$3,000 amount was discussed and you said you were prepared to pay your portion?

A.—Yes, my portion out of **that**.

Q.—It was to come out of your share of the commission?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At that time the whole transaction between Parkin and the Government had been concluded?

A.—Yes, everything settled.

Q.—I want to get clear about Mr. Brackin's question. Was the original proposal in which Mr. Brackin suggested you were going to do something dishonest—did that arise prior to the time the negotiations were on for the purchase of these trucks, or was it only after the transaction was concluded and you expected a certain commission, approximately \$3,500?

A.—Yes.

MR. CLARKE: How did you come to think about this \$3,000. Did the Minister ever approach Parkin or you as to getting a commission for himself?

A.—He never approached me.

Q.—How did you come to think about it. I never gave a man anything unless he approached me. I've often been approached and didn't do it then. How did you come to think about giving the Minister \$3,000, when he never approached you and was no party to the contract. Why did you think you should be so benevolent as to give away \$3,000?

A.—The only answer I can give is that it naturally grew on us, I thought it no more than fair that we, who were clearing \$15,000 or \$16,000 should give him a share.

Q.—You don't know whether Biggs ever approached Parkin or yourself?

A.—He never approached me.

MR. DRURY: It may be that you knowing nothing of Mr. Biggs approaching any one, and with your personal opinion of Parkin—would it occur to you that Parkin was simply putting a game over on you for the sake of getting you to contribute something that would not be handed on?

A.—I don't quite understand that.

Q.—Had you any reason to think that this \$3,000 you talked about would ever get to Mr. Biggs. Did he ever approach you or Parkin?

A.—He never approached me over it.

Q.—You regarded your presence here in the department as necessary to close the deal, because you had been working on it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was your part in working on it. What did you do?

A.—I have told all I did on it.

Q.—You said you worked continually on the deal?

A.—Well, that was just from Saturday until Tuesday.

Q.—You thought it was not safe to let Parkin come without your superior knowledge and so on?

A.—I didn't think for a minute that I should stay at home when I was working on the deal.

Q.—You regarded Parkin as being much better acquainted than you with the mechanical superiority of the trucks?

A.—I said Parkin was a mechanic.

Q.—And a man who could make a much better talk than you could on the mechanical qualities of the car?

A.—I don't think Parkin can out-talk me on cars, no.

Q.—But mechanically?

A.—No, I don't think he can. I have had twelve years experience. The mechanism of the car he does know.

Q.—You said two or three times, if I understood you aright you didn't even know the price of these cars, the price paid or anything else.

A.—I didn't know the price of the dump bodies. We had to get it and figure it out, what we would charge.

Q.—You told us you couldn't tell the price of the cars?

A.—I couldn't tell the price of these cars completed.

Q.—You didn't know the price on which the sale was to be based?

A.—The tender was not put in as one car so much. It was put in as six cars.

Q.—What I cannot understand is how you who knew less about the mechanism of the cars, and apparently did not know anything about the price, should be essential in putting through that deal?

A.—It is a matter of your own opinion, the way you look at it. I have my own opinion and he has his.

MR. DEWART: You were telling my friend about a conversation in Mr. Shaver's office on the morning of the trial when Biggs came in and asked if you couldn't get together. Tell us the whole of that conversation?

A MEMBER: The conversation in Biggs office, what did Biggs say to you. You said Biggs made a statement as you came out of the bedroom door?

A.—He shook hands and said, "That is a nice order you boys have got in a long time—or many a day."

MR. DEWART: But the time in Mr. Shaver's office. Will you give us the whole of that conversation?

A.—Between Shaver and Biggs?

Q.—Yes?

A.—I just can't say. I remember him asking what I would take to settle and I said \$3,000.

Q.—Who asked that?

A.—Mr. Biggs was facing Shaver when he said it. I told Shaver in case of a settlement what I would settle for. I said \$3,000 cash.

G.—Did Biggs ask you what you would take to settle?

A.—Yes, whether he said it to me or not I can't say.

Q.—Did he ask that?

A.—Yes, whether he said it to Mr. Shaver or myself.

Q.—You knew the question was put by Mr. Biggs as to what you would take to settle?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: He said before, "Let us get these fellows together, what would you take to settle."

MR. DEWART: Was anything further said after that?

A.—He said I will go down and see Parkin.

Q.—Did he leave the office to see Parkin?

A.—Yes, he left the office.

Q.—Was anything further said as he left?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Did he express an opinion as to whether \$3,000 was a fair sum or not?

A.—No, he didn't. He said, "I will go down and see Parkin."

MR. TOLMIE: I understood you had sold some of these trucks before?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it a custom for you and Parkin to go together to close up a deal?

A.—We worked together on every deal that went through for the nine months I was there. I have been away when deals have been closed, such as the Rogers but I couldn't do any good on it as Parkin had to make an arrangement about the money.

Q.—It was the custom for you to go together to close a deal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When this deal was likely to be closed up you two came down as was your custom?

A.—I think so, yes.

MR. DONNELLY: This was the first transaction Parkin or you ever had with the Government?

A.—The first transaction I ever had.

Q.—I gather from your evidence that it was your opinion and also the opinion of Parkin that this was the beginning of what you expected to be a considerable business. You expected further orders; hoped for further orders?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The matter of paying \$3,000 or giving a car to the Minister was never discussed by you and Parkin until after the transaction was closed?

A.—We only saw him for a few minutes.

A.—It was not until after the transaction was closed?

Q.—The time you had this discussion in which you suggested \$3,000 instead of a car, was how long after the transaction was closed and the order signed?

A.—From December 31. to March 6.

Q.—As you stated here, as far as you know, nothing was ever said by you to Biggs or by Biggs to you in reference to anything from Parkin to Mr. Biggs. Nothing was ever said? Nothing was said to Mr. Biggs about getting some money?

A.—I didn't myself.

Q.—So far as you know, nothing was ever said by Parkin to Mr. Biggs?

A.—I can't say what Parkin said.

Q.—As far as you know?

A.—I admit I don't know if Parkin spoke to him.

Q.—As far as you know you didn't?

A.—As far as I know I didn't.

Q.—Had any mention been made of the possibility of getting further orders?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you any idea that the \$3,000 or the car mentioned originally was a matter between Parkin and yourself and—as far as you know—never reached Mr. Biggs? As far as you know?

A.—Yes, as far as I know.

Q.—That is the situation?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said something about Biggs going into Shaver's office and you told us the Saturday night before you went to his house?

A.—I met him on the street and said, "I would like to have a talk with you." I got in a car and drove to Frank's house. I said, "I suppose you know what I am here for. I want to tell you my side of the story."

DR. GODFREY: Who is "Frank"?

A.—Mr. Biggs. I said, "I will tell you what I'll do. Get Parkin and let him tell his story and I will tell you my story. You be the judge, and if you find I haven't got it coming to me I will quit.

MR. BRACKIN: Did you tell him the conversation you had about the car and the \$3,000?

A.—No, I didn't say anything about that.

Q.—Why not?

A.—I had no right to talk over Parkin's head.

Q.—You told your story and didn't mention this at all?

A.—I did say to him "Whatever is coming to you I am willing to give mine."

Q.—You said you never mentioned it?

A.—I said that and he didn't say a word, whether he heard it or listened to it or not, I don't know.

Q.—You said you would tell your story and Parkin could tell his. Did you tell your story?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose you were trying to convince Frank that Parkin had always agreed to pay this commission?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You told Biggs about the conversation on the 6th of March—in Biggs house that night? You told him that on the 6th of March, you discussed this thing with Parkin, the payment of a commission?

A.—I told him Parkin offered me this \$400.

Q.—You were telling Frank about the conversation on March 6th?

A.—I remember saying, "Frank, whatever is coming to you out of this I am willing to give mine." I went on talking and he didn't say a thing.

Q.—You went to Frank and said you wanted to tell him your story and Parkin could tell his. What I want to know is this: as part of the story you told him that night did you tell him about the conversation about the commission on the 6th of March?

A.—I don't know whether I did or not. I was telling about how I had worked for Parkin, the work I did and everything else.

Q.—At the time you were talking to Frank in his house that night did you tell him that Parkin had talked about giving him a car and that you had talked about giving him \$3,000?

A.—I do not know whether I did or not. I was not going to approach him.

Q.—You told us you said that whatever was coming to him you would give yours. Did you say that Parkin had suggested a car and that you had suggested \$3,000?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—If Mr. Biggs says you did not will you accept what he says about it as true? If he says that will you accept that?

A.—It is hard for me to believe or deny. I forget. I do not know whether I did or not.

Q.—What was the effect of that conversation you had that night when you finished up. When you left the house was Frank to do anything further to see if he could get you and Parkin together?

A.—He said, "I will see Parkin Monday morning, I believe your story and you will get yours."

Q.—On Monday morning, was that when he came into Shaver's office?

A.—No, that was months after. That was during March or April.

Q.—I thought you told me it was a day shortly before he came into Shaver's office. I thought you told me that a few nights before you were at his house?

A.—Oh no, I didn't.

Q.—How long was it before?

A.—I think it was five or six months. I think that happened in March or April.

Q.—And in those five or six months did you see Mr. Biggs frequently?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you talk to him?

A.—Where?

Q.—Did you never talk to him about this business. You say he said that night five or six months before the trial, "I will see Parkin and see what we can do." Did you see him the next two or three days or the next two or three weeks?

A.—I didn't see him for some time.

Q.—The first time you did see him, did you ask him how he made out?

A.—No, he was going by in his car, going home.

Q.—Did you call him on the telephone and ask him whether he had done anything with Parkin?

A.—I don't think I did.

THE CHAIRMAN: You went up and asked Mr. Biggs to act as mediator between you and Parkin?

A.—Yes, I did.

DR. GODFREY: Does this price include any service at all?

A.—Three months service—90 days.

Q.—Where did they get the service, Toronto or Dundas?

A.—Dundas.

Q.—Had you facilities there?

A.—Oh yes. They have a good workshop.

MR. PRICE: About the time you were talking to Parkin, on March 6—that was

the time you went in and asked for your commission or what he owed you?

A.—Yes. I wanted to get straightened up.

Q.—He asked you to come into the back of the garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the object in going to the end of the garage?

A.—I was asked to go there.

Q.—What was your object in approaching him?

A.—I was going to Buffalo and there was a fellow wanted to borrow \$1,500 from me. I had been working for nine months and hadn't drawn any salary. He told a hard luck story, that he was up against it, and I took it. I said, "Let us get straightened away. We are going to far." He said come out to the garage and walked out of the office.

Q.—Then what happened?

A.—I have told what happened.

Q.—Who started the conversation?

A.—He asked me what I expected out of this Government order and then we started to talk about other deals.

Q.—Confining it to the Government order, what about that?

A.—He asked me what I expected out of the Government order and I told him \$3,000.

MR. McCRAE: Was Parkin hard up. Do you think he was stalling you, telling you a story about a commission he had to pay simply to get some money for himself?

A.—He was always telling a hard luck story, about being up against it.

MR. PRICE: There was a McLaughlin car also in this order. Do you know anything about that?

A.—It was not in the order when I was there.

Q.—Did Biggs keep a car in the garage?

A.—He drove up once in an Overland car that I thought belonged to the Government. It was snowing and he didn't want to drive back, and left it in the garage. It was there a month or two.

Q.—You don't know anything about this item of \$2,800?

A.—No.

Witness excused. The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

April 6, 1920.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m., Mr. Curry in the chair.

Hon. F. C. Biggs called and sworn; examined by Mr. Brackin.

Q.—Mr. Biggs, you are Minister of Public Works?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And have been since this Government came into power?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you come into power?

A.—November, 1919.

Q.—When you go back prior to December, 1919, tell us, so far as purchasing was concerned in your department what was the organization? Since you came in—is there a purchasing agent?

A.—Mr. Hogarth chief engineer of the Department is now and has been and

was when I took hold of the department, the purchasing agent for the Department and everything is purchased under his signature and recommendation.

Q.—Would that include trucks for the Highways Branch?

A.—Everything.

Q.—From what you learned can you tell us whether, before the Government came in, any consideration that had been given to the purchase of trucks?

A.—I found in the Department that the purchase of trucks for the development of the roads had been considered some time previous, probably a year, or a year and a half. Mr. Hogarth can clear that question up in his evidence.

Q.—I want to see what knowledge you have. As you know it doesn't make any difference where you got it, it is admissible as evidence. To come back. You say you learned after you came in that the purchase of trucks had been up for consideration sometime before you came in. How long prior to December, 1919, had this purchase of trucks come to your attention. I mean in any concrete form, coming from Mr. Hogarth?

A.—The purchase of trucks was brought to my attention in concrete form by Mr. Hogarth, early in December, with a view to trying to get their delivery for Spring work.

Q.—Tell me how it came up?

A.—I cannot state verbatim what was said. It was all verbal and not in correspondence. The purchasing agent, and chief engineer Mr. Hogarth, recommended that the Department put in enough trucks to handle the work of the Department since he thought it advisable, in his recommendation for the coming season, on account of embargoes and the difficulty of getting delivery, to consider the matter early. He brought it to my attention in December, and after bringing it to my attention he recommended that we should purchase Sterling trucks.

MR. McCRAE: Who recommended that?

A.—Mr. Hogarth. After careful consideration of the different manufactures of trucks both personally and by the chief mechanic, Mr. Johnston, his recommendation to me was that we should purchase Sterling trucks for the Department.

MR. BRACKIN: Let me ask you, just to clear that up: as far as the purchase of these particular trucks was concerned was there anything on your part verbal or otherwise in the form of a suggestion to Mr. Hogarth or the Deputy Minister or the chief mechanic to purchase any particular kind of truck?

A.—Absolutely none. It was immaterial to me what kind of trucks were purchased. This was Mr. Hogarth's recommendation after careful consideration.

Q.—Do you know what the extent of the investigation was? Something was said the other day about the Works Department, of Toronto, being consulted. Do you know anything about that?

A.—I do not know that the Works Department of Toronto was consulted. I understand they carried on a similar investigation and the report to the Board of Control in that particular matter advised the purchase of Sterling trucks also which joined with the recommendation of my own department, was strong evidence for the purchase of Sterling trucks.

Q.—You say that the suggestion regarding Sterling trucks came from Mr. Hogarth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that was in December?

A.—Along in December.

Q.—When he recommended Sterling trucks, did you yourself make any investigation of Sterling trucks, as a result of Mr. Hogarth's recommendation, did you go to see about it?

A.—After Mr. Hogarth recommended Sterling trucks I went down to Grace Motors and carefully inspected Sterling trucks to the best of my ability. I also investigated the price and I asked very carefully as to whether they were bought from Grace Motors the distributors for Ontario if there could be any discount obtained for the Department. I was informed that the price of Sterling trucks was standard and that it did not matter where they were bought.

Q.—Then with that information in your possession, Mr. Hogarth having recommended the purchase of Sterling trucks—at the time he made the recommendation was there any decision come to, as to the number to be bought?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who decided that?

A.—Mr. Hogarth recommended that twelve trucks be bought.

Q.—Then how soon after that did you see Parkin and how did you come to see him?

A.—I would explain to the Committee: Parkin's garage was what might be called my home garage, the only McLaughlin garage in my district. I drove a McLaughlin car, and that is where I got gas, and oil and minor services.

Q.—How far away were you—Reynolds said four miles?

A.—Between three and four miles.

Q.—In coming to Toronto and going back home again did you pass this garage?

A.—Yes, it is on the main street of the town. Even if only going into Hamilton we had to pass this garage. It has been my custom and is my custom now when motoring home from Toronto or Hamilton, to go to a phone in Dundas and call up Mrs. Biggs to ask if meat or provisions, or anything is needed for the home. That was my custom followed in December, 1919, and has been since.

Q.—Did you make any more stops at Parkin's garage in December, than in October or November?

A.—No, just the regular stops.

Q.—Tell me as to your knowledge, if you had any as to Parkin having an agency for Sterling trucks, how long had he that?

A.—I cannot say how long he had the agency. I knew that Parkin had sold a number of Sterling trucks for early in the season, and during the season of 1919, that concrete fact was drawn to my attention, because there are three or four Sterling trucks that draw milk from my particular district into Hamilton and they pass my home in that district every morning.

I suppose this is true, that the agency for Sterling trucks was something that Parkin had had for some time before the Department decided to buy Sterling trucks?

A.—Absolutely so. I know he sold them and they had been passing my home for months. I had a chance to watch Sterling trucks at work.

Q.—That being the case, Parkin having the agency for the trucks for some time and Hogarth having recommended the purchase of a number of Sterling trucks—after that recommendation came to you you were at Parkin's garage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it on one of your trips home?

A.—I suppose that was the 20th of December, one of the witnesses spoke about. I cannot say the date.

Q.—What talk did you have with Parkin regarding the trucks and what was said?

A.—In speaking to Parkin I said the Department was likely to buy trucks for road work and I asked him if he cared to tender on the trucks. He said he would like to tender and I said he would have that privilege.

Q.—Did you indicate to Parkin at all that the Department had decided, that Hogarth had recommended the purchase of Sterling trucks?

A.—No indication whatever as to the kind, the price or the details, whatever.

Q.—What did he say about that—about making a tender?

A.—He said he would be glad to tender upon them as he was in the business and would like to get some of the business.

Q.—How long after that was it that he had his tender or proposition ready?

A.—I think it was the week after, if I remember properly.

Q.—Is that when you called for and got the tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Just explain how that came about?

A.—The reason I called for the tender was that in the interim between the time that Hogarth recommended we should purchase the trucks we were notified by the company that the price was to advance 10 per cent. on the 1st of January, and that if we wished to save the Department \$10,000 or \$12,000 it would be necessary to have that order accepted by the Department and placed with Grace Motors, the distributors, prior to the 1st of January. It being but two days from the end of the month I called for the tender and brought it to Toronto, in order to save the Department this \$10,000 or \$12,000.

Q.—What did you do with the tender when you got here?

A.—I gave it to Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Was there any indication by you to Mr. Hogarth that you desired that tender to be accepted, or anything of that kind.

A.—I told him to compare the prices very carefully and buy Sterling trucks where he could buy them cheapest.

Q.—How long after Hogarth got that tender did you hear from him. I am speaking now with regard to the telephone conversation spoken of the other day in which you called Parkin up and told him to come over?

A.—This tender was given to Hogarth in the morning and in the afternoon he took the matter up with me. He said Parkin's price was the standard price for the Province, the same as had been offered by Grace Motors, and his recommendation was placed on that tender. In the morning as was stated here, Parkin came to Toronto so as to close up the matter and have the order placed with Grace Motors before the 1st of January.

Q.—You spoke of Mr. Hogarth recommending it on the afternoon before Parkin came over. What shape was that recommendation in, was it verbal or in writing?

A.—It is signed on the contract, that is here.

Q.—Hogarth having made a recommendation in writing on the afternoon of

the day before and you having that recommendation in writing, did you call Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did you tell him?

A.—To come to Toronto so we could get the deal closed with the Grace Motors so that we could save the 10 per cent.

Q.—Now let us go back a minute. With regard to Parkin and yourself, prior to this time, how long had you known him?

A.—I cannot say. Possibly five years. It might be six or seven years.

Q.—Did you know him exceptionally well?

A.—No, only through doing business with him, the same as any other dealer or merchant in town.

Q.—Did he take a part in the last election, or was he a supporter of yours?

A.—I didn't see him mark his ballot. I know he did no work for me. I am quite aware of that fact.

Q.—Then Reynolds, how long have you known him?

A.—By sight six or seven years. Reynolds is a man I never knew personally at all. I never came in contact with him personally.

Q.—Was he a friend of yours at all—Reynolds?

A.—No.

Q.—That being the case you called Parkin and told him to come over, and he and Reynolds came over the next morning. What time was it that you saw them here at the Parliament Buildings?

A.—It was before office hours, shortly before office hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Might I suggest, Mr. Brackin, that you get Mr. Biggs to tell what took place at the first interview he had with these two people?

MR. BRACKIN: Yes. Let us go back to the 20th of December, when you asked him if he would like to put in a tender and he said he would. Was Reynolds there at that time?

A.—He might have been in the building. I had no conversation with him on the matter of tenders.

Q.—Was there on that occasion, on the 20th of December, the date on which he asked you if you would like to put in a tender, any conversation about trucks between you and Parkin that took place in the presence of Mr. Reynolds?

A.—Not that I remember.

Q.—Was that about all that took place. Did they start to figure at all, to make up figures while you were there?

A.—No, absolutely no figures. We never discussed it at any time.

Q.—Did you talk to Reynolds about it?

A.—No.

Q.—Not about putting in a tender or anything of that kind?

A.—I never discussed the tender with Reynolds, at all.

Q.—Do you know if Reynolds took part in any conversation between you and Parkin regarding the matter of these tenders—on the 20th?

A.—No.

Q.—You phoned Parkin, after Hogarth made his recommendation, to come over, and they were here before office hours and met you in the hall and went with you to your office—

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a matter spoken of by Reynolds. He said there was a question of commission mentioned and that Parkin said he couldn't meet the National commission and that you said—

MR. BRACKIN: What he said was this: Parkin suggested that he would give the Government 10 per cent. discount and Reynolds said in your presence, "Why should we give the Government a discount of 10 per cent. and charge someone else 100 per cent." that it would be better, more sensible to charge the department 105 per cent. or the full 100 per cent., and that you said, "Parkin, listen to Reynolds, and he will make you some money." Did anything of that kind take place?

A.—No, absolutely no. The matter of price or commission was never discussed in any shape or form with either gentleman and I knew nothing of the price that Parkin would submit at any time until I had it placed before me by the chief engineer.

Q.—On that occasion or any other occasion did Parkin or any other person offer to make a discount of 10 per cent. on these trucks?

A.—No.

Q.—Then let us get back. We are back to the Parliament Buildings again and you and Parkin and Reynolds come down to your office.

A.—I was at breakfast.

Q.—You met them when you came up from breakfast?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And went down to the office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the situation in your office when you went into it?

A.—The charwoman was not through with her work in my main office. She was not in the room but her cleaning things were there. I knew she was not through with the work and we stepped through into my own private room.

Q.—How long were you there before Mr. Hogarth and Mr. McLean came in?

A.—That is a question—a matter of a few minutes.

Q.—Can you tell me what the conversation was, in the private room, when you and Reynolds and Parkin were there about this particular matter?

A.—I don't think the matter was in the conversation at all.

Q.—Prior to the coming of Mr. Hogarth and Mr. McLean?

A.—No.

Q.—Who was making the purchase. Why didn't you, having got them in there go ahead and make a deal with them? Why didn't you do that?

A.—Because it is Mr. Hogarth's business. He is the purchasing agent of the Department. The same manner and routine was followed in the purchase of these trucks as in the purchase of anything for the Department. It is entirely bought on his recommendation and the recommendation of the Deputy Minister, and after these have both been received and only when they are received is anything signed by the head of the Department, myself.

Q.—Then you say they were in the private room a few minutes before Mr. Hogarth and Mr. McLean came. When Mr. Hogarth and Mr. McLean came, into what room did they go?

A.—I do not think Mr. McLean came in, Mr. Hogarth came.

Q.—Reynolds said he thought two came in. He did not see them, but thought he heard two. At any rate Mr. Hogarth came in?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What room did he come into?

A.—The main office.

Q.—When he came who went out?

A.—Parkin and myself.

Q.—Did you go out together? Reynolds said the other day that he and Parkin were left sitting in the private room. Then you came back after having gone to the outside office and beckoned to Parkin and he came out?

A.—I went out first. Hogarth had the tenders and gave them to me with his recommendations by these officials then Parkin was asked to come in and the tenders attached. Until this had been done these trucks couldn't have been purchased from Parkin or any one else. After he had given me this showing that this was recommended by these officials then Parkin was asked to come in and the tender was accepted.

Q.—How long did it take to complete the matter after Parkin came out into the main room?

A.—Only a matter of a few minutes. The recommendations were there, of the two officials, with their signatures attached.

Q.—Then was there any signing done after that. Did Parkin sign something?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you sign anything?

A.—I signed this as the official signature after these recommendations had been previously attached.

Q.—How long did Parkin and Reynolds stay there after the final signing had been done by you?

A.—I cannot answer that, just a few minutes, a short period.

Q.—At that time was there any discussion about them going over to Milwaukee?

A.—It was never mentioned at all other than that I firmly impressed upon Parkin what is also written on the tender that this order was being given at present prices and that delivery must be completed by the 1st of March, because Mr. Hogarth had recommended that the trucks be purchased for Spring work.

Q.—Tell me right there: on what section of the highways were these trucks to be used first. Where were they to be used?

A.—Some of the trucks were used in the Hamilton Niagara district, on the Western section of the road, some on the Hamilton, London road and some on the Hamilton, Kitchener road.

Q.—Roads, some of which are close to Dundas?

A.—Well, one. On these roads we are making mention of, the trucks needed were used there. A considerable number were used and this territory is in Parkin's sale district.

Q.—I see what you mean. The territory within which some of the trucks, at all events, were to be used is in the districts allocated to him by the Grace Motors within which he has power to sell Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You impressed it upon them that these trucks were to be delivered by the 1st of March—after they went away what was the next you heard of it?

A.—I do not think I heard any more until some matters I read in the newspaper about it. As far as the Department was concerned I heard nothing more

about the truck deal until deliveries were being made and when deliveries started Mr. Hogarth asked me to go and look at some of the trucks.

Q.—Can you tell what time the deliveries started, in respect to the 1st of March?

A.—I think the deliveries started in February. Mr. Hogarth can give you the exact dates.

Q.—At any rate we have this, that Reynolds left Parkin's employ on the 6th of March. Prior to that time did you know of any trouble between Parkin and Reynolds?

A.—I never heard of any trouble prior to the 6th of March.

Q.—When did you first hear of trouble between Parkin and Reynolds and from whom did you hear it? The prospect of litigation for a commission and that sort of thing?

A.—I do not think there was any report of trouble and a prospect of litigation until later in the season.

Q.—How did that come to your ears. Did you hear it from Reynolds or Parkin?

A.—I just heard it on the street. It was common gossip that they were in trouble.

Q.—Let me ask you this: you heard generally that there was trouble. So far as either Reynolds or Parkin was concerned which talked to you personally about the trouble first?

A.—I cannot say which one of the men. You understand I have to take this from memory. I have no notes of it, I cannot say.

Q.—In any event, Reynolds spoke of a time when he went to your house and spoke to you about it. Do you remember, in his evidence he said he told you, "I will tell my story and Parkin can tell his." Did he come up to your house?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that pursuant to a telephone conversation or to a verbal conversation with Reynolds?

A.—Reynolds spoke to me on the street on the afternoon or evening of the day he came up and asked me, "I want to have a talk to you about the trouble I am in with Parkin. Have you any objection if I come up to your house this evening." I said, "No." Then he came up that evening.

Q.—Then what took place when he came?

A.—He said he would like to get the trouble settled as somebody was sure to be a loser, and that neither one of them had money to lose. He thought it would be better to try and get a settlement and asked me, if he would give the details of what he thought his claim was, if I would try and mediate between them, knowing both parties as I did, both being parties in my own home town and me knowing personally a great many of the people Reynolds had sold cars to during the season. I told him I would speak to Parkin and see if he would consider a settlement. Reynolds had said he should have so much commission on one, two, three, four or five cars, or whatever was the number of cars sold, and he thought he should have a commission on the sale of the Government trucks. I made no suggestion or intimation of what he should have at any time.

Q.—Having given you figures, did he mention a specific sum, he was willing to take in settlement?

A.—I think, if my memory bears me out, he said he would settle with Parkin if Parkin would pay him \$3,000 for commission for sales he had made for Parkin up to that time. I think he quit on the 1st of March.

Q.—There was a mention of \$3,000 that he was willing to take?

A.—Yes, if my memory bears me right.

Q.—He told us the other day that in that conversation he told you nothing about the suggestion of Parkin that you should have a car, or his suggestion that it would be better to give you \$3,000 cash and all that sort of thing, that he never told you about that, but that he did say to you on that occasion words to this effect "I am perfectly willing, Frank, that you should get what is coming to you, what is fair to you." Was there anything like that. Was that said or anything like that or anything suggesting anything of that kind by him to you on that occasion?

A.—No, absolutely not. Never at any time or place. It was never mentioned by Reynolds to me.

Q.—Was anything of that kind mentioned to you before or after the contract was let, was anything of that kind ever suggested directly or indirectly by Parkin or Reynolds?

A.—By neither Parkin nor Reynolds at any time.

Q.—That being the situation, he asked you to act as mediator and in effect beat the lawyers out of their lawful costs. We have come to a point where Mr. Biggs has said that neither Parkin nor Reynolds, either directly or indirectly ever suggested anything to him, that Reynolds asked him to act as mediator. Now we come to the time when he went into Shaver's office, when Reynolds was there. Do you remember that occasion?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Up to the time that you went into Shaver's office had you seen Parkin for the purpose of discussing this question of mediation?

A.—No.

Q.—You went into Shaver's office. Was Reynolds there?

A.—Yes, he came into Shaver's private office shortly after.

Q.—Tell us what conversation took place there with regard to this particular matter?

MR. McCRAE: Just a moment. Before you went to Shaver's office didn't you see Parkin to discuss Reynolds proposition for a settlement?

A.—No.

MR. BRACKIN: You went in, what took place then, briefly?

A.—I cannot give you the conversation. The matter of a settlement was mentioned and I said I was going to speak to Parkin and ask him if he cared to try to meet Reynolds and get a settlement.

Q.—You told Shaver and Reynolds that—was Reynolds in the room when you told that to Shaver?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you see Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where did you see him?

A.—I went right on down the street and stopped at the garage and told him Reynolds would like to settle the case without going to court and I said he was willing to settle for \$3,000, if Parkin would pay him what he considered was his

commission, \$3,000. Parkin said, "He has entered a suit and we will go on with it."

Q.—So that your mediation fell down at that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you anything further to do with it after that time?

A.—No.

Q.—Let me ask but one question more, Mr. Biggs and I think I am through. You have told us that no one suggested to you either directly or indirectly coming to you. Have you received from Parkin or Reynolds, directly or indirectly or from any person whatever, Parkin or Reynolds or anyone else, any commission or any money or anything else for yourself in connection with this transaction?

A.—I haven't received anything nor have I received a promise of anything nor has the matter been discussed with me by either party.

MR. WARREN: There is one point I would like to clear up. We were given to understand that Parkin was going to allow a ten per cent. discount on these trucks to the Department and Reynolds said, why not charge 105 per cent. What I want made clear is this: is it true that you were not offered any discount on these trucks by any person.

A.—I was offered no discount by Parkin and he is the only party that had anything to do with the transaction. I knew nothing of his price until it was submitted to the Department and Mr. Hogarth had viewed it and recommended the purchase.

Q.—Can you tell me, if the trucks had been bought from the Grace Motors would the commission have gone to the local agent as is usual?

A.—I think that point has been covered before. I say that I went to Grace Motors and investigated the trucks and the price and that if they had been bought direct from Grace Motors the standard price for this district, Ontario, would have been charged.

Q.—Was that the same price at which you bought from Parkin?

A.—Absolutely, to a cent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you talk of a discount with Parkin?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: Or with the Grace Motors?

A.—I asked Grace Motors for the price.

Cross examination by Mr. McCrae:

Q.—What constituency do you represent?

A.—North Wentworth.

Q.—You were elected a member on the 20th of October, 1919, for that district?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was your occupation at that time Mr. Biggs?

A.—Farmer.

Q.—And subsequently you were sworn in as a Minister of the Crown, what date was that?

A.—The 14th of November, I think.

Q.—Do you remember when the bye-election returning you, was held?

A.—No, I cannot give the date. It was in December was it not?

Q.—Was there any road work going on in the Province of Ontario, at that time, as far as actual work was concerned?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where?

A.—On the 422 miles, as designated by the late Government.

Q.—What work was being actually performed, at the end of November, when you became Minister?

A.—That is a pretty broad question, the customary road work on these roads.

Q.—What work was being done up in North Wentworth?

A.—There was no work at that time in North Wentworth, but there was work being done in Wentworth on two different roads.

Q.—What class of work was being done at that time?

A.—Surfacing with stone, quarry work and earthwork.

Q.—So that surfacing with stone and earthwork was actually in progress when you became Minister of Public Works?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did it stop, that Fall?

A.—I cannot give the date.

Q.—When did you come to the realization that trucks would be required and should be purchased before the next Spring's work opened?

A.—When it was brought to my attention by Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—On what date would that be?

A.—Early in December.

Q.—Was that communication verbal or in writing?

A.—Verbal.

Q.—What was the communication that Mr. Hogarth made with reference to Departmental matters at that time?

A.—He thought that to carry on the work efficiently and at the lowest cost to the Province, it would be advisable to have trucks for the Spring.

Q.—How many trucks?

A.—He recommended at that time, twelve.

Q.—And did he recommend the character of them, the make of them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Hogarth is the chief engineer?

A.—And purchasing agent also.

Q.—He occupying that position told you that it was necessary to get trucks, that twelve trucks were necessary and that in his opinion Sterling trucks were the ones that should be acquired?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that important communication, you say, was not a matter of record in the Department, that nothing was committed to writing, so far as Mr. Hogarth's recommendation was concerned?

A.—No.

Q.—Is that the practice in your Department, that recommendations as important as that doesn't require to be in writing?

A.—I don't think you are exactly getting the question—

Q.—I know exactly the question I am asking you. Is it the practice in your department that in a matter as important as the one you have described where your chief engineer advises you that trucks are necessary, that twelve of them are necessary and that they should be of a certain make, and as you understood would run into a lot of money—is it the practice that these recommendations are not made

in writing?

A.—Not until it is recommended as a recommendation under his signature.

Q.—In other words, not until the transaction is consummated?

A.—Not until the transaction is recommended to me.

Q.—Until the time they certify to it and recommend it over their signature as a purchase?

A.—It also has to have the signature of the Deputy Minister. Because the chief engineer recommends it, that is not to say that all purchases as recommended are made.

Q.—As I understand it Mr. Biggs in this particular case you say the formal recommendation with reference to these trucks so far as writing is concerned, comes into existence when there is a certificate or recommendation in writing as to the purchase and not until it is put in that form, when it has been decided a purchase is to be consummated?

A.—Not necessarily so.

Q.—It was in this case?

A.—It was in this case, yes.

Q.—Do you remember the morning that Reynolds and Parkin came down?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was earlier than the usual hours for business? I think you said they were at your office before the charwoman had cleaned up the room in the morning?

A.—They were there before 9 o'clock.

Q.—Up to that time, as I understand it, you didn't know what the tender of Parkin's was?

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't know from Parkin when you called for his tender at his garage what the tender was?

A.—I did not see the tender.

Q.—As I understand it—I may have misunderstood you—you got some word that the trucks would be advanced after the 1st of January?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And having had a previous conversation with Parkin as to the supplying of trucks of the Sterling make, you called at Parkin's garage and got a tender from him on these Sterling trucks. Did you do that?

A.—Parkin asked me if I would call and bring his tender to Toronto, which was in a sealed envelope, and I delivered it to Hogarth.

Q.—You didn't say anything to Parkin as to the price?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—So that in this particular case you didn't know what Parkin's tender was, down to the time that Parkin and Reynolds were in your room on the morning they called there?

A.—No.

Q.—And Parkin and Reynolds came through your main office through some adjoining room and into another room, your bedroom?

A.—My sitting room.

Q.—While these men were there did you send for Hogarth?

A.—Hogarth was to come to my office that morning on coming to the buildings.

Q.—Then there was an arrangement with Hogarth made by you that on this

morning in question Hogarth was to come to your office—at what time?

A.—On coming to the buildings.

Q.—What time does Mr. Hogarth usually get to the buildings?

A.—At 9 o'clock.

Q.—Why was this arrangement made with Hogarth to come to your office this morning?

A.—So that this matter might be got into shape that the Department might reap the benefit of the prices that were to have a ten per cent. increase on January 1st.

Q.—So that you were expecting Parkin and Reynolds and you knew from the night before that they would be there next morning?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And when you arrived at your room, after you had had breakfast you weren't surprised to find these two men there because that had been pre-arranged?

A.—No. I was not surprised.

Q.—In other words that was part of the pre-arrangement, that they were to be there the first thing in the morning?

A.—That they were to be there before noon of the next day.

Q.—You weren't surprised when you came up and found them there?

A.—No, not at all surprised.

Q.—And because the charwoman was not finished with her work you took them into your sitting-room, in your private apartment?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long was it before Mr. Hogarth arrived?

A.—A few minutes.

Q.—Did you have any talk with them about the trucks before Mr. Hogarth came?

A.—No.

Q.—None whatever?

A.—No, the trucks in fact were never mentioned.

Q.—Did you tell these men, "I have this all arranged to close the deal with you and I expect Mr. Hogarth here in a few minutes."

A.—I didn't tell them I had arranged to close the deal with them. I told them I expected Mr. Hogarth in a few minutes.

Q.—About what?

A.—Whether we should purchase or not purchase these trucks.

Q.—Then there was some mention of these trucks before Hogarth came?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not what he said.

MR. McCRAE: There was a reference to the fact that they were down there for the purpose of making some deal about these trucks?

A.—Nothing further than that Mr. Hogarth would be there in a few minutes.

Q.—Do you mean to tell this Committee that these men who had come down all the way from Dundas, were there at that time in the morning when you had pre-arranged for Mr. Hogarth to be on hand that when Mr. Hogarth did come according to the pre-arrangement he had these contracts ready—do you mean to tell this Committee that these men in this room who came down for that business, you knowing they came down for that business and were expecting to close the contract, do you mean to tell this Committee that you said nothing to them about

this deal for trucks?

A.—There was no discussion of the truck deal in that matter prior to Mr. Hogarth coming, other than that I said Mr. Hogarth would be along in a few minutes.

Q.—I can take it then that the trucks were not mentioned that morning before Mr. Hogarth came?

A.—No.

Q.—Did the men know what they were there for?

A.—You will have to ask the men. I am not a mind reader.

Q.—Nothing was said to indicate why they came?

A.—Nothing.

MR. DRURY: Your attitude was that you couldn't take it up until Mr. Hogarth came. Therefore you kept away from it.

A.—Mr Hogarth recommended it and also I told Mr. Hogarth that if he was purchasing Sterling trucks he was to purchase at the list price.

MR. McCRAE: I will come to that. Come back a little. Here are these two men all this distance from Dundas, motoring up to be sure to be on time. The Minister was not surprised to find them there. He took them into his room. While they are in there nothing is said by you about the trucks or the deal or business they came upon?

A.—No.

Q.—And then sometime afterwards someone came into your room and that someone was Mr. Hogarth?

A.—He came into my office.

Q.—Was the charwoman there yet?

A.—She was through her work then and gone.

Q.—So that when Mr. Hogarth came into this room, this main office-room would be quite presentable from a business standpoint as far as Reynolds and Parkin were concerned. There was no longer any reason for keeping them in the private room on account of the charwoman—when Mr. Hogarth came in?

A.—No.

Q.—When Mr. Hogarth came you went out alone from this private room to see Hogarth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And some conversation took place between you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And after that conversation you went and called to Parkin to come out into the business office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And when Parkin came in there, there was ready and prepared an accepted recommendation, as far as Mr. Hogarth was concerned, and as far as Mr. McLean was concerned, to purchase practically \$117,000 worth of trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And then what did you say to Parkin when he came out and the document was all ready. What did you tell him?

A.—I told him that the purchasing agent having looked into the price and found that the price was the set or standard price at that time that the contract had been recommended by Mr. Hogarth to be awarded to him.

- Q.—What did Parkin say?
A.—I don't remember.
Q.—Speechless, I suppose?
A.—Judge for yourself.
Q.—Were any papers with reference to this transaction signed at that time?
A.—Not in front of Parkin.
Q.—When did you sign?
A.—I signed when I was in the room with Hogarth alone.
Q.—So that Mr. McLean's name was on the paper prior to coming there?
A.—Yes.
Q.—Mr. Hogarth's name was on the paper?
A.—Yes.
Q.—And your name as Minister is on the paper before Mr. Parkin is called out from your private room to know what decision had been arrived at?
A.—Yes.
Q.—Did you tell Parkin anything the night before in the telephone conversation to lead him to believe that the contract was coming to him?
A.—No.
Q.—You knew at that time that the contract was going to him?
A.—I did not know at that time that it was going to him.
Q.—Then when did you know this contract was going to him?
A.—After Mr. Hogarth came to my office in the morning.
Q.—You did tell Mr. Hogarth before to compare prices very carefully and buy where you could get the trucks the cheapest?
A.—Where he could get Sterling trucks the cheapest, yes.
Q.—It was to be confined to Sterling trucks?
A.—That was his recommendation to me.
Q.—You approved of that?
A.—I approved of his recommendation.
Q.—You were relying upon Mr. Hogarth's recommendation as to the kind of trucks to be used?
A.—I relied upon the recommendations of the purchasing agent and the chief mechanic, of the Department, Mr. Johnson.
Q.—Did Mr. Hogarth make any report to you or did you make any inquiry from Mr. Hogarth, on this particular morning before you put your signature to the contract, as to the places where he had made inquiries as to the cheapness of these trucks, and as to the best prices?
A.—I asked him if this was equal to the best price that he could get on Sterling trucks. He said it was the standard price, that they were all sold at a standard price, and I had to draw the conclusion that that would be the price that would be submitted by any Sterling dealer.
Q.—You were putting your reliance and judgment in closing it on the recommendation of Mr. Hogarth?
A.—Certainly.
Q.—Prior to the time Hogarth came in, will you tell this Committee you didn't know this contract was going to Parkin?
A.—No.
Q.—Were there any other tenders besides Parkin's made for these trucks?

A.—Mr. Hogarth will answer that question.

Q.—Do you know whether there were any other tenders?

A.—I don't.

he said, "yes."

Q.—Did you ask Mr. Hogarth that morning if any other tenders were made?

A.—I asked him if this was the best price he could get for Sterling trucks and

Q.—Did you ask Hogarth if any other tenders were made except Parkin's?

A.—No.

Q.—How did you transmit Parkin's tender to your Department to Mr. Hogarth? You brought it down, as I understand it, how did you transmit it to Mr. Hogarth?

A.—In a sealed envelope by my messenger.

Q.—No letter accompanying it?

A.—No letter at all.

Q.—You had no conversation with Mr. Hogarth at any time with reference to the Parkin tender?

A.—No.

Q.—Except the morning it was closed?

A.—No.

Q.—You understand that question?

A.—Yes.

MR. CLARKE: The tender was sealed?

A.—Yes, sealed in an envelope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Had you any conversation between you, on the Monday afternoon before you telephoned Parkin?

A.—With Hogarth?

Q.—Yes?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: I will quote a comparison of prices and ask you whether you know anything about it, "A comparison of prices paid last year by the city for Sterling trucks, and the price paid by the Province for those purchased by Hon. F. C. Biggs from the Parkin firm at Dundas show that the city made a much better deal. The city purchased by tender in June and July 1920, one five-ton gasoline motor truck chassis without body but equipped with dumping service for \$8,250; two five-ton gasoline tractor trucks at \$8,132 each; two, two and a half ton gasoline tractor trucks at \$5,000 each. The Province purchased fourteen trucks at a total cost of \$177,899, there being eight five-ton trucks at \$9,100 each, and six three and a half ton trucks at \$7,516. The prices in both instances are for Sterling trucks." Do you know anything about the purchase made by the city? whether it was a lower price than the Government price?

A.—As I said previously in my evidence I think Mr. Wilson recommended to the Board of Control that they should purchase Sterling trucks. I can't say as to the number. If you wished to compare prices it would have to be on the stripped truck. The total price would be governed entirely by the fixtures attached to that stripped truck. The only way to make a fair comparison is to take the stripped truck and find out what the dump or platform or whatever kind of body, and equipment to be attached is. The comparison is absolutely no use under these conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: You start with the chassis as a basis?

A.—You may compare the price of chassis, that would be a fair comparison. As for those figures I do not know what they are. You may put on one thousand, two, or three or four according to the class of body you want.

MR. BRACKIN: Do you know what truck the city bought. Is it exactly the same as the Government bought?

A.—I cannot say. I haven't the slightest idea. I believe Mr. Hogarth can enlighten you to some extent on that.

MR. McCRAE: You say you inspected the trucks at the Grace Motors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you relying on your judgment as an inspector of trucks in selecting the Sterling trucks or relying on the chief mechanic and the chief engineer?

A.—I was relying on the chief engineer and the chief mechanic, but in a purchase so important as this I thought I would like to be more familiar with what was recommended.

Well now Mr. Biggs, as you know in a case involving as much as this, and the circumstances in connection with it, there is considerable comment with reference to your dealings with Parkin and I think it is only fair that I should ask you some questions that are being asked. You have been doing business for some time with Parkin at his garage—a number of years, I understand?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And from time to time considerable work is done at the garage for you personally?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever had your car overhauled and had that work done without charge to you?

A.—No. Parkin said in his evidence that I had given him cheques from time to time.

Q.—Have you ever received from Parkin, particularly since these trucks were ordered any work in connection with your own car or any service rendered by him for which he didn't charge?

A.—Not one cent's worth.

Q.—It has been said that the only thing you got out of the deal was your own car, a McLaughlin overhauled and fixed up. You say there is nothing in that?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—Who did you go first to, to see about these Sterling trucks, the Grace Motors or Parkin?

A.—I went to the Grace Motors to inspect the trucks.

Q.—Before you had any conversation with Parkin?

A.—Certainly, absolutely so.

Q.—Then why didn't you deal there with them—did you have to go and deal with Parkin?

A.—No, for the simple reason that the price was standard and there was no advantage in buying from Grace Motors.

Q.—I am asking you why you went to Parkin. Why didn't you deal with Grace Motors if that was so, without going to Parkin?

A.—Because Parkin is a young man starting in business and the commission, which is a standard commission, might just as well go to Parkin as to Grace Motors.

Q.—So that you wanted to see Parkin make something out of the deal, in that sense.

A.—That is the customary thing in these deals.

Q.—You wanted that done in this deal—you wanted Parkin to get something?

A.—I wanted Parkin to receive the standard commission, which we safeguarded.

Q.—That was the reason you initiated the talk with Mr. Parkin?

A.—I didn't initiate anything. I only intimated to him that the Department had the intention of buying some trucks.

Q.—Now we know this, that you did intimate to him that the Department had the intention of buying some trucks and you also wanted to see him get the commission?

A.—If his price was the standard price and was fair in every respect.

Q.—That was your reason for dealing with Parkin?

A.—I have already explained that Parkin was a young man starting in business and that as long as he got nothing more than the standard price, which anybody else could get there was no reason in this wide world why Parkin should not have the business.

Q.—You did have a pretty good idea then on the morning that this young man came down that Mr. Parkin was going to get this contract, because all along you had that in your mind; that Parkin should get the contract, isn't that right?

A.—I had in my mind that Parkin should get it only if his prices were standard, after investigation by Mr. Hogarth and provided that there was absolutely not one cent more coming to him than would go to any other dealer. On this consideration I would like to see Parkin get that contract and only on those considerations did he get the contract.

Q.—Then when you took it up with Parkin and Parkin told you he could give you the same price as Grace Motors, the thing was settled in your mind?

A.—Mr. Parkin and I never discussed prices.

Q.—Just one other question. Are you able to contradict Parkin or Reynolds who say, as I understand it that they were in the private office possible twenty or thirty minutes before Mr. Hogarth came?

A.—I said a few minutes.

Q.—I think Parkin said about twenty or thirty minutes, didn't he? You are not able to say how long?

A.—I would say they were there for a period of a few minutes. I cannot say how many minutes.

Q.—Would it be more than five—would it be twenty minutes?

A.—It might be twenty minutes. I cannot say.

MR. HAY: I want to clear up one thing. Mr. McCrae asked you if you knew the price of the tender being sent by Parkin, and you said you hadn't seen the tender. May I ask you did you know the price of the tender that was being sent in by Parkin?

A.—No, I never knew it, I never discussed it with Parkin nor did I see the tender.

MR. HENRY: When did you know the figures?

A.—After Mr. Hogarth brought the tender to my office.

Q.—You knew from the Grace Motors the standard price?

A.—Yes, I had instructed Mr. Hogarth to see that nothing more than the

standard price was paid. I gave him instructions to see that the lowest price possible was paid for the trucks.

MR. DRURY: Did you know from Grace Motors that you paid the standard price for the equipment?

A.—Mr. Hogarth safeguarded all those points. That was my instruction to him.

MR. McCRAE: Did you tell Hogarth that if the tender was in line with the Grace Motors' price, he was to get the job?

A.—I told Mr. Hogarth that he was to buy the trucks at the lowest price he could get for Sterling trucks.

Q.—Did you tell him that if Parkin's price was the same as the Grace Motors' price that he was to get the contract?

A.—If his price was the standard price for Sterling trucks, the lowest price Sterling trucks could be purchased for—

Q.—He was to get it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that on the morning he brought the tender to you?

A.—No, before that. After I questioned Hogarth as to whether Parkin's price was the standard price, the best price these trucks could be obtained for, he said it was and put in a recommendation over his signature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it then you told him Parkin was to have the job?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And not before?

A.—Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Was that before 9 o'clock?

A.—That was after 9 o'clock, before Mr. Hogarth came to work.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you went to Grace Motors they made it clear and absolute that the standard price was the lowest these trucks could be bought at, that no agent could sell for less?

A.—They said there was a standard price for Sterling trucks and the only difference in that price is based on the hauling of the truck. As these trucks were to be delivered in Toronto and not in Dundas the price for the trucks in this district was the standard price. I believe we have witnesses to prove that the price was the standard price.

MR. McCRAE: Who fixed the price of \$59 each to take these trucks to Dundas?

A.—There was no such price. The trucks were to be delivered at 15 Queen's Park Avenue, to Mr. Johnston, the chief mechanic. The whole thing is poppycock.

Q.—Reynolds has stated that these cars were taken by Parkin to the works?

A.—These cars were delivered to 15 Queen's Park, received and inspected by Mr. Johnston, as to them being in proper shape to be accepted by the Department.

Q.—And were accepted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had he a contract to take the cars from there to the work?

A.—No.

Q.—Who took them up?

A.—The Department's men.

Q.—Then this statement made here that \$59 was charged for taking the trucks up there is a pure myth?

A.—Absolutely bunkum, I won't say Parkin didn't drive a truck from Toronto to Dundas or Hamilton, going to the work there, but Parkin never received any commission or pay for that service.

Q.—Did he ever present a bill for it?

A.—He never did.

MR. DEWART: Is this the only firm in Dundas with which you have had business so far as trucks are concerned?

A.—No.

Q.—Is there a firm called Jerome Bros?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you purchase a number of cars from them without tenders?

A.—I did not

Q.—Were there any tenders other than those of Jerome Bros. for the cars that were bought on tenders?

A.—Yes, a series of tenders. I have a statement ready to present to the House which will clear up that whole question.

Witness excused.

George Hogarth called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Brackin:

Q.—What is your position in the Highways Department?

A.—Chief engineer.

Q.—When were you appointed?

A.—February 1, 1916.

Q.—Had you been in the employ of the Department prior to that time?

A.—In the employ of the Department of Public Works.

Q.—For how long?

A.—For a period of seven years.

Q.—Your first entry into the Government service was about in what year?

A.—Well, I was employed in the Government service in 1908, and was put on the permanent list in May, 1909.

Q.—Who was the Minister when you came in?

A.—Dr. Reaume.

Q.—Then in 1916, you were appointed to the position you now occupy?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your official title?

A.—Engineer of Highways.

Q.—You still occupy that position?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Biggs spoke of you as purchasing agent. Is that something in addition to being engineer or is that something you do as a result of being engineer?

A.—It is part of my duties as engineer.

Q.—Then you know of course about this truck purchase?

A.—Yes.

A.—I wish you would be good enough to tell the Committee the way this purchase of trucks had been considered by you before Mr. Biggs came in?

A.—The purchase of trucks by the Department of Public Highways had been considered. We had been buying trucks prior to this Government taking office.

Q.—When did the purchase of additional trucks which culminated in the buy-

ing of these twelve trucks first come up after Mr. Biggs came into office?

A.—After Mr. Biggs assumed office he made an inspection of the work we were doing on the provincial system. Mr. Biggs, Mr. McLean and myself went over the system as it then was. In the course of going over that system I had occasion to point out to Mr. Biggs that on the Western section, particularly in the vicinity of London and Brantford, and the vicinity of Hamilton and generally in the vicinity of the cities within the Provincial Highway system we had great difficulty in getting teams, we were held up for all kinds of prices, and that if we were to haul any materials or do any work, we had to have trucks in order to carry on our work.

Q.—How long prior to December, 1919, was that decision arrived at by you, that you pointed out to Mr. Biggs, that trucks should be purchased?

A.—It was particularly brought to Mr. Biggs attention during that trip because he had only become Minister a short time before that and we hadn't had much opportunity of discussing it until we were out on that inspection trip.

Q.—When did it come to the point where in effect Mr. Biggs said, "All right Hogarth, you want to buy trucks, we will buy trucks."

A.—That was discussed by myself with the Deputy Minister, and if I remember right, with Mr. Biggs on or about Christmas, 1919. We understood it would be advisable for the Department to purchase trucks.

Q.—Then prior to that time around Christmas, 1919, did you yourself make any investigation to satisfy yourself as to what would be the best kind of truck to buy?

A.—I did.

Q.—Tell us what steps you took to get that information?

A.—It is a long story. I don't think our Department was buying trucks prior to the time the Ford company actually made the one ton trucks. We had no trucks prior to that time and had been fitting up touring cars to do truck business. I said to Johnson, our mechanic, we will have to get something fixed up about this. We will have to get some light trucks. We discussed what we would do. We found that the Ford company had changed the design and that in the result it had one ton trucks. Shortly after that we got several of the Ford one ton trucks. After that we had occasion to purchase rather heavier trucks and we looked into the question of a one ton and heavier capacity. We got quotations at that time. We had several quotations in at that time. We purchased a Reo one ton truck at that time, it was worth \$2,200 with the body on. We had White quotations of \$3,675. This was in 1919. The matter went on and we considered the purchase of heavier trucks. We were going into the haulage of materials, teams were getting scarce and oats had gone out of sight. We looked into the 2½, 3½, and 5-ton trucks. That is all a matter of record on our files. We received from Grace Motors, Ltd., a letter addressed to Mr. McLean calling attention to Sterling heavy duty trucks. The letter is signed "Grace Motors Ltd., F. O. Madden, retail sales manager." He called on Mr. McLean a few days after that and Mr. McLean gave me definite instructions to pay attention to Sterling trucks and see whether they were suited to our needs. It is a matter of record that prior to that there were quotations on Whites, Packards, Studebakers, and we had been looking at R. A. F. trucks and Studebakers. We had seen trucks of the various makes in operation and knew what they could do. When this came along Mr. McLean said, you get out and find out about these Sterling trucks. I had already considerable knowledge. It was a matter of common knowledge that a fleet

of them were operating on the Toronto Hamilton highway, that they did an extensive truck business between Toronto and Hamilton. I did not need to go to the head office to find out the operating ability of these trucks. We found out by our own information and from our own men, from the garage over here, exactly what experience these people had had operating Sterling trucks under such conditions as largely applied to our trucks, that they operated on long runs and with capacity loads, and from actually seeing these trucks on the Toronto Hamilton highway I knew what they were doing.

MR. BRACKIN: And you had the experience of the City of Toronto with them?

A.—Yes, we had the benefit of their experience. We found what the result of the city's tests had been and that it was found that the Sterling truck was a very satisfactory machine for their work and they were prepared to recommend it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And did recommend it?

A.—It was recommended. This letter was from Grace Motors, signed by Mr. Madden, then retail sales manager. I had known Mr. Madden for some time. On February 3, 1919, there was a further letter from Mr. Madden and in that letter he asks that we make a definite investigation in detail as to the merits of Sterling trucks. In response to that I received definite instructions to carry on. Further Mr. Madden, in his letter states that he had asked their office to forward to us certain material and that material is here. It consisted of the ordinary catalogue and the specifications and list prices of the trucks in the States. In addition to that there is a letter here from the president of the Sterling Motors, of February 4, 1919, addressed to the Deputy Minister and calling out attention to the fact that the Sterling truck had been built by one firm for ten years, in other words it was not a truck about which you would wake up to-morrow and find the company out of business and you with a heavy investment in an equipment for which you couldn't get parts. The president in his letter points out these facts. Now in addition to having the prices of the trucks here there is a publication called the "Motor Age," printed in Chicago, which gives monthly the list prices of all trucks made in the United States. Our Department subscribes to this "Motor Age", and it was on our files upstairs and used by us whenever we were in the market or making any investigation. This "Motor Age" list has the specifications of every truck from the one-ton Ford to the heaviest truck made and in addition gives the U.S. list price. We went ahead and investigated these trucks on instructions from the Deputy Minister so that we could definitely advise the Department as to what should be done when the day came to purchase any particular truck.

Q.—Did the day come when you were in a position to make a recommendation to the Minister as to what trucks should be purchased?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did that day come?

A.—December, I think the 29th. Do you mean when we were discussing it. In December earlier, when we were speaking about the trucks it came up and was mentioned, "Now get the best trucks you think will do for our work." We looked around, sized everything up, got all the information together, and I personally felt that the Sterling truck was going to be the most satisfactory because at that time they were making a 5-ton truck that was really a road-building truck. It was a heavy general truck.

Q.—Did you communicate that to the Minister?

A.—It may have been discussed. This matter was up between Mr. McLean and the Minister and myself at different times. On that trip in December, the different makes were spoken of and I mentioned what facts we had at our disposal.

Q.—Was there any conversation particularly regarding the Sterling truck?

A.—Yes, the Sterling was spoken of as being one we were favorable to.

Q.—Then Mr. Biggs speaks of a time along in December when they learned that the price of Sterling trucks was to go up 10 per cent. on the first of January. Do you know about that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was that?

A.—The material market was bad and along in 1919 we had great difficulty in getting material and there was a jump in the price from day to day.

Q.—How did you learn that the price of Sterling trucks was going to go up 10 per cent.—how did that come to your attention?

A.—It came to our attention through inquiries I made along about that time. I believe we heard from Grace Motors that the price would go up about 10 per cent.

Q.—What did you do as a result of that?

A.—We discussed it this way: here, if we are going to buy trucks we had better not wait or we will have to pay 10 per cent. more after the 1st of the year. It was brought about in this way. We heard the price was going up. We were in the market at the same time for steel and the steel men told us that if we were going to wait longer we would get stung, that the basis metal prices would be up, so that we knew the information about the trucks was correct.

Q.—The tender that we have heard about was sent by Mr. Biggs to you? By a messenger—is that correct?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Up to that time had Mr. Biggs either directly or indirectly told you or urged you that you should buy Sterling trucks?

A.—No.

Q.—Now just to go on. You said you knew the price was going up. Then what happened in regard to the purchase of these trucks?

A.—We had discussed the number and I recommended six 3½-ton and six 5 ton trucks because some of our roads were not strong enough to carry the 5-ton trucks.

Q.—You recommended the purchase of a certain number of trucks of a certain type?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you recommend the kind that should be bought?

A.—We considered that the Sterling should be bought.

Q.—You considered that?

A.—Yes. This was a matter of negotiation between the Deputy Minister and myself.

Q.—Did he agree with you that Sterling trucks should be bought?

A.—On our investigation he agreed with us, yes.

Q.—Then what was done in communicating that conclusion of yours and the Deputy Minister's to the Minister as to what trucks should be bought?

A.—I think perhaps Mr. Biggs may have been acquainted with it. As I say, in December, on that inspection trip it was mentioned "What kind of trucks do you

think would suit", and the Sterling was mentioned.

Q.—Well, what was the next you had to do with it. Before the tender came in from Parkin did you know it was coming in?

A.—Just a minute—I did hear about the 20th of December that we were considering trucks and that in all probability a recommendation would be favorably considered for the purchase of a number of trucks.

Q.—What I want to get at is this: there came a time when Mr. Biggs sent over to you by a messenger this proposition of Parkin's. Prior to that time did you know that propositions for the sale of Sterling trucks were going to be considered?

A.—We knew that in all probability we would buy Sterling trucks.

Q.—Did you know, when you were going to buy them, if the regular price was going to be paid?

A.—We were favorable to buying before the 1st of January, 1920.

Q.—And the reason for that was that you thought there was going to be an increase in these trucks on that date?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That being the situation Mr. Biggs sent over to you this proposition of Parkin's?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did you do when you got it?

A.—I took the tender to the Deputy Minister because no tenders are opened except by the Deputy Minister and myself.

Q.—Then what?

A.—It was opened.

Q.—Then what did you do?

A.—If you will refer to the tender you will see notes in pencil on it. I made sure of the prices I had previously been quoted, with the fact that the Grace Motors were not giving any discount. They didn't abide by the National Truck Buyers' discount scale and were selling at the list price.

Q.—How did you satisfy yourself with respect to the prices?

A.—We knew what the prices were, what the Grace Motors prices were.

Q.—How did the price at which Parkin tendered compare with the standard price?

A.—They are noted there in pencil. They are the same. There is a little difference in their cost. The question of a pentle hook came up. We said throw in the pentle hook anyway, in case we might need them.

Q.—You satisfied yourself that the prices were standard prices, and then what did you do?

A.—I certified to the tender and we wanted to be sure we were getting the order in before the 1st of the year. We took it up with the Minister and we certified to the tender as being satisfactory.

Q.—Well then, it would be the next morning that you went down to Mr. Biggs' office.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you know previously, that you were to be there at that time?

A.—That was understood, that we wanted to get this business closed and get the old list price.

Q.—That was how close to the end of the year?

A.—One day.

Q.—You went down the next morning, and what happened?

A.—I went to Mr. Biggs and pointed out to him that the prices as submitted by Parkin were the same as were to be obtained from Grace Motors, that the trucks were satisfactory and the prices were right, that we were ready to purchase them, and Mr. McLean concurred in that recommendation.

Q.—Up to that time had you seen Parkin?

A.—No, I hadn't seen Parkin at all.

Q.—When that was done, when you pointed that out to Mr. Biggs. What did he do?

A.—He said, that is all right.

Q.—Did he sign in your presence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was Parkin there at that time?

A.—Parkin came in later.

Q.—He was not there when Mr. Biggs signed?

A.—No.

Q.—Was there any conversation after Mr. Parkin came in?

A.—Yes, about the delivery and about certain details mentioned in the order, the painting and the type of truck, and the fact that he was to make very certain that we would get these trucks by the date stated or pretty close to that because we wanted to start work sometime in April.

Q.—Was that the whole effect of it—as to the time of delivery and so forth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you got them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—During the whole course of the transaction with regard to the purchase of Sterling trucks, either before they were purchased or after they were purchased was there any suggestion made either directly or indirectly by the Minister or anyone else to influence you in favor of the purchase of Sterling trucks?

A.—Not at all, it was our recommendation.

Q.—I am speaking of, from the Minister or anyone else?

A.—No, we made our own investigations.

Q.—Either before or after the purchase was there any suggestion to you directly or indirectly from anybody, that there would be anything coming to you out of it?

A.—Absolutely nothing. No man ever offered me five cents and I never accepted five cents for anything ever done around these Parliament Buildings.

MR. THOMPSON: You say these tenders were opened by you and Mr. McLean?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In your office?

A.—In Mr. McLean's office?

Q.—Just he and you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that is a good idea?

A.—That is the custom we follow.

Q.—You get in maybe 100 tenders or whatever you happen to have and no one knows anything about it but you and Mr. McLean?

A.—Anyone is welcome.

Q.—Not when you are opening them. No one knows of it.

A.—It is known that the tenders are to be received on a certain day. It is advertised.

Q.—Is it advertised when they are going to be opened?

A.—Usually within a few hours.

Q.—But there was no one else there when you opened this particular tender?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you discussed this matter with Mr. Brackin prior to coming here this morning?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—You have never seen Mr. Brackin in connection with this thing?

A.—I have never seen Mr. Brackin in connection with this thing.

MR. HOMUTH: This is the way you have always considered tenders?

A.—That is the customary way.

MR. BRACKIN: Is the way you dealt with these tenders any different from the manner in which you dealt with tenders under the former Government?

A.—No.

MR. TOLMIE: You spoke about the way of dealing with these tenders—how many were there?

A.—There was one.

Q.—Did you call for any others?

A.—There is one tender for each class of truck, that would be two tenders.

DR. GODFREY: There was just the one man tendering?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn't ask for any others?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: When was the decision reached by you and Mr. McLean that Sterling trucks would be the type to be purchased for the work you had in view?

A.—I would say it was sometime early in December, when this matter was discussed. I cannot pin it down. It was during the trip in which the Minister, Mr. McLean and myself went over the roads. We discussed it amongst ourselves in a general way and a decision was reached as to what we would do.

Q.—Up to that time you had been giving consideration to various kinds of trucks?

A.—To different makes.

Q.—And you finally came to the decision that it should be Sterling trucks?

A.—The evidence seemed to point that way to me.

Q.—That is the fact, you did come to a decision?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you come to that decision?

A.—I would judge some time between September and December, 1919.

Q.—Was it after this present Government came into power?

A.—Not when we started in to find out about these trucks, to make some investigation of Sterling trucks.

Q.—I want to know when the Government came to the conclusion that they should purchase Sterling trucks, the Government through the Minister. When was the time when it was agreed that the Sterling truck was the one that should be acquired?

A.—It was definitely decided on the morning of the 30th, when he got our recommendation.

Q.—That was the time the decision was arrived at to purchase Sterling trucks?

A.—That is the day he got our recommendation.

Q.—Where is that recommendation?

A.—It is right there.

Q.—This tender of Parkin's filed as exhibits "A" and "B" under date of December 27, and executed the 30th of December, 1919,—the recommendation here is the final decision as to Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes, sir, after long investigation extending over a year and a half prior to that time.

Q.—Was there ever any recommendation prepared by you or Mr. McLean, setting forth the merits or demerits of the trucks and giving the reasons for arriving at the selection of the Sterling trucks.

A.—No, we would not put anything of that nature on the record. It would be used against other truck makers.

MR. DRURY: Have you ever done such a thing in the department?

A.—No.

Q.—In the Department you do discuss some of these things and do things by word of mouth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You couldn't do it any other way?

A.—No.

Q.—What was done in this has always been the practice. It has never been the practice in your Department to make written recommendations as to what should be accepted whether it is motor trucks or anything else, no matter what it is?

A.—Oh yes, we do make recommendations.

MR. McCRAE: Then why was not your recommendation made on an important matter like the selection of trucks?

A.—I think I have answered that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean in writing?

MR. McCRAE: Yes, I was asking why there was not a recommendation in favor of the Sterling trucks set forth in writing?

A.—The whole matter was discussed between the Minister, the Deputy Minister and myself, and we were agreed as to what we were going to do.

Q.—I see. It was the result of a conversation between the Minister, yourself and Mr. McLean, that it was determined that Sterling trucks should be purchased?

A.—We recommended to the Minister that they seemed to be the most suitable kind for our work.

Q.—It was as a result of that conversation in which the three of you took part that the Sterling was selected as the truck to be used?

MR. HALL: (Interrupting) The Minister took your word for it because he considered you an authority?

A.—We had looked into it pretty thoroughly.

MR. McCRAE: Was that on the 30th of December, that this decision was arrived at when you three decided on the Sterling?

A.—Prior to that.

Q.—How long before.

A.—We discussed it on this trip of inspection we made over the highways, all

makes were under consideration.

Q.—Then it was not on the 30th of December, that the Sterling truck was decided on as the truck to be used?

A.—On the 30th of December, the Sterling truck was bought.

Q.—What I want to get is when you knew, when Mr. McLean and the Minister knew that Sterling trucks were to be used by the Government on Government roads. When was that decision come to?

A.—I would say it was around Christmas time that we thought it advisable to get Sterling trucks.

Q.—December, 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it be before Christmas?

A.—No. The matter had been under discussion since the inspection trip. It would be about Christmas.

Q.—It was, at all events, sometime about Christmas, prior to the 30th of December, that that decision was arrived at. Where was that decision reached?

A.—We held a discussion on the trucks, while making the trip of inspection.

Q.—When was the trip concluded?

A.—We were out for several days. It extended over nearly two weeks. We went west on one trip.

Q.—Would you say it was within ten days prior to the signing of this contract for Sterling trucks?

A.—I would say twenty days prior to that.

Q.—That is close enough: so you knew twenty days prior to that that you were going to purchase Sterling trucks?

A.—We did consider that.

THE CHAIRMAN: His answer to that was that they were recommended.

MR. McCRAE: My question has been directed to this fact. As a result or practically as a result of this conversation within a period of time, twenty days prior to the 30th of December, this contract was signed for Sterling trucks. Is that a fair statement of the case?

A.—I recommended to the Deputy Minister, I said, I thought the Sterling was a satisfactory truck to purchase. The Minister was there and it was discussed.

Q.—I don't care when it was. I want to know whether it was prior to the 30th of December, that the decision was reached in which the Minister, Mr. McLean and yourself concurred, that Sterling trucks should be used for this work. Was it prior to the 30th of December?

A.—I would say it was prior to Christmas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it determined by the Minister that Sterling trucks and no other should be purchased. That is the point?

A.—I would say yes.

MR. McCRAE: And that was some time prior to Christmas?

A.—I would say around the 20th of December. That is my recollection.

Q.—Now after that decision was come to, that Sterling trucks were to be purchased, what was the next thing you heard about the actual purchase of these trucks from Parkin?

A.—I received a tender some time during the day of the 29th of December.

Q.—Was that the first thing you heard about the purchasing of Sterling trucks after the decision reached that you were to get Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you got that tender it was brought to you by a messenger?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I want you to be particular about this: What did you do when you opened this tender?

A.—I didn't open the tender.

Q.—After it was opened, what did you do?

A.—I made inquiries as to the prices. I knew pretty well what the prices were. I made a note of it there.

Q.—Where did you make inquiries?

A.—I had been making inquiries all along and was closely in touch with it. Mr. Madden told me.

Q.—Did you make any inquiries after receiving the tender on the 29th of December?

A.—I believe I called up Madden on the telephone, and that these figures here are his figures.

Q.—Do you recall calling Mr. Madden?

A.—I am pretty clear on that. I think these figures in pencil were put on the contract at the time.

Q.—What I want to know is, did you make any inquiry about the price of these Sterling trucks after you received the Parkin tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where did you make such inquiries?

A.—From the Grace Motors because they were the only people selling the Sterling truck.

Q.—You saw Grace Motors?

A.—I called Mr. Madden.

Q.—You had a number of communications prior to that from Madden?

A.—Yes. They are on record here.

Q.—You asked Mr. Madden for the prices on these classes of machines?

A.—I asked what they were marketing those trucks at, on that day.

Q.—Did you tell him you had a tender from Parkin?

A.—He knew that.

Q.—How did he know it?

A.—Oh, they know those things. Parkin had been in to see Grace Motors before that date.

Q.—Did Madden tell you he knew what Parkin's price was?

A.—I don't remember that, I asked him what the price would be, what the prices were.

Q.—How do you know, he knew what the prices were Parkin had tendered at. How did you know when Madden and you were talking, that Madden knew Parkin had made a tender?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know or are you guessing it?

A.—I am to some extent guessing. Madden didn't mention Parkin to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then don't guess.

A.—Everybody in Grace Motors as we found out later, knew all about it.

Q.—But at the time just prior to the acceptance of the tender had you any knowledge when you talked to Madden that Madden knew Parkin had a tender in?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you tell Madden that Parkin had tendered?

A.—No, we just wanted prices.

Q.—What other inquiry did you make except from Madden?

A.—That was all. He was the man we had been dealing with.

Q.—When you got Madden's prices, which are a little higher according to the figures than Parkin's, did you make any comparison with the prices listed in the "Motor Age"?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were the prices in the "Motor Age" which you had on file, the same as Parkin's or Madden's?

A.—No. Those are the United States list prices. They are not the same—But from those you can obtain the Canadian selling price within a few dollars if you know how to do it, the exchange costs, excise, customs rate and freight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean excise?

A.—Yes, there is an excise tax on them.

MR. McCRAE: It was Mr. Madden who settled the price for you rather than this book?

A.—Oh yes, but this gives you a good check. You can tell from this whether they are boosting the price on you.

Q.—Didn't you think it good policy to tell Mr. Madden at that time, that you had a tender in for a certain price and ask him if he could give you a better price?

A.—No.

Q.—You made no attempt to find out whether these prices could be reduced, except to ask Mr. Madden what their prices were?

A.—I got the best price from the Grace Motors.

Q.—You were relying on Mr. Madden for that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then after Mr. Madden told you the prices, what did you do? This was the 29th of December, you got this paper. I want to know what was the next step you took toward closing this deal. Did you have a consultation with the Minister about it?

A.—No, we did not. I went back to the Deputy with these tenders and we decided what we would do.

Q.—The decision was that it should go to Parkin, that it should be recommended. As far as you and Mr. McLean were concerned, Parkin was to get the contract?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you ever heard of Parkin before?

A.—We had not. We don't hear of a lot of contractors.

Q.—You never heard of Parkin before?

A.—No.

Q.—Never been in his garage before?

A.—No.

Q.—Never been out that way?

A.—Well, I have been out that way but I knew nothing about Parkin.

Q.—When did you send in your recommendation?

A.—It was on the 29th, when Mr. McLean discussed it and signed together.

Q.—Afternoon or evening?

A.—I believe it was the afternoon of the 29th.

Q.—What time did Biggs sign it?

A.—Then next morning.

Q.—You don't remember the day of the week?

A.—I would say it was a Tuesday it was signed.

Q.—The practice would be for you to certify as to the price and then for Mr. McLean to mark his approval?

A.—To say whether the purchase should be made.

Q.—And then for the Minister to sign?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did the Minister sign?

A.—The next morning.

Q.—I notice you certify "Prices appear satisfactory," on the 30th of December, not the 29th?

A.—That is in as the 30th, because we expected to close the deal on the 30th. We were going to take it up with the Minister on the 30th. We had to act quickly. The price was jumping and we had to get our order in. We mailed the letter the 30th, the day that was signed, and the next day the price went up.

Q.—You received this tender on the 29th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and McLean did your part on the 29th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You signed on the 29th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. McLean?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then why didn't you date it with the proper date?

A.—We were to close up the business on the 30th.

Q.—But you didn't know that?

Q.—We expected to. We were going to ask the Minister to do that on our recommendation.

Q.—Do you tell this Committee that that is a rule that governs you, when putting a date on a paper, that the date to be put on is the date on which you expect to close a thing?

A.—This was a particular thing we had to get through.

Q.—But why did you certify that it was on the 30th of December, that the price was approved, do you tell this Committee that that was a proper thing for you to do, to put on a date that was not the date you did that, but a subsequent date?

Objection by Chairman to form of question.

MR. McCRAE: Why did you certify to a thing on the 29th, and date it the 30th.

A.—Because in this case we were going to recommend to the Minister on the 30th, that he close the business out.

Q.—You expected it would be closed the next day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that was the reason that you put down the 30th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now you had received the tender that day for the first time in a sealed envelope, on the afternoon of the 29th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What reason had you to expect that the Minister would be certain to close that deal?

A.—Because if he didn't we would have to pay the increased price.

Q.—Why couldn't you do it on the 31st?

A.—You couldn't get the order in on time.

Q.—Why couldn't it be dated the 29th then?

A.—We were going to recommend the order on the 30th, the whole business was to be closed on the 30th.

Q.—Your signature was not put on on the 30th?

A.—No, it was put on the day before.

Q.—When was Mr. McLean's signature put on?

A.—Sometime on the 29th.

Q.—Did you have a previous notice to be on hand next day at the Minister's office?

A.—I wanted to take it up the next morning.

Q.—Did you have a notice from the Minister to be on hand the next morning with reference to this contract?

A.—I am not clear about that. I got this tender on the afternoon of the 29th, and in making our inquiries we found all about this increased price coming through, I said, "There is only one thing to do, and that is, close at once." I took it up the first thing on the morning of the 30th.

Q.—Did you have any notice from the Minister that Parkin was to be there on the 30th?

A.—No notice whatsoever.

Q.—You didn't know when you came to his office what the business was about?

A.—I knew, I had these tenders with me.

Q.—Why?

A.—Because we wanted to close the business out. Mr. McLean recommended that they get the order.

Q.—Mr. McLean, was he with you that time?

A.—He was not.

Q.—When you went into Mr. Biggs' room in the morning, you had these tenders with you ready to be signed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you didn't know anybody was waiting in the room there?

A.—No.

Q.—You had no intimation of that?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you see Parkin?

A.—Afterwards.

Q.—Where did you see him afterwards?

A.—He came out afterwards and we got the business transacted.

Q.—After the Minister signed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then he signed it?

A.—Yes—oh, no.

Q.—Did Parkin sign anything that morning?

A.—No, that tender was signed by him when I got it.

Q.—Now you say that prior to the receipt of this tender by Parkin, you never knew Parkin before?

A.—No.

Q.—This was your first knowledge of Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you advertise in the papers that you were going to buy trucks?

A.—No, no advertisement.

Q.—No notice or publication of any sort, that you were going to buy Sterling trucks or invite prices?

A.—No, no advertisement.

Q.—Do you know where Parkin got the information as to the equipment required and the specifications that were on this tender. Do you know that?

A.—I don't know.

MR. HALL: Would any specifications be given out to him as to what was required so he could tender on that?

MR. McCRAE: Were there any specifications given out at the Department as to the requirements for these Sterling trucks?

A.—We had discussed the truck we meant to purchase—

Q.—Were any specifications given out?

A.—Do you mean written specifications?

Q.—Yes?

A.—No.

Q.—You don't know how Parkin got the information as to the description in his tender?

A.—I do not.

MR. BRACKIN: Did the Minister know what the requirements were?

A.—We had certainly discussed the requirements.

MR. TOLMIE: Had you ever drawn up in writing the requirements you wanted?

A.—The requirements were short, only three or four things that could easily be remembered, the body the hoist, that is practically all.

Q.—It was never submitted in writing?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: Then were the details and specifications of Parkin's tender exactly what you required for the trucks?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean to say that Mr. Biggs would know?

A.—Yes, Mr. Biggs would know.

MR. McCRAE: As I understand it the only tender you saw was the Parkin tender?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: You decided it must be Sterling trucks?

A.—We wanted Sterling trucks, yes.

Q.—There was no cutting of the price among the people selling Sterling trucks.

A.—There was no cutting. There was no discount. We knew that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McCrae asked you this: were you notified by the Minister to be there on Tuesday morning to meet Parkin and you said, "No." Were you notified to be there?

A.—We wanted to close the business, yes.

Q.—Were you notified to be there?

A.—I believe I was notified to be there.

Q.—But not to meet Parkin?

A.—No, I didn't know Parkin was coming.

MR. McCRAE: This purchase involved a sum of \$117,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you say it is customary in your Department that a transaction involving over \$100,000, is it customary that a transaction of that kind be put through without some memorandum of recommendation, or something on file, something to be a record in the office as to the reasons why a deal of such magnitude should be approved. Is it customary for these deals to go through without any such recommendation or memorandum in connection with your file?

A.—It is certainly discussed thoroughly before anything is done. There is very often no memorandum on our files, practically never.

Q.—Do you know of a case where a matter involving as much as \$117,000 has been put through where there is nothing in writing on the file, in the way of a recommendation to the Minister, the reasons given as to the necessity and requirements, something upon which the Minister acts?

A.—I do not know of any deal of that total.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know of any deal either large or small where the recommendation is in writing?

A.—It is very seldom done and I cannot remember one.

Q.—Either large or small?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: You don't know, in your department, of any recommendation, large or small, in writing, being first put on the files before the deal was consummated?

A.—There may be some there. I do not distinctly remember.

Q.—I understood you to say it was often done?

A.—In what cases?

Q.—In cases involving a large sum of money?

A.—No.

MR. DRURY: Is this true, that matters are referred from time to time to the officials of the Department and a memorandum and report is made to the Minister?

A.—Yes.

Q.—A memorandum might be made in some cases. It would be taken up probably with the Minister verbally. It is a departmental matter solely. You do a good deal of it by conversation?

A.—Absolutely, yes.

MR. McCRAE: Do you know any case of a deal of this magnitude where tenders have not been invited before the deal is closed?

A.—No, not of that total.

MR. HOMUTH: Has it ever been done before, that you put through any deal without asking for tenders?

A.—We have made purchases on single tenders and have also made purchases on competitive tenders.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this case you determined that there wasn't any possibility of competitive tenders?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: This is not the first time since you have been in the employ of the Government that you have purchased road machinery, or other machinery on a single tender?

A.—No. It was not the first time.

MR. McCRAE: Can you point to any deal of this magnitude where competitive tenders were not invited, except this one?

A.—Not of this magnitude.

MR. HOMUTH: Was there ever one of that magnitude before—since you were connected with the Department?

A.—Not with our department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was there ever a matter of that size in which you determined that there could not be competitive tenders?

A.—No.

Q.—This was a case where you determined there was no possibility of competitive tenders. They were Sterling trucks and there was no competition?

A.—Yes.

MR. McCRAE: Do you know anything Mr. Hogarth as to the comparative price of trucks purchased by the City of Toronto, with yours?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you say whether they are higher or lower, or what?

A.—I would say this. We know what these prices are. What the trucks and the equipment of the trucks was, has been mis-stated in the papers. I understand that when the city undertook to purchase these trucks they actually got prices that had been negotiated for months back, before December, 1919. They were then getting a lower price. They waited until January, due to the Council throwing out the recommendation of the Street Commissioner, and they bought at an increased price.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand it these trucks had been recommended, the purchase of Sterling trucks. They recommended it but it was thrown out by Council, or the Board of Control, and later on they advertised?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And didn't succeed in getting any satisfactory tenders, as a result of that advertisement—isn't that right?

A.—They only got two or three.

Q.—They didn't accept any of them?

A.—No.

Q.—Then later they bought Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then it was dated back to December?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Because of the fact they had been in negotiation?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that the city threw out the recommendation, advertised, then came back and bought Sterling trucks afterwards and because of the fact that they had been negotiating and the Board of Control, or City Council threw it out, they

were allowed the previous price. That is what I understood you to say.

A.—They had to pay a higher price. That is what we understood.

MR. PRICE: Was what was quoted in the papers yesterday correct. Are these trucks of the same equipment?

A.—No, sir, not the same equipment. None of the city trucks had bodies on.

MR DRURY: So there was really no comparison?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: Was the price of trucks substantially different after the 1st of January?

A.—Yes, and they continued to go up in January.

Q.—Have you bought any since?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At an advanced price?

A.—No, at the original quotation.

Q.—As far as you are concerned then the advanced price charged by the Sterling people didn't affect your price?

A.—No, not at all.

Q.—The fact is it was rather more of an alarm than an actuality as was proved afterwards—the increased price that caused this rush?

A.—We knew the price was going up and if we wanted to enjoy that discount and get in on the low price we had to act quickly.

Q.—As I understand it the price of trucks, after the 1st of January, was not increased to you?

A.—Because we had our quotation in for a number of them.

Q.—Did you buy any trucks other than what went in Parkin's order?

A.—We bought two others at that price.

Q.—Which were not in the Parkin order?

A.—No, they were not in that order.

Q.—You bought them without any advance in prices?

A.—Yes, without any advance in prices.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did advertise later and got higher prices?

A.—Yes, higher prices.

MR. McCRAE: Did you buy the last two through Parkin?

A.—Yes, through Parkin, on that quotation.

MR. HOMUTH: It was a pretty good stroke of business to get that order through as quickly as possible and save that 10 per cent. That was the only reason you got these extra trucks at the old price. You really got them at the old price because of the fact that you had given an order for twelve trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So it was as I said, a good stroke of business for the Department and for the Government to have rushed that order through and get the trucks at the old price?

A.—Yes.

MR. McCRAE: I understood you told us that some truck manufacturers were giving discounts?

A.—No, I didn't say that. I said some were giving the National Truck Buyers' discount. I said that an Association in which the Sterling did not form a part, had given discounts on list prices, but the Sterling didn't.

Q.—But some of the others did?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who were the other trucks bought from—did you buy any trucks other than Sterling trucks?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Who were they bought from?

A.—From the Beaver Truck Corporation, from the National Motor Car Co., the Four Wheel Drive Co., of Kitchener.

Further questions of this nature were ruled out of order by the Chairman..

MR. HENRY: Up to the time of the purchase of these twelve trucks the Department had no heavy trucks or any other trucks, than Ford trucks except one Reo you mentioned? You had practically been using a lot of Ford trucks, you mentioned and one Reo. Had you any other trucks you had tried out before this purchase was put through?

A.—Yes, two Fultons.

Q.—What weight?

A.—7½-ton capacity steam trucks.

Q.—Special trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You hadn't any others?

A.—No we bought these Fultons early in 1919, in April, or May, 1919. We had them down at Napanee.

Q.—Were they new trucks?

A.—No.

Q.—Second hand trucks that were practically legislated off the streets?

A.—No, they were down at Napanee.

Q.—There was some law passed here in Toronto that they couldn't be used?

A.—We didn't take them inside city limits.

Q.—Then you hadn't any others than these two special trucks, any gasoline trucks beyond the one-ton capacity until you got these twelve?

A.—No.

Q.—Then you hadn't been doing any real heavy hauling work up to then?

A.—No, not very much. We had contractors on the work and these men had been using trucks with us and I had been watching their work. We had contractors who had heavy trucks before we had.

Q.—The Department had not any heavy trucks except the Fultons and they worked outside city limits?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: You saw the advantage of these trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had the experience of the contractors with these trucks?

A.—Yes.

MR. HILL: These trucks we have been speaking about were 3½ and 5-ton trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you purchased any other 3½ or 5-ton trucks other than Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes, we have.

Q.—Who did you purchase these from?

Question ruled out.

Q.—Were these trucks you purchased subsequently much the same as the Sterling trucks we have been discussing?

Question ruled out.

Q.—Will you tell us again why it was the Department used Sterling trucks?

A.—We made a complete investigation of the trucks on the market and found the Sterling truck gave better satisfaction for the work we had to do. In the case of the 5-ton truck it had chain drive, it was an exceedingly rugged up to date truck and was doing the work we wanted done in a satisfactory manner at a satisfactory cost.

Q.—Were there no other trucks with chain drive?

A.—There may be one or two.

Q.—Is it not a fact that there are a great many trucks marketed with a chain drive.

A.—There may be two or three others with chain drive, I think.

Q.—What was the next feature of Sterling trucks that made you desirous of having them?

A.—The engine is particularly good and powerful.

Q.—Now you have had experience with other trucks, is the engine better than in other trucks?

A.—Do you mean the 3½ or the 5-ton trucks?

Q.—Any make you have had experience with?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have less trouble with it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What trucks are those?

Question ruled out.

Q.—What features about the engine are superior to other trucks?

A.—The engine is a more powerful machine, of low speed, which is very desirable, with good cooling surface so that it can operate under heavy duty for a long time. The transmission in the truck is a particularly good one.

Q.—Then if this engine is so superior to other engines why have you purchased trucks of other makes since?

Question ruled out.

Q.—Why didn't you purchase Sterlings when you came to get additional trucks if the Sterling is such a fine truck?

A.—We wanted other capacities of trucks.

Q.—No, you have the same capacities. You have purchased other 3½ and 5-ton trucks. Why did you not purchase Sterlings.

Question ruled out.

DR. GODFREY: Is it so that there is the same engine in the National as in the Sterling?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Do you know for a fact that it is the same?

A.—I don't think it is.

Q.—Well it is. Do you know for a fact that it is the same engine?

A.—The Sterling engine is made by the Sterling people.

Q.—Do you know that the engine in the National is the same engine as the engine in the Sterling?

A.—Do you mean made by the same company, the same size and everything else? It is possible that as to dimensions and everything else it may be made by the same people because frequently these people job out their engines.

MR. HILL: Why did you purchase trucks of another make of the same capacity since the purchase of Sterling trucks from Parkin if the Sterling truck is the best on the market?

Question ruled out and ruling of chair sustained on appeal.

MR. HILL: Now Mr. Hogarth, you have told us you didn't call for tenders because after investigation you found the Sterling truck was the best truck on the market you could buy, and you have explained that one of the reasons was that it had a chain drive, and you have told us now that there are other makes that have the chain drive. You have told us it has a better engine and you don't know whether the engine is the same or not as that used in another truck. Now in what other features was the Sterling superior?

A.—The transmission of the Sterling was superior to others.

Q.—What trucks do you refer to by "others?" What makes of trucks. Mention some of them that have not got as good transmission?

A.—The White, the Packard, the Clydesdale, the Kelly-Springfield.

Objection taken to this line of questioning.

MR. McCRAE: Was any effort made by you to be placed on a special list by these Sterling Trust people so that the price might be cut down as cheaply as possible?

A.—We knew it was useless.

THE CHAIRMAN: Answer the question.

A.—No, sir.

MR. HENRY: You bought twelve trucks on the 30th of December, 1919, with a hint from the Department or a threat whichever way you like to take it that the price would be advanced on the first of the year. You bought twelve trucks on the understanding that the price would go up, if you didn't close the deal before the beginning of the year?

A.—The factory was going to put the price up.

Q.—The facts are that you subsequently bought two other trucks at the same price?

A.—On the original quotation, yes.

MR. BRACKIN: When you bought these trucks with the knowledge that the price was going up did you know then that you would subsequently be able to buy later on at the same quotation?

A.—No, we did not.

Q.—That was a concession they gave you?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: It was really a concession due to the fact that you had bought twelve trucks from them?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused: The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

April 8, 1921.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m. Mr. Curry in the chair.

W. A. McLEAN called and sworn: Examined by Mr. Braekin.

Q.—Mr. McLean, you are Deputy Minister of Highways?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you occupied that position?

A.—Since 1917.

Q.—I want to start at the time the Minister of Public Works and Highways, you and Mr. Hogarth, according to the evidence of Mr. Hogarth, made a trip of inspection over the proposed Provincial Highways system, and I want you to tell me whether before that trip of inspection the matter of the purchase of trucks, what we might call heavy duty trucks, for the Highways branch had been discussed by you with anyone in the Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How far back?

A.—Some months before I had particularly asked Mr. Hogarth to look into the question of trucks suitable for our work and be prepared to advise us in the matter.

Q.—Had there been any advice by Mr. Hogarth with regard to the subject of trucks before Mr. Biggs became Minister?

A.—We had talked the matter over to a certain extent from time to time.

Q.—Since that decision as between you and Mr. Hogarth, that trucks should be bought for the Department, after you came to the decision that heavier trucks should be acquired—did that decision take place before Mr. Biggs became Minister?

Objection by Mr. McCrae.

Q.—Had there been any decision, any definite decision about buying heavy duty trucks before Mr. Biggs came in?

A.—No.

Q.—Had there been any discussion between you and Mr. Hogarth before Mr. Biggs came in as to what ought to be recommended about the purchase of trucks?

A.—We had discussed the merits of different kinds of trucks but there hadn't been any positive decision at that time.

Q.—Not as to the make of trucks, but so far as the making of a recommendation of the Department is concerned, had you and Mr. Hogarth before Mr. Biggs came in discussed what ought to be recommended about buying trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What conclusion was come to as to what recommendation you ought to make, not as to the make of trucks, but the kind of trucks generally?

A.—I had concluded from our discussions that we should have trucks. I do not think Mr. Hogarth had put before me any special recommendation in the matter.

Q.—That is as to the kind?

A.—That is as to the kind or fact. We had decided, I had decided and I believe Mr. Hogarth had.

Q.—You had decided before Mr. Biggs came in that you ought to buy the heavy type of trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What took place on that trip of inspection?

A.—From point to point the advantage of having trucks for certain work was pointed out and we had a discussion on the buying of trucks.

Q.—Can you tell me about when, so far as you are concerned, after Mr. Biggs came in, you were prepared as Deputy Minister to make a recommendation that trucks should be bought?

A.—As nearly as I can recall it was in the early part of December.

Q.—After you came to that conclusion did you discuss it with Mr. Biggs in the early part of December?

A.—We may have talked it over from time to time. I cannot recall the occasions.

Q.—Was there anything done, definitely, about the purchase of trucks between the early part of December, and the day when Mr. Hogarth brought in this proposition that he spoke of the other day, from Parkin?

A.—Mr. Hogarth at some stage did recommend to me finally that we should purchase Sterling trucks.

Q.—That is before this Parkin tender came in?

A.—Yes, before the Parkin tender came in.

Q.—Before Mr. Hogarth made a recommendation to you for the purchase of Sterling trucks, had you personally made any investigation of Sterling trucks? Or was the investigation left to Mr. Hogarth?

A.—I was relying on the report of Mr. Hogarth and the facts that he had to bring before me.

Q.—Then before the Parkin tender came in Mr. Hogarth had recommended Sterling trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then was the bringing in of Parkin's tender to you the next thing that happened?

A.—As I recall it, yes.

Q.—Now just tell us what happened when Mr. Hogarth brought in the Parkin tender.

A.—Well, now I cannot say from memory the exact time, that would be a matter of routine in the Department.

Q.—Not the time—what was done when it was brought in?

A.—He brought a tender in to me and I opened it and he looked at it. We discussed the thing that day and as I recall it I think we signed it at that time.

Q.—Signed for what purpose?

A.—For the purpose of certifying to the price of the trucks as being the lowest price at which they could be obtained.

Q.—Then did you sign anything at that time?

A.—I think I did.

Q.—After you signed, indicating your approval did you have anything further to do with it?

A.—No, I left it in the hands of Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—As I understand it, it is a fact that when Hogarth went in to the Minister with the tender with your signature and his the following morning, you didn't go?

A.—No, I did not go.

Q.—Then here is a question I want to ask: from the time of the conversation about the purchase of heavy duty trucks, from the trip of inspection down to the time you signed your name on the Parkin tender for the purpose of indicating your consent did the Minister, so far as you were concerned, either directly or indirectly

urge upon you or suggest to you the purchase by the Department of any particular kind of truck ?

A.—No.

MR. McCRAE: You were appointed as Deputy Minister in 1917, just speaking off-hand ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had been with the Government many years before ?

A.—I had been here since—well I have practically finished my 25th year.

Q.—Most of that time in the Public Works Department ?

A.—In the Public Works and the Highways, the greater part of it with the Highways.

Q.—You are the Deputy Minister who subject to the Minister is in control of Highway development in the Province of Ontario ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you really take no responsibility in this truck situation at all so far as determining the kind of truck nor in determining that it should be Sterling or any other kind ?

A.—There is the fact that the information prepared by the officers of the Department is brought to me. I look it over and gave it a scrutiny before I would approve and recommend.

Q.—Then the time did come when it was brought to your knowledge which were to be the trucks to be adopted by the Department for a particular class of work ?

A.—That is, that they were the trucks the engineer would recommend.

Q.—That intimation was given to you by whom ?

A.—By Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—You heard Mr. Hogarth say here at the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee that the decision to purchase the trucks known as the Sterling trucks was arrived at at a conversation between the Minister, yourself as Deputy Minister and Mr. Hogarth ?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is a fair statement of the evidence. Reference being made to pages 279-280, of the evidence of the last meeting Mr. McCrae continued.

Q.—I will read you the question on page 280. "I want to know whether it was prior to the 30th of December, that the decision was reached in which the Minister, Mr. McLean and yourself concurred, that Sterling trucks should be used for this work. Was it prior to the 30th of December?" and the answer is, "I would say prior to Christmas." I want to know from you if you were ever present at a conversation at which the Minister, Mr. Hogarth and yourself determined that Sterling trucks should be the type of truck to be purchased for the work on the roads ?

A.—I don't recall any conversation which we had, of a formal nature, to determine the kind of trucks to be used. We had a series of conversations on the matter.

Q.—Then you learned—was it from the Minister or Mr. Hogarth that you learned that Sterling trucks were to be purchased ?

A.—From Mr. Hogarth I learned that that would be his recommendation. That was the feeling and impression I got from him and which I concurred in from the facts before me.

Q.—I asked this question of Mr. Hogarth on page 280, of the evidence. “My question has been directed to this fact. As a result or practically as a result of this conversation within a period of time, twenty days prior to the 30th of December, the contract was signed. Is that a fair statement of the case?” The answer to that was: I recommended to the Minister, I said I thought the Sterling was a satisfactory truck to purchase. The Minister was there and it was “discussed.” Do you recall that?

A.—That was a year and four months ago and I cannot recall that incident. It may have happened.

Q.—You can satisfy me on this point—you are Deputy Minister?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would Hogarth be the one to get a determination from the Minister as to the class of trucks to be used or would you?

A.—I approve before it reaches the Minister.

Q.—Did you approve before it reached the Minister?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Of what decision?

A.—The decision of the engineer, of his recommendation.

Q.—Of the Parkin tender?

A.—No, the decision to purchase Sterling trucks.

Q.—Was there a memorandum prepared as to Sterling trucks being the proper type of truck to be chosen by the Department for that class of work?

A.—No, it was not. We haven't anything in the files of that description.

Q.—You did tell Mr. Hogarth to make inquiries and to make a report to you on the question of trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And no part of his report has been committed to writing?

A.—No.

Q.—Is it customary in a matter of the importance of the selection of these trucks not to give a recommendation in writing?

A.—Had the matter been of less importance he probably would, but this was something that we had discussed so fully that there was not anything left to report.

Q.—Is it not the practice in your Department that in a matter as large and important as this that there should be some memorandum in writing as to the decision come to and the reasons for it?

A.—There is no hard and fast rule that would make that necessary.

Q.—At all events the only thing that is in writing, as far as a recommendation is concerned is the Parkin tender, when it came in?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And its approval by yourself and certified to by Mr. Hogarth?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now you have a recollection of Mr. Hogarth bringing this tender to you and of you opening the envelope which was sealed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that was, as Mr. Hogarth says, on the 29th of December, 1919?

A.—I would expect so. I cannot contradict that in any way. I recollect opening it but as to fixing the exact day, I cannot from memory.

Q.—The only reason that I pointed that out is that both tenders of Parkin show

that Mr. Hogarth certified as of the 30th of December, although he says the tender was actually brought in on the 29th, and certified to on the 29th. I ask you as Deputy Minister why the date should be certified as the 30th if it was actually done on the 29th? Your signature would appear dated as of the 30th as well. Mr. Hogarth's evidence was that the tender was received on the 29th?

A.—I am unable to explain that.

Q.—Well, Mr. McLean up to the time this tender came in there had been no tender with reference to Sterling trucks so far as your department was concerned?

A.—No.

Q.—Were any instructions given by you as Deputy Minister to procure tenders for these Sterling trucks?

A.—The circumstances of that I do not recall. I believe there were some instructions.

Q.—To whom would they be given?

A.—To Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—How long before the date of the tender?

A.—I really cannot fix that.

Q.—Are you quite clear, as a matter of definite memory, Mr. McLean that you did tell Mr. Hogarth to call for tenders or prices in connection with Sterling trucks?

A.—I do not think I gave any instructions to call generally for tenders for these trucks. We had list prices and the market was rising for this equipment. It was extremely hard to get and my feeling was at that time, I am quite sure, was that any quotation we would receive from any of the agents would be the same.

Q.—That was your feeling?

A.—That was my belief.

Q.—Then when this tender was brought in by Mr. Hogarth to you, were you, were you expecting tenders in connection with the trucks upon that day?

A.—We had discussed the urgency of closing our order before the end of December.

Q.—Were you expecting any tenders that day?

A.—I cannot say I expected it that day. I cannot recall from memory that I was expecting it.

Q.—Did you know before you saw Parkin's tender that a tender was coming in from Parkin. Did you hear Parkin was putting in a tender?

A.—I think I expected such a tender.

Q.—And when it was received, how long after it was opened by you in the presence of Mr. Hogarth was it until your signature was put on the tender as approved?

A.—I believe it was the afternoon when Mr. Hogarth brought it to me.

Q.—How long was it between the time it came to you until Mr. Hogarth went out with your signature on the paper as approved?

A.—We discussed it for some little time, I cannot say how long.

Q.—It was a matter of minutes?

A.—Well, it may have been.

Q.—Isn't that your recollection?

A.—I would not say so, no I think he was in there for perhaps an hour.

Q.—Discussing this tender?

A.—Discussing the whole question of trucks.

Q.—I mean how long was the Parkin tender discussed after it was opened until your signature was on it?

A.—Now, I really cannot recall that.

Q.—Was your signature on before Mr. Hogarth's?

A.—No.

Q.—Did Mr. Hogarth sign first?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Hogarth signed in your presence?

A.—I think so.

Q.—And your signature immediately followed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was the only tender?

A.—That was the only quotation we had, yes—other than the price lists.

Q.—Do you know anything about Parkin other than was contained on the tender?

A.—I didn't meet him at all.

Q.—You knew he was a garage owner in Dundas?

A.—I knew he was an agent for Sterling trucks, in Dundas.

Q.—Do you know that, as the Minister has pointed out, he was the garage dealer he dealt with as far as private business was concerned?

A.—No, I don't know anything about that.

Q.—Was there any discussion with Mr. Hogarth about dividing up these trucks among the dealers?

A.—That phase of it was considered.

Q.—When?

A.—In the general discussion we had concerning trucks.

Q.—Was there any discussion about dividing up this number of trucks on the Parkin tender, between other dealers, with Parkin?

A.—Oh, no. We had simply discussed whether we should standardize any one form of truck or use others.

Q.—You told me a few moments ago that before this Parkin tender was opened you had been sort of expecting that Parkin would make a tender?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where did you get the information that led you to believe that Parkin would make a tender?

A.—As I recall the situation Mr. Biggs had asked if trucks could be purchased as satisfactorily outside the City of Toronto as in the city and I said that under then existing circumstances I believed they could, that we would receive the same condition from any dealer outside, as in the City of Toronto and something was said as to a local dealer that I think was probably Mr. Parkin. I cannot recall the terms of the conversation other than that.

Q.—When the tender was opened the impression was in your mind that Parkin was the local dealer?

A.—I knew it was from someone in that vicinity, yes.

Q.—The vicinity of Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now did you know on the 29th, or whatever the date was that you and Mr. Hogarth approved of the contract, did you know that the deal was to be closed

the next day with Parkin?

A.—No, I had no specific information in that regard.

Q.—Mr. Hogarth said that although it was certified by yourself and himself on the 29th it was dated the 30th because it was to be closed the next day. Was anything said to you at the time you signed as to the deal being closed the next day?

A.—I do not recall anything of that description. That was a pure detail that might pass unobserved.

Q.—You didn't see Parkin at all in this transaction?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you any expert knowledge, as a truck expert?

A.—I am not a truck expert.

A.—Now is Mr. Hogarth, so far as you know—he would simply be collecting data?

A.—He was collecting data and I have every confidence in his mechanical and other ability.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the Minister in any way responsible for the fact that there was no written report made in respect to these trucks by Mr. Hogarth or Mr. Johnston?

A.—No, in no way whatever.

Q.—Who is Mr. Johnston?

A.—He is the head mechanic at the Highways garage

Q.—Did you know he had been consulted?

A.—Yes. Hogarth informed me he had been utilizing the services of Mr. Johnston in the matter.

Q.—So that before you put your signature to this document approving of these respective tenders by Parkin you knew Johnston had been consulted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And his view had been communicated to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Hogarth's views had been communicated to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And as a result of the consultation between you you made the recommendation which appears here?

A.—Yes.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Hogarth stated that a deal of this magnitude had never gone through all these years before without some solicitation for prices or tenders. Is that your experience?

A.—The Highways Department was comparatively new at that time and we did not ourselves put through any such deal.

Q.—That was the first of its kind?

A.—Of that magnitude, in the Highways Department.

Q.—Do you say Mr. McLean, as Deputy Minister that that is a proper way for the conduct of that class of business in the public interest?

Objection being taken to the form of the foregoing question the Chairman ruled that it was not a proper question to put to the witness in that it involved a statement of opinion in which the Committee was not interested. Mr. McCrae appealed from the ruling and upon a vote the chair was over-ruled. The Chair-

man thereupon directed the witness to answer the question.

WITNESS: One has to consider the circumstances under which you are purchasing. At that time the markets were wholly abnormal. Manufacturers were months behind in filling their orders. It was a sellers' market not a buyers' market, and our experience with other equipment was that prices were continuously going up and that we could not get delivery. In the case of the trucks, in the price lists we had we practically had quotations on every truck obtainable which we would consider. In order that we might be sure of delivery of these it was urgent that we get our order in as soon as possible and head off other orders for the coming season. As I said there was the constant threat of advancing prices in all classes of equipment. Under the circumstances I believed we were acting in the public interest in purchasing on list prices without calling for quotations.

MR. McCRAE: Everyone will feel better at your answer to the question Mr. McLean.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not an answer to the question. Answer the question Mr. McLean.

Question read by reporter as follows:

"Do you say Mr. McLean, as Deputy Minister, that that is a proper way for the conduct of that class of business in the public interest?"

MR. McLEAN: Yes, in the public interest.

MR. McCRAE: What class of trucks has your Department purchased since you purchased Sterling trucks from Mr. Parkin?

A.—We have purchased several classes.

Q.—I mean of this 3½ and 5-ton trucks the same as the Sterling.

A.—I think we have Clydesdale, and two Packards—I will have to look up the list.

Q.—You did purchase a number of others which were not Sterlings?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were they purchased in 1920?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And when they were purchased were the prices paid higher than would have been paid for the same truck in 1919?

A.—My recollection is that they were.

Q.—Is that a fact?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—The Sterling trucks, Mr. Hogarth told us, were no higher in price than those purchased in 1919?

A.—I think they were. I think the price of Sterlings went up.

Q.—In his evidence Mr. Hogarth said they didn't pay a higher price on the additional trucks than on the others?

A.—No, we were purchasing on the original quotation. We received that protection, for 14 instead of 12.

Q.—So the fact is that because of the purchase of Sterling trucks on the Parkin order of December 1919 you were able in 1920 to get Sterling trucks at the old prices of 1919 because you had placed an order in 1919 for twelve trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You purchased in 1920, trucks other than Sterlings and of the same sizes

as you purchased from Parkin although as a matter of fact their prices were higher than the prices of 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you bought several trucks at a higher price in 1920, than these could have been bought for in 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Why did you not continue to purchase Sterling trucks in the 3½ and 5-ton classes in 1920, when you could have obtained them at the 1919 price instead of buying other trucks which as a matter of fact were higher in 1920 than they were in 1919?

A.—There were several reasons. One was that we wished in practice to try out different designs of trucks. It was considered only fair that we should distribute some of the business.

Q.—Was that the reason you chose other trucks in 1920?

A.—Not wholly so.

Q.—Largely so? You felt you should distribute the business?

A.—I would not say that was the only reason. It influenced us perhaps to a slight extent.

Q.—At all events the reasons for confining yourself to Sterling trucks, as was the case in 1919, were not present in 1920, when you chose other makes of trucks?

A.—Well that is a side question. In the first thing we believed it was a good thing to standardize the equipment so that the chauffeurs could move from one truck to another and be able to operate them, and we would have spare parts for repairs, and there would be an understanding among our mechanics of the main type of truck. However we had no objection to having some of the others in our fleet.

Q.—Now Mr. McLean, have you purchased Sterling trucks since 1919, from anyone else except Parkin?

A.—No.

MR. BRACKIN: You spoke of buying in 1920 trucks of 3½ and 5-ton capacity in addition to the Sterling trucks bought in 1919. In 1919 when you bought Sterling trucks did you know at that time in December 1919 that in 1920 you were going to require further trucks?

A.—No.

Witness excused.

Roy A. Reynolds recalled, examined by Mr. Brackin.

Q.—I want to ask you about some evidence you gave in a trial in Hamilton, between yourself and Parkin. To get your mind right to the point I am going to direct your attention to the particular circumstances.

At this point objection was taken by Mr. McCrae to the presence of two men who were to be called as witnesses. He asked that they be excluded and this was done.

MR. BRACKIN: What we want to draw your attention to Mr. Reynolds is this: You were speaking the other day of a certain occasion on the 6th of March when you and Parkin had a conversation?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was the time you left his employ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were making a claim for the commissions you thought you ought

to get?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You told us this the other day, that in the course of that conversation between you, Parkin said to you, “What do you think Biggs should get” and according to your statement his idea was that Biggs should get a McLaughlin car. Do you remember that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said, “No, don’t let’s give him a car. That would cause trouble.” Do you remember that?

A.—Yes, I don’t know whether I said that right then or not.

Q.—Do you remember your story the other day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He then said, “What do you think we ought to give him.” You said, “I think we should give him money” and he said, “How much,” and you said, “\$3,000 and I am willing that my share of that, my 5 per cent of that, should go for that purpose.” Do you remember saying that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—We will refer now to the evidence given at the trial. And I will read from page 42 of the evidence of the trial of Reynolds versus Parkin, before Judge Gauld, and to the examination of Reynolds, pages 42 to 43, and questions 291 to 296 inclusive, referring to that Saturday when you spoke about your conversation with Parkin. I will read you question 291. “Did he make any reference to the Government trucks order?”

A.—Saturday, he did.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—On Saturday we went out to the office and sat in the back of the garage alone, and he said, “What do you expect to get out of this Government deal.” I said, “I expect my 5 per cent.” He said, “Not surely on Canadian prices, and I said no, on American prices. That amounts to about 3½ per cent. He thought “that was all right.”

Q.—Was that true?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Question 293. “How do you know? What did he say, did he make any objection? A.—At first when I mentioned the 5 per cent. he said, I don’t think “you should expect that. You know the Grace Motors trimmed me out of \$4,000 “and I think you should allow a little on that. I said, that is all right Len I “will do anything that is fair. He said to me, what about Biggs. He said, he will “expect something out of this. I said, you can take my share out of it. If we are “going to give Biggs anything I am willing to take it at my rate of 5 per cent., and “his rate of 20 per cent.”

Q.—Was that true?

A.—Yes, that is true.

*Q.—Question 294.

Q.—Question 295, “You mean Parkin does?”

A.—Yes, he said, “What about Biggs, and I said, I am willing to give my “share out of my 5 per cent. He said, all right but he won’t want it now. It will “be in some future time. I said, Len, put it aside so when he wants it we will give “it to him, and he said, what about this Cox deal—

Q.—Was that true? Was that your answer on that occasion and if it was,

*This question is not on the minutes.

was it true?

A.—I believe I did. He mentioned about the papers going after Biggs so strong.

Q.—That is not an answer to the question. Did you make that answer at that trial?

A.—Yes, I guess I did.

Q.—Was it true?

A.—Yes, it was true.

Q.—Question 296, "Did you leave it at that, or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs piece would be?"

A.—No, he did not say about how much it would be or anything. He just said, in some future day we will have to do something for him."

Q.—Did you make that answer. The other day you said that when you and Parkin discussed this thing on the occasion you were speaking of at the trial, he suggested an auto, and you suggested \$3,000, and you have just told me you remember saying that the other day. I am speaking of exactly the same occasion and the same discussion. In the light of what you swore, that first the car was mentioned and then the \$3,000—did you make that answer—question 296, "Did you leave it at that or did you attempt to ascertain what Biggs piece would be?"

A.—No, he did not say how much it would be or anything. He just said, "In some future day we will have to do something for him."

Q.—Did you make that answer at the trial to question 296?

A.—I guess I did make that answer.

Q.—Was it true?

A.—Yes, it was true.

Q.—I suppose you will agree with me in this, that if the answer you made at the trial was true, the statement you made the other day to the effect that on that occasion about which you were speakin at the trial, Parkin suggested a car and you suggested \$3,000—that is the statement you made the other day—is not true if that answer was true?

Objection by Mr. McCrae.

MR. BRACKIN: Do you remember swearing the other day about the time when you and Parkin had a conversation about what Biggs should get?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember you swore the other day that on that occasion which according to my recollection was the 6th of March, when you were leaving and were discussing the question of commission he said Grace Motors had put up the price on him or soaked him \$4,000. On that occasion the 6th of March, he said, "What do you think that Biggs should get." Do you remember saying that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember swearing the other day when you were here, when he asked you on that occasion what you thought Biggs should get, you said he said, "We should give him a McLaughlin car. Do you remember that?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said, "No, that would cause trouble to give him a car?" He said, "What do you think we should give him." And you said in answer to that, "I think we should give him \$3,000, and I am willing that my 5 per cent. share should go into that?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, I have read you your evidence with regard to that particular occasion which you gave at the trial, and I have read you particularly question 296. That question was, “Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs piece would be.” And your answer was—you told me you made that answer and that it was true—“No, he did not say about how much it would be or anything. He just said, “In some future day we will have to do something for him.” Now, I ask you this question—will you agree with me that if your answer to question 296, at the trial was true, that what you said the other day about a car being mentioned and \$3,000, couldn’t possibly be true. Do you agree with me that that is a fair statement?

Objection by Mr. McCrae that the question was not a fair one.

Witness excluded: Mr. McCrae argued that it had not been established that the evidence referred to the same conversation.

Witness recalled.

MR. BRACKIN: We are trying to fix the time. Do you remember going to Parkin and telling him that you wanted to get straightened out by Saturday, that you were going to Buffalo and wanted to lend \$1,500 to a party and you wanted to know how you stood with him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You did see him on a Saturday?

A.—Yes.

Q.—This was the time you had the discussion about what you ought to get and about Biggs?

A.—Yes. We had talked of it all during the week.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion you had was prior to giving evidence in Hamilton?

A.—Yes.

MR. BRACKIN: I will go back to question 285, page 41. “When did the split-up come?”

A.—Around in March—March 6th, I think.

Question 286. “When did you first take up with Parkin the question of paying you for what you claim was your share?”

A.—During the Fall I said to him two or three times, lets get straightened away. This is no way of doing business. I am spending all my money running around the country. Let us get squared away. He always had a story he was up against it. I knew he was up against it for the banks were after him. He said, “If you can carry on help me out in this way. I had lots of cash. He said “some day luck will turn and we will be all right. So I listened to this alibi and “this is what I got.”

Q.—Question 290. “Don’t quote what they said about this man. You have “not any right to do that no matter what it was. In consequence of your wish “to get your money what did you do?”

A.—I said, “Let us get straightened away here, I said I want to get “straightened away by Saturday, for I am going to Buffalo and I want to loan “\$1,500 to a party. I want to know how I am standing here. He put me off until Saturday.”

Question 291: “Did he make any reference to the Government truck order?”

A.—“Saturday he did.”

Q.—Was that the Saturday, the 6th of March, the day you left him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was Saturday, the 6th of March, that you were giving evidence with regard to here the other day when you said there was a discussion about Biggs and he said, "Let us give him a car" and you said, "No, give him \$3,000?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was the same day you were discussing in giving evidence in Hamilton?

A.—We talked of it every day. I worked nine months for him for practically nothing.

Q.—You went over on Saturday all that you discussed the previous week. Did you speak about the car and the money?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On the Saturday?

A.—Yes. We did from day to day.

Q.—Did you talk about the trucks, the truck order—before Saturday?

A.—Yes.

Q.—We'll go back to your evidence. Question 291, you were referring to him putting you off, and say, "He put me off until Saturday." Question 291. Did he make any reference to the truck order?"

A.—"Saturday he did."

A.—On Saturday he did and during the week.

Q.—I will read it again. "In consequence of your wish to get straightened away what did you do?"

A.—I said, "Let us get straightened away here. I said, I want to get "straightened away by Saturday for I am going to Buffalo and I want to loan "\$1,500 to a party. I want to know how I am standing here. He put me off until Saturday."

Q.—"Did he make any reference to the Government truck order?"

A.—"Saturday he did."

A.—Yes he did from day to day, we talked about it a lot.

Q.—I asked you a moment ago did a conversation take place about giving Biggs an automobile and you said, "No because that would cause trouble, let us give him \$3,000." You said that took place on Saturday, March 6, was that true?

A.—Yes, it took place Saturday and also previous to Saturday. At different times we spoke about it.

Q.—Did you ever before that Saturday tell him what you expected out of this Government deal.

A.—Yes, it was understood I was to get something.

Q.—When did you first tell him what you expected? When and where was it you first told him what you expected out of this Government deal?

A.—I think it would be the first of the week. I think it was Tuesday, Monday or Tuesday.

Q.—What did you say to him on Monday or Tuesday?

A.—It was either the first of the week or the week before that he handed me letters from the——firm and also in those two letters was a letter from the Grace Motors that he didn't expect I had seen.

Q.—How did you come to see it?

A.—He handed me these letters to read. He only knew I had two. In this letter the Grace Motors wanted the cheque from the Government turned over to

Grace Motors instead of to Parkin. Parkin owed them something for some trucks or something. I said, "Parkin, don't turn it over to Grace Motors. If you do, my share you won't turn over."

Q.—I asked you when was the first time you told Parkin what you expected to get out of this Government order. You said Monday or Tuesday. Is that right?

A.—I cannot say the day—it was understood all along.

Q.—It might be understood in your mind and not in his. I am asking about what you said. Do you swear that at any time during that week before the Saturday, the 6th of March, you told him what you expected out of the Government order?

A.—I cannot swear to that week, no.

Q.—Can you swear this whether during the week before the sixth of March there was a discussion between him and you as to what you expected out of the Government order?

A.—Yes, there certainly was.

Q.—When, during that week?

A.—I cannot say, during that week.

Q.—You didn't listen to my question. The question I asked was this, whether you would swear that during that week, at any time during the week before the Saturday, the 6th of March, there was any discussion between you and him about what you expected out of this Government order?

A.—After I read this letter I told him the cheque would not be turned over to the Grace Motors. I mentioned it then.

Q.—Can you swear that at any time during the week before Saturday, the 6th of March, there was any talk between you and Parkin about what you expected out of the Government contract that one week, the first week in March?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was it?

A.—I cannot say when it was. We talked about it all week.

Q.—Can you tell me whether during the week before Saturday, the 6th of March, there was any talk between you and him in which there was any mention made of anything coming to Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What date?

A.—I cannot say what day it was.

Q.—How long before the 6th?

A.—I do not know. It was talked about from the time the order was got.

Q.—Tell me then about when it was, about what day in the week. The beginning or the end of the week?

A.—I cannot tell you the day—from the day we left the Parliament Buildings until I broke with him on the 6th of March.

Q.—Can you tell me what was said apart from what was said on the Saturday, the 6th of March, about Mr. Biggs. Can you tell me if anything was said the week before about Biggs? You have been telling us what was said on Saturday.

A.—From the time the deal was closed we talked of it at different times. Once I went out on the road to pick up Mr. Biggs who was stalled. When I came back in Parkin came in and said, "You didn't charge for that trip, you didn't put in any charge for it?" And I said, "No."

Q.—He was complaining about you not charging it?

A.—No. He said, “You didn’t charge it.”

MR. BIGGS: Who said that?

A.—Parkin said that.

Q.—Didn’t I give you \$2.00 personally yourself for bringing gas to me at the Half-Way House, on the Hamilton road. Did I not personally give you \$2.00 for your personal trouble for bringing me gas to the Half-Way House?

A.—You did not. You gave me something to pay for gas.

Q.—I want you to say no, or yes. You brought me out a couple of gallons of gas to the Half-Way House?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And I gave you \$2 right then and there after we came back to the garage?

A.—You gave it to me to pay for the gas and there was about 40 cents change and you said, “That is allright Roy, there is a tip for you .” There was about 40 cents change.

Q.—I ask the question plainly. Did I or did I not give you \$2 at that time?

A.—For myself?

Q.—For service—didn’t I give you a \$2 bill?

A.—You gave it to me to pay for gas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Biggs is asking whether you got \$2.

MR. BIGGS: Wasn’t it handed to you?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it \$2?

A.—I won’t swear to that.

MR. DRURY: What was it?

A.—I cannot say.

MR. BIGGS: How much gas did you bring out?

A.—I think two or three gallons.

Q.—Would two or three gallons be \$2? Gas was selling then about 42 cents?

A.—Yes.

MR. McCRAE: There is no doubt about one thing, that is that the gas you brought out was paid for by Mr. Biggs?

A.—It would not go in the books. It was marked as cash. I admit there was forty or sixty cents change that Mr. Biggs gave me for that trip, but that would not pay for the trip.

MR. BIGGS: But the point is that the gas was paid for and he got \$1.20 change.

A.—I would not say it was two gallons.

MR. McCRAE: Would this be in Parkin’s books?

A.—No, just marked to cash.

MR. BRACKIN: During the week before the 6th of March—what I am asking is this: You were asked question 291. “Did he make any reference to the Government truck order.” And your answer was, “Saturday he did.” I want to get back and ask you whether prior to Saturday, during that week was there any talk between you and Parkin about the Government truck order?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was it?

A.—The only talk of the trucks was after I read this letter, I think that was

the week before.

Q.—Tell us what it was?

A.—I don't remember what he said any one day.

Q.—Did I understand you to say that during the week before the 6th of March, the only talk about the Government truck order was when he handed you a letter from Grace Motors asking that he have the Government cheque drawn out to them, and you said, "Don't do that." Is that what the talk was there?

A.—We talked about the Government truck order, naturally.

Q.—You told me that during that week before the 6th of March, there was a talk between you and him about the Government truck order. I asked you what it was. You said he handed you a letter from the Grace Motors asking Parkin to turn over the Government cheque to them and you said, "Don't turn the Government cheque over to them or I will never get mine?"

A.—I said, "Don't turn my part over to them."

Q.—Outside of that which you have just told us was there any other talk, before Saturday the 6th of March, between you and Parkin about the Government truck order? During that week?

A.—We talked about it practically every day.

Q.—Then tell us what was said?

A.—Every morning I would say, "Let us get squared away."

Q.—And he put you off until Saturday?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there any other talk during that week, before Saturday except what you have told us? That is, talk about the Government truck order?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was it?

A.—We talked about the Government truck order. I cannot say what he said.

Q.—Do you agree with me in this, that you cannot remember what he said during the week before Saturday, the 6th of March, when you were trying to get settled, except that about the letter from the Grace Motors. Do you agree with me in this that the sole mention of giving a car when you said, "No," give him \$3,000." was on Saturday, that that came out on Saturday the 6th of March?

A.—That was spoken of before.

Q.—Tell us when, and where?

A.—I can't say when and where. We got two new cars, one for a Mr. Barry and one in stock.

Q.—I want you to tell me whether before the 6th of March, there was any talk between you in which Parkin mentioned giving a car to Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was that?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Where was it?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—How long before?

A.—I could not say that.

Q.—You can't remember where it was?

A.—No.

Q.—Tell me what he said? (no answer.) You cannot remember where it

was or when it was at all? Was it before Saturday, the 6th of March?

A.—I cannot get down and say when or where or anything else.

Q.—What I want to get at is this. You told me that in the week prior to the 6th of March, there was some discussion about the Government order and you told me one thing the discussion consisted of, that it was referring to a letter from the Grace Motors and what you said about turning over the Government cheque. I have asked you whether there were any other remarks that week about the Government order. What do you say?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was it?

A.—One day I was in Chatham—

Q.—I am asking you this. You said you had seen him the week before about getting straightened away and that he put you off until Saturday. I want to ask you whether during any one of these discussions when he was putting you off until Saturday, was there any talk about the Government order except the talk about the letter from the Grace Motors?

A.—I cannot say whether there was or not.

Q.—I suppose it would come down to this. He kept putting you off. You said you wanted to go to Buffalo and that you wanted to lend someone \$1,500, and he kept putting you off until Saturday?

A.—Yes, from day to day.

Q.—Then Saturday came?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was the day you expected to get a settlement with him?

A.—I expected to come to some agreement.

Q.—You expected on Saturday you would come to some agreement?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When Saturday came where did you see him, at the garage?

A.—Yes, in the office.

Q.—Questions 292, 293 and 294, of your examination that I read to you at the opening dealt with that question?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your answer to question 293 was, "At first when I mentioned the 5 per cent. he said, I don't think you should expect that, you know the Grace Motors trimmed me out of \$4,000, and I think you should allow a little on that. I said, all right Len, I will do anything that is fair. He said to me, what about Biggs he will expect something out of this. I said, you can take my share out of it. If we are going to give Biggs anything I am willing to give it at my rate of 5 per cent. and his rate of 20 per cent. That took place on Saturday?"

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now then, what I want to ask is this: Was that the first time that Saturday that he said, in effect, Biggs will want something out of this, or anything to that effect. Was that the first time he came out boldly like that, and said so?

A.—I won't say it was the first time.

Q.—Would you say it wasn't? Would you swear it wasn't, or would you swear one way or the other?

A.—I do not think I would swear one way or the other on that.

Q.—Was it that day when he said, “Biggs will want something out of this and so forth,” was that the time there was talk about the \$3,000, between you and Parkin?

A.—No, we talked about having a new car at different times.

Q.—Did you talk about it that Saturday, about the car and the \$3,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you tell us what was said about the car on that Saturday?

A.—Which car?

Q.—The car you spoke about having in the garage that you were willing to give Biggs? You told me that on Saturday, the 6th of March, there was mention made of a car in the garage, that he was willing to give to Biggs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Well, what was said that Saturday about that?

A.—Only that he mentioned about giving a car to Biggs and asked me, “What do you think is fair, what do you suggest.” I said, “That car is selling about \$2,800 or \$2,805.” He suggested a car, and I said, “That amounted to about \$3,000, and I suggested \$3,000, and said that we would have to be careful. I said, if we gave him a car people might pick it up and make a lot of talk about it.” He said that in some future time we would have to look after him.

Q.—That was on Saturday, the 6th of March, the day you mentioned the \$3,000.

A.—Yes.

Q.—I will read you again your answer to question 296, of your examination in the trial in Hamilton, regarding Saturday the 6th of March. Question 296. “Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs’ piece would be?”

A.—No, he did not say about how much it would be or anything. He just said, “In some future day we will have to do something for him.” In the light of what you have told me was that statement true that you made at Hamilton?

A.—Now you have me tangled up.

Objection by Mr. McCrae that witness was being confused, question shown to witness and re-read by Mr. Brackin, from evidence taken at examination in Hamilton.

MR. BRACKIN: Now the question I am asking you is this: In the light of what you have told us of the conversation on that Saturday, the 6th of March, when Parkin suggested giving a car which you said was worth \$2,850 or whatever it was and you said, “No, that would cause trouble,” and he said, “What do you think we should give him?” and you said, “\$3,000.” In the light of what you have sworn as to that, first the car and then the \$3,000, I am asking whether the answer you made to question 296 at the trial at Hamilton was true, when you said, “No, he did not say about how much it would be or anything. He just said, in some future day we will have to do something for him”— Do you still say it?

A.—I can hardly answer that. I do not understand what he said about leaving it at that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have told Mr. Brackin on several occasions and particularly on the 6th of March, a car and \$3,000 were mentioned?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that prior to giving evidence in Hamilton?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then when you were asked that question in Hamilton why didn't you tell about the car and the \$3,000?

MR. McCRAE: He was not asked that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you were asked the question about what took place between you and Parkin in regard to what Biggs was going to get, why didn't you tell about the discussion in respect to the car and the \$3,000?

MR. McCRAE: That is not the question you say is here.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have told Mr. Brackin that on several occasions and particularly on the 6th of March, that Mr. Parkin and you discussed giving Mr. Biggs a car or \$3,000, that is right, isn't it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were asked in Hamilton about what sum Biggs was to get out of it, were you?

A.—I don't think he put it in that way.

Q.—How did he put it?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Were you asked anything that would indicate to you that you were to tell the court whether Biggs was to get anything at all or not?

A.—My answers in court referred to my case and not for the political side of it.

Q.—Why did you not in Hamilton tell about the \$2,800 car and the \$3,000?

A.—I did not think I was supposed to tell it.

MR. BRACKIN: I will read you question 296 again, "Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs piece would be?" Answer it now.

A.—I do not know. I don't want to be tripped up.

Q.—There is no question of being tripped up. Tell the truth.

A.—I am telling the truth.

Q.—"Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be?"

Then in question 295, you say, "He said all right, but he won't want it now. It will be in some future time. I said, "Len, put it aside so when he wants it we will give it to him." And the next question is: "Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be?"—Did you leave it at that until some future time, or did you attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be, answer that question now?

A.—We were working on it and Biggs was to be there that Saturday afternoon. He had been doing all the talking to Biggs and I didn't speak to him of anything particularly.

Q.—Did you and he attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be?

Q.—At that time when he said, "All right, he won't want it now or won't take it now, it will be in some future time." At that time was there any interview or any talk between you and him about a car for Biggs or \$3,000?

A.—Certainly there was talk about it.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—He mentioned a car and I mentioned \$3,000.

Q.—You said a little while ago when asked why you didn't tell about the car and the \$3,000 at the trial in Hamilton, you said you were giving evidence

then in your own case, in the case in court, and not for political purposes—you said that a minute ago—

A.—Mr. Washington didn't ask me about a car or \$3,000. That had no bearing on my part of the case with Parkin. I had kept my mouth shut during this thing and did during my trial.

Q.—You were being asked about Biggs' piece at the trial?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you say that when you were giving evidence at the trial you held back deliberately and didn't tell about the car and about the \$3,000?

A.—Mr. Washington didn't ask me.

Q.—When he asked you this question: "Did you leave it at that or did you and him attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be." When he asked you about Biggs' piece, did you have in mind then at the time when you were in the stand what had been said about a car and the \$3,000?

A.—I would not say it was in my mind then.

Q.—Did you know it at that time?

A.—Certainly, I knew it.

Q.—Knowing it, as you tell us, did you deliberately keep it back and not tell it?

A.—Mr. Washington didn't ask me that question. It was none of his business. It had no bearing on my private case with Parkin.

Q.—He was asking about Biggs' piece and whether any attempt was made by you or Parkin to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be. According to what you have told us there had been a discussion between you and Parkin, first about a car and then about \$3,000. When Mr. Washington asked you if any attempt was made by you and Parkin to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be, knowing as you did what had been said about a car and about the \$3,000 did you deliberately keep it back and not tell them what you knew?

A.—I don't think I deliberately kept it back.

Q.—Did you keep it back?

A.—Apparently I did. He didn't ask me that question.

Q.—He didn't ask you about a car or about the \$3,000, he asked you about Biggs' piece. When he asked you if you had made any attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be of course you knew what "Biggs' piece" referred to. When he referred to Biggs' piece you knew what he was referring to, didn't you? Do you say you didn't know what he was referring to?

A.—Certainly, I knew what he was referring to.

Q.—You knew Biggs' piece when there was this discussion between you and Parkin on the 6th of March, was first a car and later a suggestion of \$3,000, didn't you. You knew that?

A.—Yes, I knew that.

Q.—Mr. Washington was referring to a talk you were telling about that took place between you and Parkin?

A.—I took that to mean—he asked me did we approach Biggs and I said no.

Q.—His question was, "Did you attempt to ascertain what Biggs piece would be." You told us you knew what Biggs' piece was and what he was referring to. You told us that your discussion between you and Parkin with regard to Biggs' piece was first a car and then \$3,000?

A.—You say I was telling you what Biggs' piece would be? I had nothing from Biggs. Probably he would refuse the car and refuse the \$3,000. The way Parkin put it to me he wanted to ask Biggs.

Q.—Go back a minute, please. You were being asked about a conversation between you and Parkin and about any attempt to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be. You told us the discussion between you and Parkin about what Biggs' piece would be was first a car and later \$3,000?

A.—I didn't say that Biggs was going to be satisfied with that, I didn't say that. He was to talk it over with Biggs.

Q.—The talk was between you and Parkin. He asked you specifically about Biggs' piece, when he asked you about any attempt by you and Parkin to ascertain what Biggs' piece would be. Why didn't you tell about that discussion regarding first a car and then \$3,000?

A.—He didn't ask me that question, that is why I didn't.

Q.—I will ask you this: will you say that the reason you didn't tell about the car at Hamilton was because you were not asked about the car, is that what you say?

A.—I was being cross-examined by Mr. Washington and was answering his questions as he put them to me.

Q.—Do you say that the reason you didn't tell about the car at Hamilton was because you were not asked about the car?

A.—It probably wasn't then in my mind.

Q.—Is that the best answer you can give, that the reason you did not tell about the talk between you and Parkin about the car and the \$3,000, was because you were not asked about the car and the \$3,000?

A.—If Mr. Washington had asked me I would have answered it.

Q.—Do you say that the reason you did not tell about the \$3,000 at Hamilton was because you were not asked about it?

A.—I cannot say the reason, I did not. He did not ask me the question.

Q.—There is question 814, on page 77, that I want to ask you about. You appeared at the trial of Parkin against Harwood?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know Percy Woodward and Wallace Matthews?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That trial of Parkin against Harwood was brought by Parkin against Harwood for repairs to a truck injured in a collision. A car of Parkin's struck the truck, ran into it or was run into, Parkin sued Harwood?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were there at the time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were there and Woodward and Matthews were there at the time of the smash. Then in December, 17, there was a trial, where was it?

A.—In Hamilton.

Q.—Before a judge?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Parkin against Harwood?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You gave evidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On behalf of Harwood?

A.—I was called by Harwood.

Q.—Percy Woodward and Wallace Matthews say that after you gave evidence on this question as to whether Harwood had admitted his liability to you and said to have the truck fixed up and he would pay for it—that was the question on which you gave evidence?

A.—Yes.

Objection having been taken by Mr. McCrae to evidence of matters relating to another trial being submitted, argument was heard.

The Chairman then ruled as follows: I am going to keep this evidence out unless the Committee of which the Prime Minister and Mr. Biggs are simply members, consents to it. It is up to the Committee. I am going to rule as I see it but I am quite prepared to have it come in as the Committee choose to direct. It is a general rule of evidence that a witness cannot be contradicted by a matter which is purely a collateral matter. This to my mind is not a collateral matter. This refers entirely to the attitude of the witness in regard to Parkin and his attitude toward Parkin may reflect his attitude toward the Minister and this Committee and the public of the Province of Ontario, must determine as between the word of the Honorable Minister of Public Works, and the word of this witness and if it can be shown that this witness has stated at any time that he was prepared to commit perjury to get Parkin, then I rule that that is evidence and the Committee should have it.

MR. BRACKIN: Having fixed the time of the trial at December, 17, at Hamilton in the action of Parkin against Harwood, Matthews and Woodward will say, and have sworn that you gave evidence to the effect that Harwood had not said to you that he would pay for the repairs and that after you came down out of the box you took a chair near Woodward and Matthews in the Court-room and Woodward said to you, "Reynolds you are an awful liar. You know darn well that Harwood said to you that he would pay for the damages." And that you replied to Woodward in the presence of Matthews and heard by Matthews, "I know he did but Parkin will swear my life away when his case comes up, why shouldn't I swear his away?" If they swear that you said that on this occasion will you say it was true?

A.—I deny it absolutely. I deny it was anything but a frame up to beat me in my trial.

Q.—You deny the whole statement?

A.—I certainly do.

Q.—Woodward says that on page 156, in reply to question 592 and on page 165, question 685, is Matthews' statement. Is it true? You told me you gave evidence at that trial?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you came down out of the witness box did you sit down near Woodward?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he speak to you about the evidence you had given?

A.—He didn't, he said something to me, some casual remark.

Q.—What did you say?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Did you say anything about Parkin swearing your life away? Did you say anything of that kind?

A.—No, I did not.

Q.—Nothing of that kind?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you say nothing about why you should swear Parkin's life away, in their presence?

A.—I did not.

Q.—Let me have, if you have it, the letter of March 9, 1920, from Parkin to you. I think there was a cheque enclosed. Have you that letter?

A.—No.

MR. DRURY: Do I understand you to say that when you went and sat down beside this man in the court, he said, "You are a liar?"

A.—I deny he said I was a liar. He said in court in my case with Parkin, he swore he called me a liar as I walked out of the stand. If you knew Percy Woodward you know he couldn't call me a liar.

MR. BRACKIN: Would you please be good enough to produce and lay on the table now the original letter from Parkin to you dated March 9, 1920?

A.—I haven't it.

Q.—Then get it for me.

A.—I can get it. (Undertaken given by Mr. McCrae to get letters).

MR. MCCRAE: The question Mr. Washington asked you at the trial you answered to the best of your ability?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you been asked as to the giving of a car or \$3,000 you would have told it at the trial?

A.—Yes.

(Witness excused).

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

April 13, 1921.

Percy Woodward called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Brackin.

Q.—Where do you live?

A.—Dundas.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Parkin and Mr. Reynolds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember a suit at Hamilton where Parkin brought a suit against a man named Harwood?

A.—Yes, I remember.

Q.—Were you at that trial?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was that, a long time ago or a short time ago?

A.—I would say maybe around the last of March or April, 1920.

Q.—Do you mean when the accident happened, or the trial took place?

A.—I think it was in February the accident happened.

Q.—And the trial was how many months after that?

A.—Possibly two or three months.

Q.—At the time it took place you were there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Reynolds was there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Reynolds gave evidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He has already said he gave evidence on behalf of Harwood—he gave evidence on what particular point that you were interested in?

A.—It was in reference to paying for the truck.

Q.—What evidence did he give on that point, so far as Harwood was concerned?

A.—He said he didn't hear Harwood make any statement about paying.

Q.—Was that different from your understanding of it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Because you thought that was different from what you yourself knew about that particular phase of the case did you speak to Reynolds after he came out of the witness stand?

A.—Yes, I had a few words with him.

Q.—Where did he go after he came out of the witness stand?

A.—We were sitting in the court room and he came and sat between Matthews and myself.

Q.—He came and sat between you and Matthews?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who spoke to him?

A.—Me. I said, "Reynolds, you are an awful liar. You know very well that Harwood told us he would pay for the damage." Reynolds turned around and said, "Yes, I know but Parkin will swear my life away when his case is up, why shouldn't I swear his away?"

Q.—Could Matthews hear that?

A.—Oh, yes.

MR. McCRAE: Cross-examining.

Q.—What is your full name?

A.—Henry Percy Woodward.

Q.—When was the trial in the Parkin action against Harwood?

A.—Around April or May, 1920.

Q.—Is your memory clear on that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were a witness in that case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You had given evidence in that case before Mr. Reynolds was called—you had been in the witness box, had taken the oath and given your evidence before he gave his?

A.—I cannot swear whether he or I gave evidence first.

Q.—Surely you remember that—who were you called as a witness for?

A.—Parkin.

Q.—Didn't you give evidence before Mr. Reynolds?

A.—I would make no statement on that because I don't remember.

Q.—You did give evidence that day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Your evidence was different from what Reynolds gave?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were in Parkin's employ at that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you are still?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you have been on the job from before Parkin brought his action down to now?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You say you called Reynolds, over here, a liar when he came down out of the box?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—“I know I am but Parkin is going to swear my life away when his case comes up so why shouldn't I swear his away.

Q.—You tell this Committee that that is what Reynolds said?

A.—Yes, that is what Reynolds said.

Q.—And you can't remember whether you had been in the witness box at that time or not?

A.—No.

Q.—But you are clear about this other part of it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—As soon as you heard Reynolds say what you have now told us, what did you do?

A.—After we went out of the court I told Parkin what Reynolds had said.

Q.—That was on the very day it happened?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was Woodward, your chum with you when you went to Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Both together?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you and Matthews had a talk before you saw Parkin about what Reynolds said?

A.—We did, yes.

Q.—And you said, “Matthews, did you hear what Reynolds said when I told him he was a liar?”

A.—Yes.

Q.—And what did Matthews say?

A.—He said something about him having a hell of a nerve or something.

Q.—You talked it over between you and Matthews and then decided you would go and see Parkin?

A.—No, we didn't decide to go and see Parkin.

Q.—You did see him?

A.—Only because we were going to Dundas, he drove us back.

Q.—You decided to tell him that?

A.—We didn't decide to tell him, it was me that told him. Matthews just

said, "He has one hell of a nerve." And I said, "I will say he has." We started to talk about other things then.

Q.—When was it that you made up your mind that you were going to tell Parkin what this man said?

A.—It was during the conversation I told him. It was when we got in the car and were driving away. Parkin was asking about the case and I told him what Reynolds said.

Q.—Had the judge given a decision at that time?

A.—No.

Q.—Judgment was reserved?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But you were pretty sure you were going to win the case?

A.—I didn't know. I wasn't enough interested in the case. I was just there as a witness.

Q.—Was it not your opinion you were going to win?

(Objection taken).

Q.—It was on the way home, at all events, that you told Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember what time of the day it was?

A.—We had lunch. I would say it was about two o'clock or so.

Q.—Was anybody there except Parkin and Matthews and yourself?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you remember how long Reynolds was sitting beside you after he came out of the box?

A.—I would say about twenty minutes.

Q.—Did you have much of a chat?

A.—No.

Q.—Was anything said except what you told us?

A.—Not directly on that case, no.

Q.—When you told Parkin about this what did Parkin say?

A.—He says, "Are you prepared to swear out an affidavit to that effect?" I said, "Yes, I am."

Q.—What happened?

A.—We went up and swore out an affidavit.

Q.—He took you down to whom?

A.—To Mr. Lawrason, in Dundas.

Q.—At the end of the journey you went right to Lawrason's office?

A.—Yes, right to his office.

Q.—You never got a minute from the time you mentioned it, you were never a minute away from Parkin until he took you to Lawrason's office. Mr. Lawrason drew up the affidavits and you signed them there?

A.—We stayed at the garage and Parkin went to Lawrason's office and then called us up from there.

Q.—You went and made an affidavit and Mathews made an affidavit.?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was in those affidavits? (Affidavits presented).

Q.—Now Mr. Woodward, was Mr Lawrason the lawyer who was acting for Parkin that day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In the case of Parkin against Harwood?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Lawrason was Parkin's lawyer in the case of Reynolds' case against Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have told us you have always been in the employ of Parkin since this Harwood case and are still working for him?

A.—Yes, except for two months.

Q.—You were out West some place?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose you and Matthews were quite free in your comments about the trial on the drive home after the trial, with Mr. Parkin. You were talking all about it?

A.—The case was brought up in just the ordinary conversation for a few minutes and then we would switch to something else.

Q.—You were all on the same side and quite enthusiastic about winning. (Over-ruled by Chairman as immaterial).

Q.—You were quite positive about winning the case? (Over-ruled).

Q.—Were you desirous that Parkin should win this case?

A.—It made no difference to me whatever.

Q.—Now, Mr. Woodward, how long before this Harwood case had you been working for Parkin?

A.—About six or seven months.

Q.—And Parkin knew you well in that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he knew Matthews well?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he knew whether you were a man who was truthful or not?

A.—I think he should, in that time.

Q.—He knew just how reliable you were?

A.—He ought to.

Q.—And as soon as you told him this story about Reynolds on the way home, as soon as you told him that you had told Reynolds he was a liar, and that Reynolds had given the answer you have sworn to, he insisted on you going before a lawyer and taking an affidavit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The first business Parkin did after you disclosed to him what you tell us now was to get you before a lawyer and get you signed and sworn as to what you had told him, before you got away?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He insisted that that be done?

A.—He didn't exactly insist. He said, "Will you swear an affidavit to that." And I said, "Yes."

Q.—Did he insist that you do it? Didn't he insist that you go and do that?

A.—No, he didn't insist. He asked me if I would. If that is insisting then he insisted.

Q.—Do you remember that day, how you took your oath?

A.—Standing up.

Q.—Do you remember whether a Bible was used?

A.—Yes, a Bible was used.

Q.—Did he explain the meaning of this affidavit to you that day?

A.—No, he didn't. I didn't know an affidavit from a newspaper.

Q.—He did tell you you would have to stick to that and be prepared to swear to it?

(Objection to form of question).

Q.—Didn't Mr. Lawrason tell you that you would have to stick to the story told that day and that you would be expected to swear to it at the Reynolds case?

A.—Yes, he did.

Q.—And from that time to now you have stuck to that story and you swore that at the Reynolds case?

(No answer).

THE CHAIRMAN: That was a double question. Did you mean to say yes, to both of those questions?

A.—No.

Question read by stenographer.

WITNESS: I say, "yes," to the first question, and "No," to the second.

MR. McCRAE: Did Parkin tell you that you would be called as a witness in the Reynolds case to tell what was in this affidavit?

A.—No, or the simple reason that Reynolds had me as his witness.

Q.—What did you mean when you said that Lawrason told you you would have to stick to that story?

A.—That if this case came up again I would have to swear to it again.

THE CHAIRMAN: There might have been a retrial.

MR. McCRAE: At all events, in case this came up again you were to stick to your story and swear what was in the affidavit?

A.—Why, certainly.

Q.—Now you are quite sure you took the affidavit standing up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You are quite sure a Bible was used?

A.—Positive.

Q.—You kissed the Bible?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember whether the book was open or shut when you kissed it?

A.—I don't remember because I had to kiss one at the other court.

Q.—Mr. Lawrason, the lawyer told you it was an affidavit, you remember that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And a Bible was produced and you swore that what you said was true?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was Matthews sworn in the same way?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In your presence?

A.—In my presence, yes.

Q.—You had went through the same ordeal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then after you left Lawrason's office you went where?

A.—Back to the garage.

Q.—And how long after that was it that the case of Reynolds against Parkin came up?

A.—I was away when the first case came up. I was out West.

Q.—Not when the Harwood case come up?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you tell Mr. Parkin before the Harwood case came up what you were going to swear in the Harwood case?

A.—I didn't tell him I was going to swear anything. I told him when we returned from seeing Harwood, when we went down after the truck. I remember telling him what Harwood said.

Q.—Parkin knew before the case of Harwood came up what you were going to swear?

A.—He heard me say that Harwood said he was going to pay for the damage.

Q.—In the Harwood case did Parkin take you to Lawrason's office to make you swear an affidavit as to what your evidence would be in the case?

A.—No.

Q.—It was only in the Reynolds case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Well then Mr. Woodward when did you have the next talk with Mr. Parkin after you left Mr. Lawrason's office as to the Reynolds case?

A.—I can't say that.

Q.—You had a great many talks—or did you have many talks about the Reynolds case?

A.—We would discuss it now and again, yes.

Q.—How often?

A.—I would not say how often.

Q.—Did you have a talk with Mr. Lawrason after you made your affidavit before you gave your evidence in the Reynolds case?

A.—No. I am not acquainted with Mr. Lawrason.

Q.—Did you ever see him between the time you took the affidavit and the time you gave evidence in the Reynolds case?

A.—I saw him when he brought his car into the garage. That was the only time, I spoke to him at all.

Q.—You did give evidence in the Reynolds case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were called by whom?

A.—I was subpoenaed by Reynolds.

Q.—Reynolds gave you a subpoena but Reynolds didn't call you?

A.—No, Mr. Washington called me, Crown Attorney Washington of Hamilton.

Q.—He was Parkin's lawyer?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he called you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The trial of this Harwood case was in April or May, as you recall it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the day of the trial of the Harwood action you told this story, after

the court, to Parkin and Parkin took you to Mr. Lawrason's office to swear an affidavit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the affidavit was sworn to on that day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is no doubt in your mind about it?

A.—I am positive.

MR. McCRAE: Taking declaration (exhibit "A"). This you say was on the day the trial took place, and it is dated the 17th day of December, 1920, and not April, 1920. What explanation have you to make now about the difference between your story that the trial was in April or May, in the Harwood case and that on the day of the trial you took this affidavit, and the fact that this affidavit is dated the 17th of December, before Mr. Lawrason. What is your explanation?

A.—I have made a mistake in the months or there is something wrong in there. I am positive it was the day of the trial.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the bottom of this declaration it clearly shows that you made a solemn declaration. Ordinarily you would not have to kiss the Bible to do that. Do you remember now whether in this case when you swore to this declaration, when you did make an oath, whether you were sworn on the Bible or not?

A.—On the Bible.

Q.—A Bible actually was used?

A.—Yes. (witness excused).

WALLACE MATTHEWS: Called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Brackin.

Q.—Where did you live?

A.—Hamilton.

Q.—Where you in court at the time a suit was brought against Harwood by Parkin for truck damage, and was tried at Hamilton?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you give evidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did Reynolds give evidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you give evidence before Reynolds gave evidence or after?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Do you remember where Reynolds, after he gave his evidence, went and sat in the court room, in respect to where you were sitting?

A.—He sat next to Mr. Woodward.

Q.—Where were you sitting?

A.—On the other side of Woodward.

Q.—So that you sat together in the court room?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember what evidence Reynolds gave with regard to the question of whether or not Harwood had agreed to pay for repairs to the truck?

A.—He said Harwood didn't.

Q.—Had you been there at the time Harwood said something about that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What I want to get at is this: One of the main points in the Harwood case was as to whether or not Harwood when you and Matthews and Reynolds were present had agreed to pay for repairs to the truck that had been injured?

A.—He did agree.

Q.—That was one of the questions you were trying out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and Woodward gave evidence as to what you heard Harwood say?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You say, I think, that Reynolds was there but that Reynolds went into the box and said Harwood didn't agree to pay?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You say Reynolds was giving evidence on the same point. He was giving evidence on behalf of Harwood?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and Woodward gave evidence on behalf of Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I think that you have already told me that Reynolds swore he didn't agree to pay the damage?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You and Woodward swore he had agreed to pay?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have already told us that you and Woodward were there for the purpose of giving evidence that Harwood agreed to pay for the damage. Reynolds who, I think was there at the time, went into the box and swore that Harwood didn't agree to pay for the damage?

A.—That is right.

Q.—Having given that evidence you, knowing what you knew about it, when he came and sat down, did either you or Woodward speak to him about it?

A.—Woodward did.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—He said he was an awful liar, that he knew Harwood said he would settle.

Q.—What did Reynolds say to that?

A.—“I know he did but Parkin will swear my life away when his case comes up why shouldn't I swear his away now.”

Q.—After the trial was over with whom did you go back to Dundas, or did you go back?

A.—I went to a restaurant with Parkin and Woodward.

Q.—Was anything said then by either of you to Parkin about what Reynolds stated in the Court room?

A.—Yes, we told Parkin about it.

Q.—After you told Parkin, what did you do subsequently, did you do anything further about it?

A.—We went to the law office in Dundas?

Q.—Whose law office?

A.—Mr. Lawrason's.

Q.—You went to his office in Dundas and swore an affidavit about it?

A.—Yes.

(Affidavit identified.)

MR. McCRAE: examining.

Q.—At the time you gave your evidence in the Harwood case you were working for Mr. Parkin?

A.—I don't think I was, just at the time.

Q.—Will you make sure and ask Mr. Parkin if you were?

A.—I am not sure because I was out of work for a few weeks about that time.

Q.—You did work for him before that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you have been working for him since?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you are now in his employ in the garage at Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You sat in the court room that day and heard Reynolds give evidence in the Harwood case?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You don't remember whether you had been in the witness box up to that time or not?

A.—No, I think I was called after Mr. Reynolds.

Q.—You are pretty clear about that?

A.—I would not swear to it.

Q.—If you were called after Reynolds did you tell what Reynolds who had just come out of the box said?

A.—No.

Q.—Why didn't you do that?

A.—I don't know. We told Parkin shortly after.

Q.—You knew it at that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who spoke first when Reynolds came down and sat between you?

A.—He did not sit between the two of us. He sat on the left of Woodward and I sat on the right of Woodward.

Q.—Then Reynolds was not between the two of you?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—I understood Woodward said Reynolds sat between you. Your version of it is that he didn't sit between you but to the left of Woodward and you were on Woodward's right?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were furthest away from Reynolds?

A.—Yes, I was leaning over Woodward.

Q.—In that case Woodward was the man who sat between you and Reynolds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you expecting Woodward to say something like this to Reynolds?

A.—I don't know about that but I knew Reynolds' story was false to my knowledge and I expected something would be said. I thought something would crop up between the three of us.

Q.—Reynolds did say what Woodward swears to in the affidavit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What were the first words Woodward said to Reynolds when he came down?

A.—He said, "You are an awful liar."

Q.—Pretty loud?

A.—Loud enough for me to hear.

Q.—Then after the trial was over that day where was the first place you and Woodward went?

A.—With Mr. Parkin to the restaurant.

Q.—You left the court house with Parkin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where was Parkin sitting when Reynolds came down from the box and sat beside Woodward?

A.—He was sitting at a desk I believe, in front.

Q.—Beside his lawyer?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And as soon as the court adjourned you and Parkin and Woodward went to a restaurant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was anything said in the restaurant about what Reynolds had said?

A.—Yes, we told Mr. Parkin.

Q.—Who told Mr. Parkin?

A.—Reynolds told him first.

Q.—In the restaurant?

A.—Just as we were getting out of the car to go in.

Q.—So that Parkin knew about it before you set out for Dundas that afternoon?

A.—He had an idea of it anyway.

Q.—Hadn't he told him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He knew before you started for Dundas in the afternoon what Reynolds was supposed to have said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Woodward told him that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now was anything said in the restaurant about going to a lawyer and having what was said put in an affidavit?

A.—Not that I remember. He may have asked us if we would swear to it.

Q.—What was the name of the place where the trial took place?

A.—Hamilton.

Q.—How far is it from Hamilton to Dundas?

A.—Four or five miles.

Q.—How did Lawrason come home that day—he lives in Dundas?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Was Lawrason engaged in the case that day in Hamilton?

A.—No, I don't think so.

Q.—Was he in the Court House?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—When did you first hear, Mr. Matthews, that you were going to have an affidavit about what Reynolds said?

Q.—Did you know about it until you were landed in the office of Mr. Lawrason?

A.—I don't think I did.

Q.—You were taken up by Parkin with Woodward?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was said when you first realized they were going to swear you about what Reynolds said. Who was it mentioned first at Mr. Lawrason's office that you should take the affidavit?

A.—I just forget.

Q.—Had you ever taken an affidavit before?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you know at that time what an affidavit meant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were sworn on an affidavit and this is your signature here?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it on the Bible?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who administered the oath?

A.—Mr. Lawrason.

Q.—Did Mr. Lawrason say to you that it would be necessary to stick to that story in case it was necessary to give evidence on the point on a later date?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—I would like you to be clear on that, was anything said to you about that, that you would have to stick to the story?

A.—Not that I remember.

Q.—Was any reason given by Parkin or by Lawrason why you two boys should be sworn on an affidavit in reference to this matter?

A.—No, not that I know of.

Q.—Do you know now why you were asked to take an affidavit?

A.—They had another law-suit on.

Q.—They wanted to make sure that the story you told then would be told at that law-suit?

A.—I don't know that.

Q.—Mr. Matthews, do you know what a statutory declaration is?

A.—No.

Q.—You do know what an affidavit is?

A.—I have a good idea.

Q.—Do you know that the document you signed was not an affidavit but a statutory declaration only?

No answer.

Q.—Do you know the difference between an affidavit and a statutory declaration?

A.—No, I do not.

A.—No.

Q.—Do you know what a statutory declaration is?

Q.—What is an affidavit?

A.—All I know is that you just swear a thing on oath. That is all I know, you sign your name to it.

Q.—Did you ever see Mr. Lawrason about that little paper you signed, after that? Did you ever have any talk with him?

A.—No.

Q.—Were you given a copy that day, of the paper you signed?

A.—No.

Q.—Who kept the affidavit Parkin or Lawrason?

A.—Lawrason, so far as I know.

Q.—You don't know whether Parkin got a copy of it?

A.—No.

Q.—Were you reminded afterward by Parkin that you had signed this and that you would have to stick to that story?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Were you reminded by Parkin?

A.—I don't think so

Q.—Never before the trial?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Do you remember the day you gave evidence at the trial?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were shown this before you went into the box?

A.—I don't think I was.

Q.—Please think. Didn't you see that affidavit before you took your oath at the trial and read it over before you gave evidence in the Reynolds case?

A.—No, I did not.

Q.—Did you ever see it from the time you swore to it in Lawrason's office until to-day.

A.—No.

Q.—No one ever read it over to you?

A.—No.

Q.—It never was discussed?

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't call Reynolds a liar?

A.—No, Woodward called him that.

Q.—What did Reynolds say then?

A.—He said he knew Harwood said he would pay for it, that Parkin would swear his life away when their case came up, why shouldn't he swear Parkin's life away then.

Q.—That was all that was said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the conversation stopped right there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You heard Reynolds say it was false, absolutely false?

A.—I didn't hear him say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Matthews was out of the room.

MR. McCRAE: Well, he did say it was absolutely untrue. In the face of that do you still stick to your story?

A.—Why, certainly.

MR. DRURY: What is your occupation?

A.—Motor mechanic.

Q.—Have you always been that?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you ever have anything to do with law-suits or courts before?

A.—Up in Hamilton, that was all.

MR. BRACKIN: You gave evidence there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you told the same story that you told here in regard to this matter?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused.

L. C. PARKIN, recalled. Asked to identify letter from himself to Parkin with cheque enclosure.

A.—If this was mailed by registered letter, we have the stub from registration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you say whether it was written and mailed the day it was dated?

A.—Yes, it was written and mailed on the same day.

Q.—This is your signature?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And this is the original?

A.—Yes.

Letter read and put in as exhibit "A," containing cheque and copies of two original letters.

MR. McCRAE: That letter was sent on or about March 9, to Mr. Reynolds?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You signed the letter?

A.—That is my signature.

Q.—Who wrote the letter?

A.—I think Mr. Lawrason wrote the letter and then my girl re-wrote it on my letter-head.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean Mr. Lawrason dictated it?

A.—Yes, and my girl re-wrote it.

MR. McCRAE: The letter say you are tendering a marked cheque for \$459.62.

A.—That was commission on cars sold.

Q.—How was the \$400 arrived at, Mr. Parkin?

A.—I went to my lawyer and explained the situation, he pointed out that it would cost me probably \$400 or \$500—

Q.—It was not figured out on any basis—it was just an offer?

A.—Yes, just an offer.

Q.—What was the total amount of the contract price for these trucks?

A.—I cannot give it to the dollar, \$99,600 and something, I think.

Q.—What ran it up to \$117,000?

A.—There were two trucks purchased after that. I think in that statement

there are supplies purchased for the running purposes of the trucks when they were in West Flamboro.

Q.—The total Government purchase from you was in the neighborhood of \$117,000?

A.—Yes, trucks and supplies.

Q.—How much of it would be supplies?

A.—I can't tell, probably a thousand.

Q.—The first tender you put in was for eight trucks?

A.—Twelve.

Q.—What was the total of that?

A.—The two tenders came to \$99,600, odd.

Q.—Was that the tender accepted on the 30th of December, 1919?

A.—Two tenders were accepted on that day.

Q.—Subsequently the Government bought two additional trucks?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the tender on those?

A.—\$9,100 each, \$18,200.

Q.—The last two trucks were purchased when?

A.—I cannot give you that off-hand. I presume it would be about June.

Q.—The balance of the total sum of \$117,000 then would be made up of supplies?

A.—There was one McLaughlin car.

Q.—What was it worth? \$1,400?

A.—No, the list price of the car was \$2,925.

Q.—What did you sell it for?

A.—\$2,800.

Q.—The contract of the 30th of December, for approximately \$99,000, two extra trucks amounting to \$18,200 and a McLaughlin car at \$2,800 would be substantially the total dealings with the Government outside of some repairs?

A.—I think that would be about it.

Q.—When did you receive the first cheque from the Government on account of the purchase?

A.—March 3, 1920.

Q.—How much was that?

A.—That cheque was for \$15,033.

Q.—Is that shown in your bank book?

A.—Yes, sir.

Bank book produced.

Q.—There is an item here, on the 3rd, \$15,033?

A.—That is the one.

Q.—When was the next item received from the Government?

A.—On the 10th.

Q.—The sum amounted then to \$15,033?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was the next one received?

A.—On March 12, a Government cheque was paid to Grace Motors and they gave me their cheque for \$1,986.

Q.—How much was the cheque?

A.—\$15,033.

Q.—Was that paid to Grace Motors by the Government?

A.—No, I paid the Grace Motors. The reason I did that was that the Grace Motors wanted to charge one-tenth of one per cent. on my cheques as collection charges. Their bankers told them they were going to do that.

Q.—Now why do you say that was paid to Grace Motors?

A.—Because the Bank of Commerce charged them a commission on these cheques. And in order to do away with that I got the Grace Motors to give me my profit on their personal cheque and I gave them the Government cheque.

Q.—Was this Government cheque payable to your order?

A.—Yes, and I endorsed it to Grace Motors.

Q.—How much did you get back from Grace Motors?

A.—\$1,968, that was on the 12th of March.

Q.—What was that paid you back for?

A.—That was my commission.

Q.—On what amount?

A.—On \$15,033.

Q.—At what rate?

A.—There were two rates, 15 per cent. on the chassis and 7½ per cent. on dump equipment.

Q.—And you say that amounted to \$1,969.

A.—Yes.

Q.—What day did you receive that cheque from them?

A.—March 12.

Q.—You deposited it, I see on the 13th?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was the next cheque received from the Government?

A.—March 31.

Q.—How much did you receive then?

A.—\$27,300.

Q.—What did you do with that cheque?

A.—I brought them a marked cheque from my bank marked at par in Toronto, for \$23,486.25.

Q.—Was the difference your commission calculated in the same way?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was the next cheque received?

A.—The same day.

Q.—Is that the item of \$9,100?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were the Government cheques in favor of the Grace Motors or in your favor?

A.—They were in my favor.

Q.—You turned them over to the Grace Motors?

A.—No, I think they are deposited in that book there.

Statement prepared from books of Grace Motors, of L. C. Parkin, account presented by witness. Marked as Exhibit "B." Total \$91,949.25.

MR. McCRAE: I see there are two items, of \$7,900, on the 28th of May, and one on the 17th of May, of \$7,972. I see there is a credit item in your

bank book of \$9,175, on the 15th of May—that would be the cheque from the Government for one of the trucks on the second order?

A.—I would not swear to that.

Q.—There is this item on the 15th of May, of \$9,175.60, and a further credit item on the 20th of May, of \$9,100. Would these be the two cheques for the two trucks you thought were purchased about June?

A.—I guess likely they will.

Q.—I notice that after you received one cheque on the 15th of May, for \$9,175.60, which appears to your credit, you paid out a cheque of \$7,962.50—would that be to the Grace Motors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And would the difference between \$7,962.50 and \$9,175.60 be your commission, approximately?

A.—In that neighborhood. There may be other things put in there at the same time. I cannot go to work and swear that.

Q.—What was your commission on the second two trucks?

A.—On the same basis, 15 on the chassis and 7½ on the dump equipment.

Q.—I notice on this copy of the ledger marked Exhibit "B", and which you say is a statement from the Grace Motors' ledger that they invoiced you for 12 trucks at \$86,167.50, is that correct?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The total amount paid by the Government was \$99,699?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And on the two trucks purchased later for which the Government paid \$18,200, your commission would be computed on the same basis as the first deal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember approximately how much those commissions were?

A.—I cannot tell you that from memory.

Q.—You would know, you would have an idea of what the commissions amounted to?

A.—About \$1,100 each.

Q.—Now Mr. Parkin, you were agent for the Sterling trucks in that section of the Province?

A.—Yes, I have the Niagara Peninsular.

Q.—Before I leave the Grace Motors—did you make any deposit with the Grace Motors when the deal was closed?

A.—You mean when I took the order in?

Q.—Yes?

A.—No.

Q.—When did you pay the Grace Motors the first money by way of deposit or anything else?

A.—I have a contract deposit with them that has been there since I took over the agency.

Q.—But that had nothing to do with this deal?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you make any deposit or pay anything before you got the first cheque from the Government?

A.—I did not.

Q.—You were the agent for Sterling trucks in your district?

A.—I have the Niagara district.

Q.—When did you get that agency?

A.—January 27, 1919.

Q.—And up to the time you sold the Government order had you disposed of many Sterling trucks?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—How many?

A.—I think I sold nineteen.

Q.—Up to December, 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there ever a time in the sale of these nineteen trucks before you dealt with the Government when you gave a discount on the sale of trucks?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Is there any provision in any of the contracts of the Grace Motors for discounts where a large number of trucks are bought by railways or government concerns?

A.—Not that I have ever seen.

Q.—Did you ever hear of that?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Where was the headquarters for Grace Motors?

A.—255 Queen Street, East, Toronto.

Q.—Did they advise you from time to time as to changes in the prices of trucks?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In what form would that advice come?

A.—It would come from the wholesale department.

Q.—In the form of a letter?

A.—Yes, also a sheet showing the advance in each individual truck.

Q.—There would be a regular formal business communication giving you the changes in prices from time to time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you receive a communication in December, 1919?

A.—I did.

Q.—Telling you prices would be advanced?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you that here?

A.—No, I haven't.

Q.—Can you get that for the Committee?

A.—Yes, I will.

Q.—Do you recall now what was said in that letter?

A.—That on and after January 1, there would be an advance.

Q.—Did the price advance after January 1st?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What percentage?

A.—I cannot go to work and give you the exact percentage for the simple reason that on some models it would not advance as much as on others. It

would be approximately 10 per cent.

Q.—When I spoke a moment ago with reference to an advance in prices I spoke about trucks?

A.—Yes, I am referring to trucks.

Q.—Now, were the prices actually advanced on the 3½ and 5-ton trucks after the first of the year?

A.—Yes, after the 1st of January.

Q.—You say that advance was 10 per cent.?

A.—Yes, approximately.

Q.—Did you make any sales of Sterling trucks at the advanced prices?

A.—Yes, sir. We have been selling them right along.

Q.—At the advanced price, 10 per cent. greater than the price at which they were sold to the Government?

A.—Yes. The Grace Motors supply the prices and you have to sell at those prices.

Q.—Is that the list price?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you understand that there is no discount to anyone off the list price?

A.—No, sir, and I never gave it to anyone.

Q.—Do you know whether Grace Motors did make a discount on list prices?

A.—I never heard of it.

Q.—Do you know whether there were any other commissions allowed in this Sterling truck deal other than to you?

A.—There naturally would be a commission for the reason that Grace Motors have the selling agency for Canada.

Q.—A commission to whom?

A.—To Grace Motors.

MR. HOMUTH: That is a commission from the American concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean a commission by the manufacturers to Grace Motors as having the agency for Canada?

A.—Yes, the distributors.

Q.—In this case there would be two commissions?

A.—There is on any truck.

Q.—You get one commission?

A.—I get my selling commission.

Q.—That was computed at 15 per cent. on the chassis and 7½ per cent. on the dump equipment?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And in addition to that you say this agency in Toronto as distributors would also get a commission?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How much?

A.—I cannot tell that.

Q.—You don't know anything about that?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you got the form of contract supplied you by Grace Motors as distributors? Have you your contract between you and Grace Motors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where is it.

A.—In Dundas.

Q.—Will you bring it along?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this the first time you have been asked for that?

A.—Yes.

MR. McCRAE: Where is your bank account prior to February, 1920?

A.—It was transferred out of one bank into another. That one had all the Government cheques and I thought that would suffice for what you wanted. That is from February, 20. That was previous to any Government cheque. I didn't see that anything previous to that was required.

Q.—Now Mr. Parkin there are one or two questions I want to ask you. It has been said that prior to your getting this contract you were indebted to Mr. Biggs?

A.—I never owed Frank Biggs ten dollars in my life.

Q.—It has also been said Mr. Parkin that on the 31st of December, the day after this contract was signed you and Mr. Biggs and a third person went over to Buffalo to celebrate the securing of this contract?

A.—I never was in Buffalo with Mr. Biggs in my life.

Q.—I want to find out from you where you got the specifications for the Sterling trucks as placed in your tender, where you got the information as to the specifications as to the Government requirements which you put in your tender for Sterling trucks?

A.—I just got that out of the price list, the catalogue.

Q.—You didn't get that from Mr. Biggs?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—You are quite clear about that?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you hear that question, where did you get the specifications of what the Government required?

A.—Out of the Sterling Literature.

MR. McCRAE: How did you get this out of the Sterling book if you didn't know what the Government required?

A.—I tendered on dump equipment and dump equipment is the same whether the Government buys it or anyone else buys it.

Q.—How did you know the Government required a tender on dump equipment. How did you know enough to go to the price list and take out certain things?

A.—Mr. Biggs mentioned about the dump trucks.

Q.—You got the information from Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes, I thought you meant the way it was compiled on the tender.

Q.—I wanted to know where you got your information as to what the Government required?

A.—From Mr. Biggs.

Q.—Did you go any place with Mr. Biggs on the 31st of December?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—To go back to the 30th of December, the day you got the tender I wasn't

here when Mr. Price examined you, who did you see in Mr. Biggs' room that morning?

A.—On that point I would like to make a correction. I stated that Mr. McLean was in there. I do not think Mr. McLean was there.

Q.—You stated in your former evidence that Mr. McLean was there?

A.—Yes, and I would like to correct that now.

Q.—You are satisfied he was not there that morning?

A.—Yes.

Q.—One other point, Mr. Hogarth was there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the Minister was there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is your recollection as to the signing of that contract that morning?

A.—I don't know exactly what was put on it that morning. I was over on this side of the table and Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth were on the other side of the table. I would not go to work and swear I could read from the back the signatures. It was my opinion and is yet that it was signed that morning.

Q.—Signed by whom?

A.—Mr. Biggs and Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Your recollection is that it was signed by both of them that morning?

A.—Yes.

MR. BRACKIN: On this question of a discount to the Government. You have told Mr. McCrae that the subject of a discount was never mentioned?

A.—Not mentioned at all.

Q.—I want to bring your mind to one specific instance. Reynolds has said here that one day when you were discussing the matter, the day Mr. Biggs was there, which was before you made up your tender, that you spoke to Mr. Biggs in Reynolds' presence indicating a willingness on your part to give the Government a discount of 10 per cent. and Reynolds said, "Why do that, why charge someone else 100 per cent. and let the Government off for less," and Biggs turned and said, "You listen to him and he will make you some money." Did such a conversation take place in the presence of Mr. Biggs?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—Did any conversation in which a discount was suggested ever take place when you and Reynolds were together?

A.—I never suggested a discount.

Q.—Was there ever any conversation between you and Reynolds either in Biggs' presence or not in regard to giving the Government a discount?

A.—No, sir.

MR. MCCRAE: Who would be the officer in charge of Grace Motors who signed this letter as to an advance in prices?

A.—I think the signature that was on my letter was Blackmore.

Q.—Do you remember at the time if he was manager?

A.—No, he was an assistant down there, in what capacity I could not swear.

Q.—You will let us see those letters to that effect and your contract?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused.

J. M. Mowat, called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Dewart:

Q.—Mr. Mowat, you are chief clerk and accountant of what is commonly known as the License Branch?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you deal with accounts that relate to the administration and the enforcement of the O.T.A. amongst other things?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you anything to do with administration or simply with questions of accounts?

A.—Simply questions of accounts.

Q.—In the accounts of last year, I find on page 542, a number of items relating to the travelling expenses of officers, beginning with J. A. Ayearst, \$923. 62?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Ayearst occupies what position?

A.—Chief Provincial Inspector.

Q.—His duties would require him to travel all over the Province?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is no question as to the reasonableness of that account?

A.—No, they were all reasonable.

Q.—There is an item here W. K. Snider, \$979.50. Who is Snider?

A.—He is the Provincial Inspector in charge of standard hotels.

Q.—Then the account of J. O. L. Spracklin, \$1,674.49. Who is Mr. Spracklin?

A.—He was a Provincial officer, a specially appointed Provincial officer.

Q.—Are you aware as to the territorial jurisdiction he has, the territory he covers?

A.—He was specially assigned to Essex and Windsor.

Q.—Will you produce the accounts and see if from them the date of his appointment and the amounts paid to him for services or expenses?

A.—I think it would be about July.

Accounts produced.

Q.—This is the account for his expenses?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you an account for the payment of his salary?

A.—The salary would be charged in that amount to special officers.

Q.—You mean the \$47,000 item?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now take this item for travelling expenses. I see it commences on August 21. Can you from that ascertain when his salary started to run. I am anxious to know whether his expenses began to run about the same time as his appointment?

A.—Those are all the accounts covered by that item.

Q.—Was there a car furnished for Mr. Spracklin?

A.—There was a car purchased.

Q.—For his special use?

A.—For his use and the use of the district.

Q.—Perhaps you can turn up that account—I see an item in the Public Accounts, page 542, Automobile and Supply Ltd., automobiles and supplies

\$5,007.60, would that be it?

Account produced.

Q.—This is an account of the 6th of October, 1920, "Hon. Provincial Treasurer, please pay Automobile and Supply Ltd., 100 University Avenue, one Paige touring car and insurance, per account attached hereto, \$5,007.60, charge to Law Enforcement Account, Provincial Secretary, miscellaneous, J. D. Flavelle, Chairman," with a rubber stamp, "I hereby certify that the sum of \$5,007.60 is required to be paid as provided in Chapted 50, 6 George 5, sub-section 2, of section 117."—

Q.—At that time apparently the License Commission was still under the Provincial Secretary's department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are they still?

A.—No, under the Attorney-General.

Q.—That applies to all matters of administration and expenses as well as law enforcement?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What time did the change come into effect?

A.—I am not sure about that. It was in November or December, I think.

Q.—The invoice for the car shows that the price was \$4,700 and with extra fittings including one set of Gabriel snubbers, a rear bumper, motor meter, two spotlights \$22, so that the whole thing came to \$4,813.15, insurance \$201.60, and the license fee of \$17.50 was deducted, as it was a departmental car. Are you aware that this car was purchased for the express use of Spracklin and his squad?

A.—No, it was purchased in the first place for his use and it was intended for the use of the whole district.

Q.—And particularly for Mr. Spracklin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Paige car, as you know, is a high speed car?

Q.—What speed will it make?

A.—I don't know anything about that.

Q.—Is it not a fact that the car was turned over to Spracklin?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And, I have been advised, was kept by him during the time he was in charge of the work there?

A.—As far as I know.

Q.—Prior to that, apparently, there had been a little different system because I see in the statement of Spracklin's expenses, charges beginning on August 23, "Own car, 6hours, \$1.50 per hour, \$9; August 24, own car, 4 hours \$1.50 per hour, \$6; August 25, own car, 3 hours, \$1.50 per hour, \$4.50; Auguust 26, own car 4 hours, \$1.50 per hour, \$6; August 27, own car .4 hours, \$1.50 per hour, \$6. I find that these items, 23 in all running down to the 5th of August, the date the Paige car was bought were part of the travelling expenses of Mr. Spracklin, so that he was charging \$1.50 per hour to the Department for the use of his own car?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he was allowed to do that?

A.—Yes, it was cheap.

Q.—What kind of a car was it, I understand it was a Ford?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—On some days he charged as high as \$2 per hour and received for nine hours \$18, on other days for 8 hours he received \$16, on another day for 10 hours he received \$20, and this was for the use of his own car?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Did the Department supply him with a boat as well?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where is the charge for the boat?

A.—In next year's accounts.

Q.—Do you know what the price paid was?

A.—\$3,500.

Q.—A gasoline high speed launch?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was it bought?

A.—I don't know when that was bought.

Q.—The reason I ask is that I find items like these, on Aug. 28, supplies for boat including meals \$9.70; August 31, supplies for boat \$9.40, and so on, similar charges at different points. Those were for the boat which you say was purchased for Spracklin's express use?

A.—For use on the river up there.

Q.—Then I find items for the days when apparently Spracklin's own car was out of business, September 15, taxi, 12 hours, \$3 per hour, \$36; September 16, taxi, 12 hours at \$3, \$36; a number of days when there was a taxi for twelve hours at \$36.00 a day. Do you know why that taxi was employed?

A.—No, I don't personally, he sometimes required extra cars. Do you notice that this charge for the outside car was \$3, and it was only half that for his own car.

Q.—Will you tell me who checked over these charges for the use of these cars?

A.—Spracklin vouched for the use of them.

Q.—Was there any voucher for the payment of these items or to show that the cars were actually used these hours except Mr. Spracklin's own voucher?

A.—No. There are some vouchers there where he can get them, but Spracklin vouched for the accounts.

Q.—Then Spracklin was vouching for his own personal expenses. I see here that J. F. M. certifies that this account was examined, checked and found correct "and I hereby recommend the same for his approval"—but you say the only check was the check by Spracklin himself?

A.—The bills rendered by Spracklin were checked by us and approved by the Board and the Minister.

Q.—In amongst the items of travelling expenses I find, "Railway fares, Hallam Brothers, Windsor to Toronto, return for two \$37.50, and meals \$4.25 totalling \$41.75. How does that come to be in Spracklin's expense account?

A.—I think he brought them down here for the information of the Board. The Board wanted some information.

Q.—Then I find an item here on the 12th of October. "Railway fares, Stratford-Toronto for two, that with meals came to \$12.60. Do you know what that was for?

A.—I don't remember that.

Q.—On the 14th of October, “Railway ticket, Toronto to Windsor, return from October 5, not used, sleeper \$3.30, meals \$4.60, coming to \$7.50. That evidently is the return trip of the Hallam brothers?

A.—I cannot tell that.

Q.—Then there are three items here on October 15, “Salary, Wm.Hallam, September 1 to 30, paid cheque \$130; salary, S. M. Hallam \$125, expense account, S. M. Hallam \$38.90. Can you explain why these items come to be in Spracklin’s account and are not charged as Hallam’s expenses?

A.—The Hallam’s were under Spracklin and he paid their way.

Q.—But why did he pay their salaries, salaries were paid by cheque?

A.—These men were not Provincial officers, they were county constables.

Q.—Were they not recognised by the Department as Departmental employees?

A.—They were county constables under Spracklin.

Q.—If they were not in the employ and pay of the Government why did Spracklin pay them?

A.—They were under Spracklin’s direction altogether. He had power to employ them or dismiss them at a moment’s notice.

Q.—Who arranged what they should receive?

A.—He did, with the consent of the Board.

Q.—So that the amount of salary was fixed by the Board?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then the Board had knowledge of the fact that these men were acting for the Government?

A.—They were acting for Spracklin.

Q.—Did he ever hire any class of men independent of the Board?

A.—He had authority to hire what assistants he required.

Q.—As he pleased?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then further down on October 23, there is an item of salary, “ S. M. Hallam, three weeks \$94.50, and his expense account is for \$57.75. That is in Sprackin’s account?

A.—Spracklin paid it.

Q.—It seems rather curious to me that these men were employed by Spracklin, the amount of their remuneration was approved by the License Board and yet you want them to be treated as not Government employees?

A.—I am not wanting one way or the other. They were employed by Spracklin and were chosen by him. He had authority to employ men when he required them.

Q.—Do you in any accounts, at any other point find payments to either of the Hallam brothers directly by the Department?

A.—No, I don’t think so. I don’t remember any anywhere.

Q.—The accounts for the \$47,000, would they include some payments to the Hallams?

A.—I am not very sure about that. I don’t think so.

Q.—How long did the Hallams remain in the employ of whoever they were employed by?

A.—I don’t know, I think it was a couple of months.

Q.—There is an item of \$47,216.69 for special officers, services and expenses. Who engaged those special officers?

A.—As a rule the Provincial Inspectors.

Q.—Who are the Provincial Inspectors?

A.—Ayearst, Sarvis, Bromley, Connors, Putman and Spracklin. Those are in the Public Accounts.

Q.—And what service do these special officers perform?

A.—Detective service.

Q.—Did this include payments for the service of those employed at Windsor by Spracklin other than the Hallams?

A.—Those would be in Spracklin's account, all those specially employed by him.

Q.—Have you the account of a man named Courrian there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long has Courrian been employed?

A.—Seven or eight years I think.

Q.—This is simply a statement of his travelling expenses, what about his remuneration?

A.—His salary is in that \$47,000.

Q.—The pay list would show what he received?

A.—He was getting \$125 a month.

Q.—How long has he been receiving that?

A.—I cannot tell that without going back to the orders in Council.

Q.—It is the highest salary he has received isn't it?

A.—No, he gets \$150 a month now.

Q.—Up to the time of last year's accounts \$125 was the highest salary paid him?

Q.—Up to the time of last year's accounts \$125 was the highest salary paid him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And in addition to that he receives his travelling expenses?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I see amongst the travelling expenses of October, there is, "two bottles of whiskey \$10, on the 21st, one bottle \$5 on the 27th, one bottle \$5," and then there is an item at the foot, "I paid \$50 deposit on 110 cases of whiskey to Barry Michankie, which I forgot to put in my last expense." These are certified to by Mr. Ayearst?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Apparently Courrian worked at Windsor?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I see from these accounts that in June he went to Windsor and he appears to have been at Windsor, Amherstburg, Tecumseh and other places?

A.—He was there several weeks.

Q.—The entries would show he was in Windsor and Amherstburg in August and September and during October—is there a man named Slavin on the payroll of the Department during the past year?

A.—No.

Q.—If he were one of the special officers employed by any of the inspectors you would know that by your records?

A.—Yes, I looked carefully in all the accounts.

Q.—You were to show me one of the accounts for the special officers any one, I take it they are monthly accounts?

A.—Those are for the special officers.

(Account produced).

Q.—I see that in January, 1920, there were sixteen officers employed and the pay-roll was \$1,277.50. Then why does the payment of \$18,071.97 to M. E. White become necessary when you have these special officers to the number I have mentioned, to whom did you pay \$47,000?

A.—We have special work sometimes and we have to get special men.

Q.—Who is M. E. White?

A.—He has a detective agency.

Q.—Is it not the Employers' Detective Agency?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then why does the account appear in his name still. The Employers' Detective Agency, we learned last year, is an incorporated agency?

A.—White renders the account in his own name.

Q.—We learned that Provincial Inspector Morrison was a considerable shareholder in the Employers' Detective Agency and because of that connection he had to resign from the service of the Government. His resignation was asked for?

A.—I do not know that his resignation was asked for. He resigned before they asked him.

Q.—It was under the former Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then why is that agency that had that connection with Morrison still retained?

A.—Because the Board and the Provincial Inspectors say they get better service from them and at a cheaper rate than from anybody else.

Q.—Have you any of the accounts—give me one at random—You have given me the account covering September and October, 1920, amounting to \$1,397.90. I see you paid at the rate of \$6 a day for the operators?

A.—That is in New Ontario, we pay \$5.50 in the older districts.

Q.—And all expenses?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In this account it is quite clear that board and tickets and all incidentals are paid in addition to \$6 a day. I find that in the total of \$1,397, the incidentals amount to \$333.25. Are vouchers given for these incidentals?

A.—No.

Q.—No way in which these sums are vouched for?

A.—No, we take their word.

Q.—There is a quarter of the whole bill for the month, incidentals in obtaining evidence?

A.—They cannot very well take receipts for that kind of evidence. You cannot get receipts when buying drinks or a bottle of whiskey and that sort of thing.

Q.—The operators' services are 36 days at \$6 a day, which amounts to \$432, and their incidentals in obtaining evidence are \$333.25. How many men is that for?

A.—Two men.

Q.—What I am pointing out is that in addition to room and board and tickets, in addition to all that there is nearly \$10 a day for these incidentals.

A.—When you have to pay \$5 for a bottle of whiskey and 50 to 75 cents for drinks it makes a big hole in \$10.

MR. HALL: Do they send in an itemized statement?

A.—No.

Q.—I suppose they give the Agency a statement?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Do they send in hotel bills?

A.—No.

Q.—Absolutely no check upon it at all?

A.—No, you cannot ask them for that sort of thing, they would be spotted in a minute.

MR. DEWART: Your own men do give the Board a statement of what their expenses are? That is the difference. You take the Courrian account or the Spracklin account and you have an itemized statement day by day, railway fares, board and incidentals. When he buys a bottle of whiskey he puts it in. In these **Detective Agency** accounts there is no such check?

A.—What would be the good of a check. They would put down **anything they liked**. We cannot get a check unless they put in vouchers.

Q.—But that is the system and there is no check on the accounts?

A.—You cannot check them. The agency is responsible for that.

Q.—Your department doesn't investigate anything more than the account that is brought in. They apparently rubber-stamp it and it is paid?

A.—Except for the time they are employed and the railway fares and that sort of thing. That is checked. Everything that can be checked is checked.

Q.—There is an account here of W. J. Ward, \$1,000. Have you that account here. It struck me as odd that the expenses should amount to a flat \$1,000?

A.—The reason for that is that he got an accountable warrant for \$1,000 and he didn't get the accounts in, in time to straighten it out.

Q.—Who is W. J. Ward?

A.—He is one of the sergeants of detectives for the city.

Q.—How did he come to be working for the Department?

A.—They loaned him to us for a month and the \$1,000 was advanced him.

Q.—Then he hired what men he wanted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that the Department didn't have a check upon his hiring?

A.—No, except his own vouchers.

Q.—I mean as to the men he hired?

A.—No, he had a free hand.

Q.—Did the Department decide the rate of wages of the men he employed?

A.—I don't know. You would have to ask the Board.

Q.—Do you know what the rate of wages was?

A.—I think it was \$100 a month.

Q.—I find an item such as this in October. "paid \$7 for whiskey re Harry Dysholly, 3 Morrison Street, fined \$1,200 and costs or three months. I see an item such as this, "A. Richards \$5, obtaining information, C. Hemming \$5, obtaining information, S. Curtin \$4, obtaining information." That was countenanced by the Department, was it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Another fruitful bottle of whiskey, "\$2, whiskey, re Tony Jalowski,"

and the fine is \$1,500 and costs or three months.

Q.—Then there is an account, “use of auto, 30 days \$300, services of three officers \$100 each \$300—

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that Ward’s own car?

A.—Yes, they needed a car and he had a car. We told him to use his own car.

MR. DEWART: The account is vouched for and approved by W. E. Raney, the Attorney-General?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know how much that netted in the way of fines?

A.—We had fifteen convictions.

Q.—Amounting to how much?

A.—Thirteen of them went to jail, we only collected \$1,100 in cash.

MR. HALL: You say you only collected \$1,100. Can you say off-hand approximately what this flying squad cost?

A.—Somewhere about \$2,000. But there were thirteen convictions. If they had paid their fines it would have been a good speculation.

Q.—That is what you got in cash and thirteen were sent to gaol.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much liquor was recovered?

A.—I don’t know.

Q.—I understand there were large seizures of liquor?

A.—I remember one case of 100 cases of liquor but I haven’t the figures in my head.

MR. DEWART: Are the accounts of the dispensaries kept separately or are they in your department?

A.—It is a different institution altogether.

Q.—How are those accounts kept?

A.—They are kept at the dispensary under the supervision of the manager I suppose. They are audited by the Clarkson firm. There is another report from Clarkson, to the auditor.

Q.—What I was wondering was this; it seems extraordinary that we haven’t the details of the payments to the different officers of that department?

A.—The dispensaries are a separate institution.

Q.—Is the dispensary under the control of the Attorney-General’s Department?

A.—Yes.

DR. GODFREY: Who recommended the bonus to the various officers of the dispensary?

A.—I don’t know anything about a bonus. There have not been any bonuses to anyone in the dispensary.

Q.—I happen to know there have been?

A.—There are a couple of Provincial officers in connection with the dispensary, those were all the bonuses.

Q.—Did they get a bonus?

A.—Yes, the civil service bonus.

MR. HALL: In case these officers of the law get a conviction, do they get any shares of the fines?

A.—Our officers?

Q.—Yes?

A.—No, none whatever.

Q.—Is there a fine paid to any officer who brings in a conviction whether

municipal officers or county officers?

A.—Not that I know of. There were a few municipal councils some two years ago that passed by-laws under section 120 of the Act, where they appointed special constables to enforce the law that specified they should get 25 per cent. of the fines. Last Session they passed an Act prohibiting that.

HON. MR. SMITH: That went to the municipalities?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There has been none since that time?

A.—No. They passed by-laws of that kind and we put through an amendment a year or two ago prohibiting that.

Witness excused.

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

April 15, 1920.

The Committee met at 10 a.m. Mr. Curry in the Chair.

Dr. J. W. S. McCullough called and sworn. Examined by Mr. Sinclair.

Q.—What is your office, doctor?

A.—Chief Officer of Health.

Q.—And as such have charge of any matters relating to health in the Province of Ontario and the purchase of articles in that Department?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Cheques, vouchers and accounts and that kind of thing go through your hands?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—As I understand it there are some items here on page 562, of the Public Accounts, in connection with M. and H. Jerome of Dundas?

A.—Yes, an item of \$9,999.58.

Q.—Have you the vouchers here in connection with this item of \$9,999.58?

A.—No, the vouchers go to the Treasury.

Q.—What vouchers did you bring?

A.—I brought the correspondence and the tenders.

Q.—Are there any advertisements in connection with these items?

A.—Yes, I have the advertisements. (Advertisements produced).

Q.—This advertisement was published where?

A.—In the Toronto Telegram and other city papers.

Q.—For how long a time?

A.—I cannot say exactly, on several occasions.

Q.—This advertisement was for what articles?

A.—For 16 automobiles.

Q.—For what purpose?

A.—For the use of the Board.

Q.—It doesn't specify what kind of automobiles?

A.—Yes, coupelets or runabouts.

Q.—I mean whose manufacture?

A.—It doesn't specify.

Q.—Just what type of automobile, the manufacture, the kind of automobile isn't specified. It is open to anyone?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have the tenders which were submitted in response to that advertise-

A.—Yes, I have them here. (Tenders produced).
ment?

Q.—And on these tenders the purchase was made?

A.—No.

Q.—Then regarding this large item of \$9,999.58, does it not arise out of the tenders filed in response to this advertisement?

A.—No.

Q.—Where does this item come from?

A.—I was at the same time negotiating for the purchase of a truck of a particular variety and at the same time I got tenders for trucks. When I had the tenders in I took them to the Minister of Labor and submitted them to him, the prices for both the autos and the trucks. He said he didn't know anything about trucks. I wanted to get advice from somebody as to the truck I should purchase. He said, "I advise you to ask Mr. Biggs about the trucks". I did. The variety of truck I was inclined to purchase Mr. Biggs agreed was as good a one as I could get, and I purchased that. Then about the automobile prices, I thought they were too high and I asked Mr. Biggs advice about it and he told me he thought I could get a better price from the Jeromes. Then I saw the lowest tenderer with this and ask him if he could do any better and he said he couldn't. That was the Ford people on Jarvis Street whose tender was the lowest. So I said, all right, I am through with you. Then I got into communication with the Jeromes and got a better tender from them and I purchased from them.

Q.—Then you have the vouchers there for this item. The vouchers and everything are in the file?

A.—I haven't the vouchers at all.

Q.—They are in the Treasury Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have the correspondence?

A.—Yes, the tenders and advertisement.

Q.—Then the next item is on page 565, \$11,430.40?

A.—That is a continuation of the same thing. It was on the same tender.

Q.—The same tender but appears in a different department, they both went to different parts of Health and Labor Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that what was the history of one item will be the history of the other?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then there is another item on page 747, \$21,412.80?

A.—I had nothing to with that. It is not in my Department.

MR. THOMPSON: Did I understand you to say you advertised for tenders?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did the Jeromes put in a tender?

A.—No, they didn't until I got rid of the original tenders.

Q.—After you got all your tenders in you went to Jerome who didn't tender in the first place?

A.—No, he didn't tender in the first place.

Q.—You went to him afterward?

A.—Yes, I went to him afterward.

Q.—What happened then?

A.—I got a better price and purchased.

Q.—And it was Mr. Biggs who sent you to him?

A.—No, he didn't send me to him. He told me that if I was not satisfied with the price I was getting to try him. He suggested that. He didn't direct me to do anything.

Q.—How was it that Jerome could give a better price than these other people?

A.—I am unable to say how he did.

Q.—Did he know the price of the tenders?

A.—No, as a matter of fact I didn't see him in the transaction at all.

MR. TOLMIE: Who did you see?

A.—I didn't see any of them.

Q.—Was it all correspondence?

A.—I asked him to give me a price over the telephone. About the time he gave me his price I was leaving town. I got his price and I accepted it by letter so that I didn't see Jerome until long after the autos were purchased.

Q.—Who closed the purchase?

A.—I did, by letter.

Q.—Was he the only one you spoke to outside of those who tendered?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He gave you a lower price?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you found that out why didn't you continue. You might have got someone else to give you a still lower price?

A.—I might.

Q.—But you closed with this man?

A.—Yes.

MR. CLARKE: Was there much difference in the price?

A.—It amounted altogether to \$276.

MR. SINCLAIR: On how many cars?

A.—Sixteen.

MR. THOMPSON: A \$20,000 deal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What kind of a Ford was it?

A.—A Ford coupelet.

Q.—A regular standard car, was it?

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: This was what you would call bargain day in Fords, about \$16 on each one. Do you know whether anyone else was spoken to about it besides Jerome after your advertisement had failed. You thought the price was too high you started to inquire and found that Jerome would sell cheaper. Did your inquiry go still further to see if you could get a further cut in prices?

A.—No, because I had had many of the dealers here to see me about it. I knew pretty well the situation regarding the prices.

MR. TOLMIE: Mr. Biggs said to you that if you were not satisfied with the tenders to try Jerome and Jerome?

A.—He suggested that.

Q.—How did he come to know you were buying these cars?

A.—I have already stated that I went to see him regarding the character of truck I should buy. At that time I told him of the difficulty I was having about the cars, that I was not satisfied with the price.

Q.—Jerome, and Jerome knew nothing about the price of the other tenders?

A.—No.

Q.—You didnt tell them?

A.—No, they knew nothing about it from me.

Q.—You spoke to them over the phone?

A.—Yes, I asked them to submit prices on sixteen cars.

MR. THOMPSON: Had you any special knowledge about the price of automobiles?

A.—I cannot say I had.

Q.—You say you were not satisfied with these prices, on a matter of over \$20,000. Was there much difference between the prices tendered and the one you finally got?

A.—Not a great deal.

Q.—You must be quite an expert on the price of automobiles when you can tell within \$200 on a \$20,000 deal, mustn't you?

A.—I don't know. I leave that to you to judge.

Q.—You say here you got these prices and weren't satisfied with them. You got another price just \$16 less per car, so that you must have been a pretty keen judge of the value of automobiles.

A.—I cannot say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What tenders did you have?

A.—They are all here.

Q.—Let us know what they were?

A.—I had tenders from the Toronto Motor Car Co., Ltd., Jarvis Street, at \$1218.60 each.

Q.—The total tender was how much?

A.—Sixteen times that. I had the Maxwell \$1,595, the Columbia \$2,900, the Chevrolet \$1,140, Ford coupelet \$1,218.60.

Q.—Is that the name of the Company?

A.—No, that is the best price I had for the Ford people.

Q.—What do you mean?

A.—There were two Ford companies in Toronto that tendered, one on Jarvis Street and A. D. Gorrie & Co.

Q.—In respect to the Ford car you had tenders from the Jarvis Street people and from Gorrie and Company. How did each tender compare?

A.—The Jarvis Street company's tender was \$1,218.60, and Gorrie's \$1,225.44.

Q.—Now the next tender?

A.—I have the Chevrolet \$1,140, that is Gooderham and Co., the United Sales Co., the Maxwell \$1,595.

Q.—No others regarding the Maxwell car?

A.—No,—Gray Dort, Motor Sales Co., Ltd., \$1,497.50.

Q.—Any other tender on the Gray Dort?

A.—That is the only one.

Q.—In respect to each style of car had you more than one tender on any car except the Ford?

A.—No, sir. Practically, for Toronto, the agency of those other cars is in the hands of one company. Then I had the Willys Overland, two tenders for that, \$136.63 and \$1,342. I do not seem to have the name of the tenderers here. How-

ever, that is the correct amount.

Q.—Then as a result of receiving these you called on the Minister of Labor and he asked you to see Mr. Biggs?

A.—Yes, that was with respect to the trucks. I had had tenders for trucks at the same time. At that time it was really the truck I was more anxious to get his advice about.

Q.—What were the tenders in respect to the trucks?

A.—They were the Pierce Arrow \$8,100, the Winton \$8,250, the Packard \$7,800.

Q.—Did you have more than one tender regarding any one class of truck?

A.—No, sir. Then I had the Grace Motors \$5,400, the White \$5,128.85, the Republic—which is the Oldsmobile—\$4,365, and the Reo \$4,250. Of these I thought the Pierce Arrow, the Packard or the White would suit me better than the others. Some were too light and some too heavy.

Q.—You spoke of Grace Motors, what truck was theirs?

A.—The Fulton. It wasn't heavy enough. It was a one and a half ton truck and I wanted a two ton truck. I might say that I didn't advertise for these tenders but I sent one of my men to all the truck dealers?

Q.—How did you get the list of truck dealers?

A.—I have a man in my office who knew them.

Q.—And you sent him to get the tenders?

A.—Yes, and asked them to come and see me. They came in and saw me and found out about what I wanted.

Q.—And as a result of that?

A.—They sent in the tenders.

Q.—And as a result of having those tenders you brought them to your Minister's attention and he asked you to about the tender and as a result of your conversation with him in which, I understand, you said you were not satisfied with the tenders for the trucks he suggested that you should speak or write or communicate with Jerome and Jerome?

A.—That is not it exactly. I asked him to advise me about the kind of truck. I told him I thought the Pierce Arrow, or the Packard or the White would suit me and that the White was the cheapest one of the three and the one I was inclined to purchase. He said, "I don't think you will make any mistake if you buy the White." That is all that transpired about that and I went and bought it.

Q.—That is all that took place between you and Mr. Biggs in regard to that?

A.—Yes. Then I said to him, of the tenders I have for cars the Ford coupelets will suit me best but I think the dealers here in Toronto are charging me too much. "If," he said, "You are not satisfied with the price why not speak to Jerome." Something of that kind transpired. I considered the fact that I could not speak to anyone else until I had finished the business with those who had tendered. I called in the man who had given me the lowest price for the Fords and said to him. "You will have to give me a better price if you want to get this order." He said, "Let me have a few hours." When he returned he said, "I cannot do any better." "All right." I said, "I am through with you." I considered I was done with those who had tendered, so I telephoned to Jerome and asked them for their price.

Q.—Up to this time had you stated to anyone what the figures were in your tenders?

A.—They were never out of my possession.

Q.—Did Mr. Biggs know?

A.—I don't suppose he did. I don't remember.

Q.—Did you tell him?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Did you have them with you when you saw Mr. Biggs?

A.—I presume I did.

Q.—Did you communicate any information in regard to the amount of your tenders for Ford coupelets to Jerome and Jerome?

A.—No, I didn't.

Q.—Then when was it you got their tender?

A.—Their tender came to the Minister of Labor on the 14th of June, and I accepted their tender in this letter.

Q.—Was there anything in your communication to them whether by telephone or letter which would indicate where their tender was to go to?

A.—I don't remember but I don't think so.

Q.—Was there anything to indicate to them what Department you were connected with?

A.—Of course I would tell them I belonged to the Board of Health.

Q.—Then the tender came to the Minister of Labor, and when did it reach you?

A.—Apparently on the 14th of June, because I wrote this letter on the 14th of June, accepting the tender.

Q.—How did the tender reach you?

A.—I presume it was sent to me from the Minister's office.

Q.—No covering letter?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Did you get any instructions from anyone in regard to who should have the tender?

A.—No.

Q.—Who determined who should have the tender?

A.—I did.

Q.—Upon what?

A.—Upon the fact that I got a price which I thought was satisfactory.

Q.—Have you the tender?

A.—I haven't. The successful tender would go with the voucher to the Treasury.

Q.—And their tender for each Ford coupelet was what?

A.—\$1,208.60 per car.

Q.—How much less per car than the lowest other tender?

A.—\$10, and there was \$7.30 difference on the tires, on the spare tires.

Q.—So there would be \$17.30 per car difference?

A.—Yes.

MR. TOLMIE: Just one spare tire for each?

A.—A spare tire and tube. The regular price of these tires at the time was \$30.05. They supplied them at \$22.75.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was there a rim with that tire?

A.—The rim is part of the standard equipment.

Q.—So there would be detachable rims for the cars?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Detachable rim with spare tire and tube?

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: What was your reason for thinking that the price mentioned in the tenders was not satisfactory?

A.—From the attitude of the agents, from the statement of the agents. For example, the Ford people came around and told me this. "We have one price for everyone and we can't come down on that price." I found on looking into my tenders that I had two Ford tenders with different prices, one \$1,218 and some cents and the other \$1,225 and some cents.

MR. HALL: Did I understand you to say that you didn't advertise for tenders?

A.—Oh, yes, I did for the cars, the advertisement is here. I didn't advertise for trucks. I considered I got every dealer in trucks to make a tender.

Q.—Wouldn't it have served the purpose as well and saved the Department a great deal of trouble such as this, if you had taken the usual course and asked for tenders?

A.—No, because I was buying a truck and having a special body put on it for child welfare work and I wanted to see the agents individually and discuss with them the question of the special body. It had to be made in a special way and they had to use photos of it in order to understand how to make it. It had a special body and specially fitted up. The body was worth nearly as much as the truck, two-thirds as much as the truck.

THE CHAIRMAN: You got every truck dealer?

A.—As far as I know.

Q.—Every truck dealer who wanted to tender?

A.—The Ford people spoke to me about their truck but it wouldn't do at all.

Q.—It was seeking advice in respect to trucks that got you the information in regard to Ford cars that caused you to ask Jerome and Jerome to send in a tender?

A.—I got information in a variety of ways. I thought it was another hold-up, putting up prices.

MR. SINCLAIR: Did you come to this conclusion from past experience in buying cars. I want to get down to the reason you thought you were being held-up by the Ford agents. You didn't get a much better price when you did buy. What was your reason for thinking you were being held-up?

A.—I told you I had from two Ford dealers two different prices, that, on top of the statement that they couldn't give me any better price, that there was one price for Fords and they couldn't cut it I was under the impression that they could, gained in a general way. I hadn't had much experience but I had bought a few cars. In talking with these various agents I came to the conclusion that they could cut prices.

Q.—Do you know whether they did sell at a less price than the price they tendered for?

A.—I know they offered me two different prices in these tenders.

MR. CLARKE: A difference of about \$7.00?

MR. SINCLAIR: You don't know any other case where there had been a lower price than what they had tendered?

A.—No.

Q.—That tender for the Chevrolet of \$1,140, is that a coupelet?

A.—Yes, I went to see the car and it didn't suit me.

Q.—In what respect? It is \$100 less than the Ford, I wonder why that wasn't considered?

A.—If I remember right it was a runabout, one with a removable top.

Q.—That is what I was asking, whether it was a closed car or an ordinary open car?

A.—No, it was a Chevrolet runabout.

Q.—Does it specify in the letter what kind of a car?

A.—Yes, a Chevrolet runabout \$1,140. It wasn't the kind of a car I wanted. The Ford coupe was the kind I wanted.

Q.—Had you bought any before, in the previous year?

A.—No.

MR. TOLMIE: What was the date of this purchase?

A.—June 14th.

Q.—You bought them at \$1,208.60?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you pay more than that for any cars?

A.—Yes, there was one with special equipment, for instance a speedometer and shock absorbers and things like that. In some cases I sent the car to the district officer and he purchased the extra equipment. Some needed a speedometer and some wanted the bumper. There were various extras added.

Q.—You bought these extra from the same company—Jerome and Jerome?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were they put on at the time the cars were bought or later on?

A.—I think there was only one where they put them on at the time they were purchased. In some cases the extra equipment was bought elsewhere. For instance the man in Belleville bought extra equipment in Belleville, and the man in London got his extra equipment in London.

Q.—These cars were all delivered in June?

A.—No, eight were delivered in July, about the 12th or 15th and the balance later on towards October. They were delivered when I wanted them delivered.

Q.—At the one price with the exception of these extras?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In regard to that: were they all delivered at the one price or was there a luxury tax that had to be paid under the excise law?

A.—Yes, there was that.

Q.—Did that alter the prices?

A.—Yes, that altered them to the extent of \$8.66, because it was a tax that was put on.

Q.—That is why there is a difference in the price of some of the cars, because of that?

A.—Yes, that is one reason.

MR. SINCLAIR: I thought it was 15 per cent. of the car—the excise tax?

MR. BIGGS: It is the sales tax. I think the sales tax was increased one per cent. during this time. I think that is what that refers to. It is not a general tax. It is a sales tax.

MR. SINCLAIR: You paid for the cars at the time of delivery?

WITNESS: As soon as they were delivered the bills were put forward and the Treasury paid them.

Q.—Some cars were bought in July and you paid for them at that time?

A.—I presume so.

Q.—And some in October. Are you sure there was no increase in price between July and October?

A.—No. There was an increase effective from the 17th of June. We had to pay that \$8.66.

Q.—You had to pay which?

A.—One per cent. on the cars delivered after a certain date.

Q.—So that the cars you arranged to buy at \$1,208 from Jerome and Jerome really cost more on account of that increase?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the difference?

A.—\$8.66.

Q.—I notice here in voucher 31283, it says, "Increase in price effective September 22,"—in this case the Ford coupelet price is increased by the amount of \$62.03 and is marked, "Increase in price effective September 22, 1920?"

A.—No, we were not charged anything like that, that I know of. Here are all the increases we had to pay, \$8.66. We had no \$62 to pay.

MR. TOLMIE: What is this voucher 31283, that is here—take voucher 27176, September 28, "3 cars, Dr. McCullough vouching as above." That is in connection with Jerome and Jerome? This is for three cars at \$1,240.01, "Dr. McCullough vouching as above?"

A.—That is right.

Q.—\$1,240?

A.—That includes the tires, the \$1,240 represents the price of all these cars except the one on which special equipment was put.

Q.—You don't know anything about this one on November 6, voucher 31283?

MR. BIGGS: Would that be the one with the special equipment?

A.—I presume it would be, if it refers to my department at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was that special equipment?

A.—A speedometer and shock absorbers.

Q.—Do you know what kind of shock absorbers?

A.—I think it is the Haslor.

Q.—What kind of speedometer—the Stewart?

A.—I think so.

MR. SINCLAIR: How many cars did you have in the Department before you decided to buy these cars?

A.—Just one truck.

Q.—No passenger cars?

A.—No.

Q.—When you decided to buy passenger cars had you any particular car in view?

A.—Yes, either a run-about of the type of the Willys-Overland or the Ford Coupe.

Q.—When you advertised for cars you advertised for Ford Coupe or the run-

about. You told me a little while ago that the Chevrolet people tendered on a run-about. Why did you advertise for tenders on runabouts if you didn't intend to buy?

A.—I did intend to buy one or the other when I advertised.

Q.—The Chevrolet is \$1,140, and the Ford \$1,218. There is quite a difference there if you were looking for a certain class of car. That is a Chevrolet run-about and you advertised for runabouts. How do you figure it out?

A.—Because I thought the coupe suited me best.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the advertisement for each, one or the other?

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: "Sixteen automobiles, coupe or runabout type."

THE CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, have the Chevrolet a coupe?

A.—Yes, but much higher in price.

Q.—Did they put in a tender for the coupe?

A.—No, I recollect going to see their coupe. The agent asked me down to see it. I went down and saw it. It is a good type, roomier than the Ford but the price was too high for our resources.

MR. HALL: From your experience in this matter is it the usual thing to charge an extra price for the extra tire. When I bought a tire I knew what I was getting. I got a 5th tire?

A.—I got a spare tire with the Jerome tender but there was no separate tire with the other tenders. The price was \$1,218.60, without a spare tire, from the other Ford people. From Jerome and Jerome, it was \$1,208.60 with \$22.75 added for the separate tire. That \$22.75 represented a saving of \$7.30.

MR. SINCLAIR: When you turned down these tenders you didn't know what you were going to buy the Ford coupe for?

A.—No.

Q.—Nor how much reduction you could get in that price?

A.—No.

Q.—And the only reason that you had for discarding the tenders is that two Ford dealers in Toronto gave you different prices?

A.—That is the chief reason.

Q.—Any other reason?

A.—No particular reason.

Q.—Did you say anything to either one of these dealers when you got different prices asking them how it was there were two prices?

A.—I think I did. I had a great deal of talk on it. They were in seeing me constantly. They were keen on selling. There were others who came in but only two submitted tenders. The Overland people, Gooderhams and others were in a great many times to see me.

Q.—They didn't show any signs of dropping the price, these Toronto fellows?

A.—No, but the young agent dealing with me about the Fords expected to get me a better price. That was the impression I had until the last moment.

Q.—Did you follow it up and see if he could do it.

A.—Finally he told me he couldn't do it.

Q.—You didn't try anyone else dealing in Ford cars, anywhere else?

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't communicate with the head office of the Ford people in Ontario

and see what they would do for the Government?

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't take it up with the office at Ford City and see if you could get a wholesale price on these cars?

A.—No, I didn't because I understood it would not be of any use to go to them.

Q.—Why?

A.—They would not interfere with the local dealers. Anyone would know that.

MR. CLARKE: In other words you asked for tenders and you only dealt with the people who put in tenders?

A.—Only until I got through with them.

Q.—Did any of the Ford agents give you any assurance as to delivery?

A.—I cannot say about that. I don't recollect that.

MR. TOLMIE: The tenders came to you—did anyone see them except the Minister and Mr. Biggs?

A.—I don't know whether Mr. Biggs knew. I had them there and he could have seen them if he had wanted to.

MR. THOMPSON: Did you talk to anyone?

A.—Not about the prices.

Q.—No person else knew the prices except yourself?

A.—No.

Q.—When these tenders come in they go to you directly?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You are the only man who knows anything about it?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long has the present policy in that regard been carried on?

A.—This is my first experience in having tenders for cars.

Q.—Then tenders for other things?

A.—We don't have tenders for other things. We don't purchase much else. We do purchase drugs but they are not purchased by tender. We purchase chemicals for the laboratory but I do not purchase those. I have the director or the laboratory do that because he knows more about it than anyone here.

MR. SINCLAIR: What change in the policy of the Department has come about requiring you to use 16 automobiles?

A.—The work of the district officers of health and the nurses.

Q.—Are there five district officers?

A.—No, eight.

Q.—And does the Government provide each with an automobile?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At the expense of the Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In addition to the salary the Provincial Officer gets?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Prior to this was there an allowance made to these district officers for travelling expenses?

A.—They always got travelling expenses. This was with the idea of saving travelling expenses and allowing them to get into the remote portions of the Prov-

ince that they couldn't get into by rail.

Q.—The other eight were for the travelling nurses?

A.—Yes, we had sixteen cars.

Q.—Is that new work?

A.—Yes, it was just begun last year.

Q.—Are these automobiles to be kept in repair and gasoline supplied?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who operates them ?

A.—The nurses or doctors.

Q.—They don't have a driver sent along and someone to wash the car and all that?

A.—No, they get along as best they can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that change necessary?

A.—It was thought advisable.

Q.—Has it turned out to be advisable?

A.—I think it is almost to soon to say. Hitherto they hired motor cars and regularly a physician would arrive at a station and find he was unable to get back into the remote portions of the Province. Now starting from home he can go any place. As far as time is concerned we find our officers are doing twice as much work. They get into localities they rarely visited before. They have headquarters in the towns and they can get out easily into the farming communities.

Q.—What about economy?

A.—It is difficult to say. I expect to know at the first of the year. I will be able to say then whether it has been cheaper or more expensive. Certainly we are able to do more work.

Q.—And that will enable you to get along with less help?

A.—It will enable us to do more work with the help we have.

Q.—You will do that work with less help than you would have required if you did not have these cars?

A.—Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: You will only be able to do that in the summer months?

A.—This winter they have been able to work nearly all winter. In some parts of course they will only be available for summer work.

THE CHAIRMAN: That item was included in the estimates?

A.—Yes.

MR. TOLMIE: Where were these cars delivered?

A.—Some were delivered here, one to Fort William, one to Sault Ste Marie, two to Belleville—there is a district officer of health at Belleville so we sent two cars there and the district officer at Ottawa came up to Belleville and got his car. I distributed them in the most economical way. This price included \$20 for freight. That is included in the standard price. The tenders included \$20 for freight.

MR. SINCLAIR: Are these district medical health officers working all the time?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: About the distribution of these cars. At the Exhibition last year the Minister of Labor took me to see some cars he had, demonstration cars, how many of them have you?

A.—I think perhaps you mean our truck with the body on it. We just have

one of those. That is the White truck.

Q.—Where is that being used?

A.—It is not being used so far. It was not completed last year in time to put on the road. I have had it stored at the exhibition and we are going to start it as the roads are fit.

Q.—What are the special purposes of that car?

A.—It will go out with a doctor and nurses, a doctor trained in childrens affections. Nurses will go with him and they will go into the villages through the country and hold child and public clinics. We carry these on in the Winter time but travel by railway and take the equipment with us. In the Summer we are going to do that work by means of the truck. It will carry a full equipment, and they will give mothers advice regarding their children.

Q.—How many trucks will be in operation?

A.—We simply have the one truck. It is just an experiment.

MR. TOLMIE. Your equipment is sixteen cars and one truck?

A.—Yes. We have another truck, a little one for errands here in the city.

M. JEROME called and sworn. Examined by Mr. Sinclair.

Q.—You are in partnership as a dealer in automobiles in Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been in business there?

A.—Since 1910.

Q.—What line of automobile do you deal in there?

A.—Fords.

Q.—Ford service people and Ford dealers at Dundas?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there any other agents there selling the same cars?

A.—No.

Q.—Now, you have sold some automobiles to the Government during the last fiscal year. There is an item here for \$9,999.58 for eight Ford coupes at \$1,240.01, which you have sold to the Department of Health. Who made that purchase?

A.—Dr. McCullough.

Q.—How did you come to get in touch with Dr. McCullough?

A.—I am not sure but I think he sent a wire to me to tender.

Q.—Had you seen an advertisement in the papers?

A.—I believe we did, on roadsters and coupes.

Q.—You had seen the advertisement? Where did you see it?

A.—I cannot tell you now.

Q.—After seeing that advertisement did you put in a tender?

A.—I would not be sure whether we did or did not. We put in a tender for the coupes.

Q.—You saw the advertisement in the paper that the Government were buying a certain amount of roadsters or coupes, the advertisement which we have been discussing here, "Tenders wanted on sixteen automobiles, coupelet or run-about type. Apply Dr. J. W. S. McCullough." Is that the advertisement you saw?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And after seeing that advertisement did you put in a tender?

A.—I don't believe we put one in until he wired.

Q.—You saw the advertisement, you were in the automobile business and you didn't put in a tender?

A.—We don't put in for every tender.

Q.—At any rate you didn't tender on this?

A.—Not that I remember.

Q.—Then shortly after you got a wire—do you mean a telegram or a telephone message?

A.—I would not be sure whether it was a telegram or telephone.

Q.—Was it to both of you? If it was a telephone it couldn't be to both of you?

A.—The telephone is right in the same office.

Q.—If it was a telephone message only one of you would get it. If it was a telegram it would be addressed to both of you?

A.—I believe it was a telephone message.

Q.—Who got the telephone message? You or your brother?

A.—I would not say which one it was.

Q.—When was this?

A.—Some time in June.

Q.—You won't say whether it was you or your brother who got the message. What makes you think you had a telephone message? Why do you say it was a telephone message?

A.—I believe that is what we got.

Q.—After you got this message did you have a conversation with your brother about it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Immediately?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What decision did you come to?

A.—We tendered for them.

Q.—What was your tender?

A.—I believe our tender was just what they spoke of here.

Q.—You say you got a phone message, you believed, from Dr. McCullough in Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the message?

A.—I have given you what the message was.

Q.—Would you have a copy of it if it was a telephone message?

A.—No.

Q.—Can you say whether it was a telephone message or a wire?

A.—I believe it was a telephone message.

Q.—Then if you received that telephone message let me know what was the effect of the message? What was the talk about?

A.—It was about a tender for the Ford coupes.

Q.—About what tender?

A.—For the Ford coupes.

Q.—You say it was about a tender about Ford coupes, what Ford coupes?

A.—Sixteen.

Q.—Did he want to know why you didn't put in a tender? What was the message for?

A.—It was to put in a tender for coupes.

Q.—From Dr. McCullough to you people?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that is all the message there was?

A.—I suppose he asked—that is all I remember.

Q.—There was a request from Dr. McCullough that Jerome and Jerome should put in a tender for these 16 automobiles?

A.—Yes.

MR. CLARKE. Did he ask for your best price?

A.—That is what they always want.

MR. SINCLAIR: Did he say, put in the best price on sixteen coupes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you sure that was said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—To whom was it said?

A.—I am not just sure.

Q.—You were the one who received the message, what did he ask you to do?

A.—To put in a tender for sixteen coupes.

Q.—Was anything said about prices?

A.—To put prices in on sixteen coupes.

Q.—Anything else now?

A.—We put a price in for the tender which was asked for. And because we had a lot of tires on hand—

Q.—How long had you had them on hand?

A.—We just got them in.

Q.—So you had more in than you could sell, did you?

A.—We had a lot of them.

Q.—So you offered to put in a spare tire in addition to what the tender called for?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Because you had a lot on hand?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was that the reason you could afford to be so generous over the prices?

A.—I have some right there I will sell for the same price.

Q.—And probably before Summer you will sell them cheaper than you will now. You volunteered this separate tire price, it wasn't asked for?

A.—No, although we thought it needed to be on.

Q.—How long after you got the telephone message was it before you put the tender in?

A.—I believe it was the next day.

Q.—Who did you send the tender to?

A.—The Provincial Board of Health.

Q.—You mailed it to Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long was it before the tender was accepted?

A.—The next day or two.

Q.—Did anybody phone afterwards about your tender, after it was sent in? Did anyone call up to see if you could cut a little more on your price?

A.—No, we just had the one price.

Q.—What is that one price. What do you mean by that one price?

A.—It is just the same as their price was here. We didn't put in any tender for the painting, that makes that \$10 difference.

Q.—That price you gave the Provincial Board of Health was the standard price on the Ford car?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the price of the Toronto men had put on was the standard price plus the painting of the Ontario crest on the cars?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you been told about painting the Ontario crest on?

A.—What I heard here this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was nothing about that here.

MR. SINCLAIR—Before you tendered nothing was said about putting the crest on the car?

A.—They wanted to know if there would be a crest on it.

Q.—Who wanted to know?

A.—DR. McCLENAHAN, he is the assistant I suppose to Dr. McCullough.

Q.—Where is he, in Toronto?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you see him?

A.—After we sent the tender in. We didn't have the painting of the crest mentioned. I told him it would be on.

Q.—Did he call you up about that, where did you see him?

A.—I went to his office.

Q.—You came to Toronto after putting a tender in?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And saw them in the Health offices here?

A.—I saw Dr. McClenahan.

Q.—Did you make an arrangement then about painting the crest on the cars?

A.—I told him it would be on.

Q.—Did you put it on?

A.—Yes

Q.—And made no charge?

A.—No, We made no charge.

Q.—Was this arranged to be done before your tender was accepted?

A.—The tender didn't ask for the crest.

Q.—Before the Government accepted your tender did you agree to put this extra painting on the cars. Was that a part of the consideration in the tender?

A.—Yes

Q.—That is the difference, as you say, between any other dealer's price and yours, that you threw in the painting of the crest?

A.—Yes

Q.—That is the real difference in price?

A.—Yes

Q.—How did you come to offer to do this?

A.—Because they wanted it on.

Q.—Did they want you to do it for nothing?

A.—I suppose they did I don't know.

Q.—Did they ask you to throw that in?

A.—I told him I would put it on, because it was not in our tender.

Q.—Who suggested that you should throw this in for nothing?

A.—They asked me if there would be a crest and lettering on it.

Q.—Who did?

A.—Dr. McClenahan.

Q.—He asked you if the crest would be on for this price and you told him what?

A.—That it would be.

Q.—Did you originally intend to put that on when you first made the tender?

A.—No

Q.—That was an after consideration?

A.—Yes

Q.—Now to get back to this one price, each dealer in Fords has a territory within he sells cars?

A.—Yes

Q.—The head company contracts with you for a certain territory in which you deal?

A.—Yes

Q.—They gave you a price at which you were to sell cars?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then they sold the automobiles to you at a reduced price and the difference between that reduced price and the selling price is really your commission?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you buy outright or work on commission?

A.—We buy outright.

MR. SINCLAIR—You buy the cars, you don't take them in and sell them on commission?

A.—No.

Q.—What you say is that there is the same price all over Ontario for Ford dealers to sell Ford cars at?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Subject to the expense of freight?

A.—There is a difference in freight in different places.

Q.—The further away from Ford City the higher it gets?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Will there be any difference between the freight to Toronto and Dundas? Dundas?

A.—I gave it the dollar.

Q.—You can sell a dollar cheaper in Dundas than Toronto?

A.—I believe it is a dollar less in Toronto.

Q.—Where were your cars delivered?

A.—Queens Park, some of them. They went to Woodstock and different places.

Q.—Then the Government could have got a price here a dollar cheaper per car?

A.—We put the price in the same as it was here:

Q.—Why?

A.—Because this was where we had to deliver them.

Q.—What right had you to sell cars for delivery in Toronto under the terms of your contract with the Ford people? How could you come in here and sell cars.

A.—Just like they could go out in our place and sell cars out there.

Q.—Didn't you have an agreement?

A.—It is open territory at the present time.

MR. CLARKE—Do the Ford people permit you to cut prices on cars?

A.—No.

Q.—But you can as an agent give part of your commission in order to make a sale can't you? Is there a law against that?

A.—There is no law against giving a man a car.

Q.—Suppose you were making twenty or forty dollars on a car, could you give half of that? You would not be breaking the law of your contract?

A.—That would be against our contract.

MR. SINCLAIR—You have to maintain prices?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The only place where you can make what might be called cut in the selling price is where you take an old car in trade. There is a chance there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But for a cash transaction you have to sell at the standard price of that car?

A.—Yes.

MR. BRACKIN—Isn't it so that you make a cut on accessories or extra tires etc.?

A.—There isn't a man who sells tires to-day at the list price.

THE CHAIRMAN—How did you come to be in Toronto seeing Dr. McClenahan?

A.—I was down here after cars at the Ford Motor Co..

Q.—That was before your tender had been accepted?

A.—After, we were here before but not in here.

Q.—Did you see Dr. McClenahan?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did you learn about the lettering and crest?

A.—When he told us they wanted the letter and crest on.

Q.—What was said to you with reference to your tender?

A.—I told him the letter and crest would be on.

Q.—Then this tender would include the lettering and crest?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Up to that time had the tender been accepted?

A.—I would not be sure about that. I believe it was at that time.

Q.—You mean the same day? Did you agree to put the lettering and crest on before the tender was accepted? Had your tender been accepted before

you agreed to put the lettering and the crest on?

A.—No.

Q.—You were asked if it included the lettering and the crest?

A.—It was not in writing. They asked if it would be put on and I said it would be put on.

Q.—They asked that it be put on the cars and you put it on?

A.—We put it on.

DR. McCULLOUGH recalled.

MR. SINCLAIR—Are these the only Ford tenders received, one from the Toronto Motor Car Company and the other from A. D. Gorrie and Co.?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is a tender here from A. D. Gorrie and Co. for \$1210, a Ford coupelet complete with electric starting and lighting system, demountable rims, spare rim on rear of car, \$1210.44.

A.—They asked \$15 more for putting the crest on which brought it up to \$1225.

Q.—It doesn't say that here?

A.—It is written on in pencil.

MR. DEWART—When you had this tender from Gorrie and Co. for these coupelets at \$1,210.44, and that was the lowest tender why didn't you accept that?

A.—That wasn't the lowest.

Q.—Wasn't it the lowest of the three tenders?

A.—It wasn't for what I wanted. When they came to see me there was a discussion about putting on the crest. He didn't include in his tender the putting on of the crest.

Q.—Your advertisement made no reference to the crest?

A.—No but I told this man that we wanted the crest and he said they would put it on for \$15.

Q.—With that tender in at \$1210.44. were you dissatisfied with that price personally?

A.—Yes, because they wanted \$15 for the crest and I thought that was too much.

Q.—Whom did you see before you became dissatisfied with the price?

A.—I saw all these dealers.

Q.—But who, in the Government?

A.—I didn't see any of them previous to my being dissatisfied.

Q.—What made you dissatisfied?

A.—Because I thought they should give me a lower price than they did.

Q.—Isn't it a fact that as far as you are concerned you laid these tenders before your responsible Minister, Mr. Rollo?

A.—I did.

Q.—Did he express dissatisfaction?

A.—No. he said he didn't know anything about it.

Q.—It was not until you reached Mr. Biggs that you found reason for dissatisfaction?

A.—No.

Q.—Then where had you been that made you dissatisfied?

A.—I was dissatisfied with the whole attitude of these agents.

Q.—They were giving you the flat charge in Toronto, you knew that?

A.—They kept running back between me and their offices and it appeared to me that they could get me lower prices.

Q.—Didn't you know they were giving you what was here in Toronto the flat rate?

A.—They told me so but the two tenders disabused my mind of that. One tender was \$1,225 and the other \$1,218.

Q.—And another is \$1,210.44?

A.—No, not \$1,210.44, the tender is \$1,255, as I understand it.

MR. SINCLAIR: The price of the car in both tenders, Gorrie's and the other is \$1,050.

A.—I am talking about what I was going to get. I knew what I was going to get.

Q.—The price was only different on the accessories, not on the cars themselves?

A.—It was only what I was going to buy. One came to a cost of \$1,218.60 and the other \$1,225.44. I was satisfied from the attitude of these gentlemen that they could have given me a lower price.

Q.—On what?

A.—On the whole thing.

Q.—Did you think these dealers could cut on that \$1,050?

A.—I am not talking about the \$1,050.

Q.—But I am?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—That is the big item in the price of the automobile?

A.—What I was concerned with was what I was going to get the whole thing for.

Q.—Where did you think they could make a cut, in what price? They could not cut the war tax, that would be the same for everybody?

A.—I was satisfied they could, and the results show I got a cut. I got a cut when I bought from Jerome.

Q.—He says no. He says he couldn't cut?

A.—The figures show it.

Q.—Not his figures. He put in some accessories that were not advertised for in the tenders at all.

A.—I got what I wanted. I got a lower price on the whole thing I bought.

MR. DEWART: Who was it suggested to you that you should play with this question of a crest?

A.—No one suggested any such thing.

Q.—When did you first realize that that was the place where you were going to get a cut?

A.—When I went to consult Mr. Biggs I had tenders on trucks as well as automobiles. When I went to the Minister (Mr. Rollo), and asked him about awarding the tender, I asked him his opinion on the trucks. He said he didn't know anything about it, that I had better see Mr. Biggs. I went to Mr. Biggs and asked his advice about the trucks and his opinion coincided with mine about the kind of truck I wanted to purchase. Eventually I purchased the White truck. I asked Mr. Biggs about the trucks, then I told him I thought the Ford dealers were asking me too high a price for the cars. He said to me, if you think so, why not get a price from Jerome. So I finished with those fellows in Toronto whose tenders I

had. I got rid of them when they couldn't give me a lower price and then I asked Jerome for a price.

Q.—These cars were to be delivered in Toronto according to the advertisement here?

A.—I don't think the advertisement specified were they were to be delivered. The whole question about delivery was a matter of agreement.

Q.—Were they in fact delivered in Toronto?

A.—Some were, some were delivered in Belleville, in London and so on, various places, but they had charged \$20 for freight in the original tenders.

Q.—Did you take into consideration the question of service?

A.—I heard a lot of talk about service but it doesn't amount to anything.

Q.—I am not asking you what you think it amounts to. Do you realize that if you have a car delivered by a dealer in Toronto you have three months service on that car?

A.—I have heard that.

Q.—Did you take that into consideration when you were thinking about buying?

A.—No, I didn't because I don't think it amounted to anything. You get what service you pay for.

Q.—You realize that when a dealer sells a car in Toronto you get three months service and ordinary repairs for nothing?

A.—But my cars were not being used in Toronto, they were to be used in Fort William, in Sault Ste Marie, Ottawa, Belleville, London, Hamilton and so on, and North Bay.

Q.—What about the eight cars for the nurses?

A.—They were all for outside Toronto. For that reason I say this three months service charge didn't amount to anything as far as I was concerned.

Q.—So that really the only reason why you did not deal with the tenderers was because of a question as to what you could get the painting done on the side of the car for?

A.—The question was to get the lowest price I could.

Q.—The only reason that you did not accept the tenders is that it was a question of painting or lettering on the side of the cars?

A.—That didn't enter into it at all particularly, it was a question of price.

Q.—That was the one factor of price that induced you not to accept any tender put in?

A.—No sir. The question was to get the lowest price I could.

Q.—What I cannot understand is this; this Jerome, of Dundas was not one of the original tenderers?

A.—No.

Q.—Why did you take him into consideration when he didn't tender at all?

A.—I asked these tenderers, the Ford people, they were the ones who spoke to me, I asked them if they would give me a lower price. The young man who was dealing with me said to me finally, "Let me have until 4 o'clock this afternoon." He came back and said he couldn't give me any lower price and I said we were through.

Q.—Who is the young man?

A.—One of these agents, I don't know which one it was. I considered then that I was through with these people. I didn't go to Jerome until I was through

with the original tenderers.

Q.—Jerome and Jerome didn't come to you?

A.—I telephoned him and asked him for a price and he sent a price to the Minister of Labor.. He sent a tender to the Minister of Labor and from the Minister of Labor it reached me.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Toronto Motor Car Company's, price was \$1,218.60, including the coat of arms and lettering which you wanted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that of A. D. Gorrie & Co., was \$1,225.44?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—They had no extra tire, either one of those?

A.—No.

Q.—And for this same service you had another tender, what did you get it for from Jerome and Jerome?

A.—\$1,208.60.

MR. DEWART: When you first telephoned Jerome did you discuss the question of the painting of the cars?

A.—I don't recall whether I did or not.

Q.—Surely you would remember that, for that seemed to be the place were they were making the cut?

A.—You seem to think that, Mr. Dewart, I didn't take that into consideration.

Q.—Do you not recollect the fact that when you telephoned to Jerome you discussed with him over the telephone the question of his painting the side of the car?

A.—I do not know that I did. I may have.

Q.—Oh, now come. I really think you might remember that?

A.—I really don't. I may have discussed it with him.

Q.—Cudgel your memory a little?

A.—I should like to oblige you.

Q.—Is it not a fact that when you telephoned to Jerome, it was in your mind that you might get a cut on the painting of the crest?

A.—The thought in my mind was to get a lower price, to get the lowest price I could.

MR. TOLMIE: In response to your tender they stated they would look into the matter and send a tender in?

A.—I presume so because a tender came in.

Q.—Have you that tender?

A.—I explained that the original, the successful tender goes with the vouchers to the Treasury.

Q.—Then that tender was sent to you by mail.

A.—It was sent to the Minister of Labor. My reason for saying it was sent to the Minister of Labor is that I referred to it in a letter accepting the tender.

Q.—That tender would show whether the crest was included?

A.—Evidently it doesn't because I quote in my letter the price of the car and the price of the spare tire. I say in my letter, "I have your tender of the 14th inst. addressed to the Minister of Labor, submitting a price for Ford cupelets, with standard equipment at \$1,208.60 with separate tire and tube on rim \$22.75 additional."

Q.—Would that indicate to your mind that you hadn't mentioned the crest

in your telephone conversation with him, because it is not in his tender?

A.—I cannot say about that. It might have been. I couldn't say one way or the other. It is likely I may have and just as likely I didn't.

Q.—If you had mentioned it, it would have been in the tender?

A.—I don't know that I could express an opinion about that.

Q.—If you asked for a certain thing with certain equipment when the tender came in it would include those things would it not?

A.—I presume it might, or it might not. I cannot say for certain.

The following were here marked by the Chairman as Exhibit "A." Tender of the Toronto Motor Car Co., Ltd., tender of A. D. Gorrie and Co., letter of A. D. Gorrie and Co., letter of Toronto Motor Car Co., Ltd.

Mr. JEROME recalled.

Mr. DEWART: Mr. Jerome, I understand that you did not intend to tender on this matter in the first instance, that it was as a result of a telephone message you tendered?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That telephone message came from whom?

A.—Dr. McCullough.

Q.—So that instead of your soliciting the Department for business Dr. McCullough solicited you to put in a tender?

A.—I suppose that was so.

Q.—Do you recollect what Dr. McCullough said to you when he telephoned?

A.—I can't tell you word for word.

Q.—I am not asking you that, to the best of your recollection give us your recollection of what he said?

A.—He asked us to tender for sixteen coupes.

Q.—You were asked by Dr. McCullough to tender for 16 coupes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he say who it was suggested you should tender?

A.—No, nothing was said.

Q.—Give me all you can remember of what Dr. McCullough said when he spoke over the phone?

A.—He wanted a tender for 16 coupes at the lowest price.

Q.—That is all?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you tell Dr. McCullough there was a uniform price that you couldn't lower?

A.—No, I didn't.

Q.—You knew that to be the fact?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Didn't it come to you as something of a surprise that he should ask you a dealer in Dundas to tender on Ford cars here?

A.—I don't know why it should.

Q.—Did Dr. McCullough say anything to you as to where the cars should be delivered?

A.—Not at that time.

Q.—Now, give me anything you remember about the conversation.

A.—I told you what I remember.

Q.—He simply asked you to tender for sixteen Ford coupes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he tell you he had tenders in?

A.—He told me nothing.

Q.—Did he suggest that anyone asked him to telephone you?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you in the meantime hear from Mr. Biggs?

A.—No.

Q.—Did he telephone to you?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then when Dr. McCullough asked you to tender on these sixteen coupes what did you say to him?

A.—That we would send in one.

Q.—In writing?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you got a copy of your tender?

A.—Yes.

Memorandum of tender submitted, instead of copy.

MR. SINCLAIR: Did you keep a duplicate copy?

A.—No, this is all I have.

Q.—You don't know what became of the tender you sent in?

A.—I presume this is taken off it. The original tender was sent to Toronto.

Q.—Then in making your tender did you figure anything on the delivery of the cars, in the price?

A.—That is always included.

Q.—You said to Mr. Dewart that there was nothing said as to where these cars were to be delivered. When you tendered did you include anything for delivery?

A.—No.

Q.—You didn't charge anything for that?

A.—We did if they had to be delivered in London.

Q.—Suppose you had to deliver a car in Toronto would there be any charge?

A.—No, because we had to come down here for the cars.

Q.—You take delivery at Toronto for Dundas, they don't come direct to Dundas? Suppose you ordered ten cars for delivery around Dundas. Are they delivered at Dundas?

A.—No, we go to Toronto for them.

Q.—So there is no charge for delivery to anybody?

A.—If it is right here there isn't.

MR. DEWART: Take the City of Toronto. Did you not charge for delivery here?

A.—No.

Q.—There were two lots of cars, eight and eight, one eight for the district officers of the Board and the others for the nurses. Do you recollect that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you make no charge at all for delivery?

A.—Not in Toronto.

Q.—On either of these lots?

A.—No. We charge for delivery at London.

Q.—You did deliver one there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What charge did you make for delivery?

A.—Here? We didn't make any charge.

Q.—As far as the other cars are concerned did you charge for delivery?

A.—At Belleville we made a charge.

Q.—How much?

A.—I don't know whether I can find that.

Q.—I want to know what your recollection is?

A.—I cannot tell you, not now.

Q.—As a matter of fact on the eight cars delivered for the district officers of health you make a charge of \$41 on each car for delivery. Do you recollect that?

A.—\$41 for each car, there was no such charge for each car.

Q.—On page 562, we find, "M. and H. Jerome, 8 Ford coupelets at \$1,240.01 each, allowance for delivery of cars \$41"?

A.—One, I think, went to North Bay and we were paid for that.

Q.—That \$41, what is that?

A.—That \$41, I assume, would be on the delivery of the whole 8 cars.

Q.—Now, Mr. Jerome, I don't quite understand how it came that you put in a different price so far as the painting of the cars was concerned. Who suggested to you that that was the item on which you should make your cut?

A.—Dr. McClenahan wanted to know if there was to be a crest and I said that if they wanted it on it would be put on and we put it on.

Q.—How long was it after the discussion on the telephone before you got in touch with Dr. McClenahan?

A.—I think about two days.

Q.—Where did you see him?

A.—In his office.

Q.—Where?

A.—Right here in the Parliament Buildings.

Q.—How did you come to see him?

A.—I was down here after cars.

Q.—Did he telephone you to see him?

A.—No.

Q.—Had you an appointment with him?

A.—No.

Q.—Was there an understanding with Dr. McCullough that you would see him when you came here?

A.—No.

Q.—You don't mean to suggest that this conversation was accidental.

A.—I came to see whether we were going to get the order for them. I came after cars at the Ford Motor Co., and then I came up here.

Q.—Tell us what happened between him and you?

A.—I just asked him if we had the order, if we were going to get the contract. He spoke about the crest and the lettering. He wanted them put on and I said

we would put them on.

Q.—Did he say whether the contract depended on you putting the crest and lettering on?

A.—No.

Q.—Did he tell you the others would put the crest on?

A.—No, we didn't know that they had been even turned down.

Q.—The result of your conversation was that you gave him a price on the cars?

A.—I told him the crest and the lettering would be on.

Q.—And then he told you you would get the order?

A.—No, he didn't tell me that.

Q.—What did he say?

A.—That was all there was to it. We got word after that our tender was accepted.

Q.—By letter?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The item of \$9,999.58 is made up of eight times \$1,240.01 plus \$41, plus \$22.50, plus \$16, the \$41, the \$22.50, and the \$16 being apparently delivery, shock absorbers and supplies for one car?

MR. DEWART: Now, Mr. Jerome, I find you have done other business with the Government besides that. You have sold other cars to them, have you not?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How did you sell the other cars. Did you tender or were you asked to submit prices?

A.—We tendered for them.

Q.—What was the next tender you sent to the Government, had you sent a tender before these sixteen cars?

A.—I guess it was after.

Q.—Do you recollect tendering for twelve cars, for others apparently of a different type, seventeen in all? On page 747, of the Public Accounts, under the heading of Public Highways, I see that you supplied Ford touring cars complete, 12 at \$927, 3 at \$968.58, 2 at \$730; Ford one-ton truck with Goodyear cords etc. \$950, Ford runabouts, 3 at \$730, roadster 1 at \$741.72, tires and tubes \$1,528.48, sundries \$3.25, including tax \$21,412.80. How did you come to get that order?

A.—We tendered on it.

Q.—Is the tender here? (Tender produced.) This tender appears to have been just for the one car: "We beg to submit herewith tender for Ford touring car, complete with standard equipment starter and tool box with Dominion non-skid tires on rear wheels for any number up to twenty, at the rate of \$927, per car, delivery to be made before July 1; 1920, at Toronto." Would that be in response to an advertisement?

A.—I believe that was sent by letter asking us to tender.

Q.—Who sent the letter asking you to tender?

A.—I believe it was Mr. Hogarth.

Q.—Have you the letter he sent asking you to tender?

(Letter produced.)

Q.—This is dated May 1, 1920, "Dear Sir.—Before 12 o'clock noon on Friday,

May 7, we will be pleased to receive from you at the rate per car for any number up to twenty, standard Ford touring cars, complete with starter. F.O.B., Toronto delivery of these cars, to be completed on or before July 1, 1920. Yours truly, Chief Engineer. —N.B. This letter has been forwarded to the following: Ford Motor Co., 672 Dupont Street, Toronto; M. and H. Jerome, Dundas; Sparling and Reeson, Cobourg; A. D. Gorrie and Co., 205 Victoria Street, Toronto; W. C. Warburton and Co., 670 Bloor Street, West; Toronto Motor Car Co., 52 Jarvis Street; Riverdale Garage, 211 Hamilton Street; Universal Car Co., 621 Yonge Street.”—Now I see under date of May 14, that George Hogarth, Chief Engineer, of Highways, and W. A. McLean, Deputy Minister of Highways says: “Tenders for the supply of one to twenty Ford touring cars prior to July 1st, have been received and are as follows: M. and H Jerome \$927; Sparling and Reeson \$927.80; A. D. Gorrie and Co., \$929.30; Toronto Motor Car Co. \$929.30; Universal Car Co. \$931.55; W. C. Warburton and Co. \$932.54; Bradley and Love \$932.79; Riverdale garage \$934.30; See and Smith \$939.30. ‘I would respectfully recommend that the lowest tender received, being that of Jerome and Jerome be accepted for the supply of from one to twenty cars, yours truly, George Hogarth, approved F.C.B.’” Will you tell me, Mr. Jerome, how on Ford cars as to which you have a specified territory you can tender at \$937 at Toronto, when other Toronto dealers quote the standard price of \$929.30? I am taking these two Toronto ones. The Toronto Motor Car Company, being a Toronto firm quoted a price of \$929.30. Being the agent in Dundas how can you quote a price that was \$2.30 lower, for delivery in Toronto?

A.—We put on a non-skid tire. It didn’t say as to what kind of a non-skid tire.

MR. THOMPSON: You put on a cheaper tire?

A.—It cost us less.

MR. DEWART: What tire did you put on?

A.—A Dominion non-skid. It is a standard tire.

Q.—The reason you were able to quote a low price is because of the difference in the tire you put on?

A.—I suppose that is one reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don’t suppose. Give a straight answer.

A.—We put on a cheaper tire, but a non-skid which was asked for.

MR. SINCLAIR: So that we don’t get as good a car from you as to equipment?

A.—Just as good.

Q.—You say it was a cheaper tire?

A.—It cost us less.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know what the others put on?

A.—No, I don’t know what they put on at all.

Q.—Do you know what they quoted on?

A.—No.

Q.—Then why do you say yours was cheaper?

A.—Because we bought it lower.

Q.—Was the tire that was put on the same tire that they put on or different?

A.—The same tire, a Dominion tire.

Q.—Is it of equal value?

A.—No—it is to-day.

Q.—Was the tire you were putting on that car of equal value to the tire the Ford Company, of Toronto, was putting on?

A.—I can't tell you that.

Q.—Then why do you say it was a cheaper tire?

A.— We took the Dominion "nobby" off and put on another.

Q.—How was it you were able to quote \$2.30 cheaper than the Jarvis Street, firm. That is what you were asked. Do you know?

A.—No.

Q.—You don't know what they were putting on?

No, I didn't see it.

Q.—Do you know what they were tendering, as to tires, on that car?

A.—No.

Q.—Then why do you say the tire you tendered for was cheaper than the tire they were tendering for?

A.—As a rule they come equipped with Dominion or Goodyear chain tread. We put on a Dominion non-skid. That is a Dominion tire. We took the "nobbies" off and put them on. There is about \$4.00 difference in the tires.

Q.—Do you know what they were putting on?

A.—No.

Q.—You don't know whether they were tendering on the same tire as you were putting on or not?

A.—No.

Q.—Why was this, why were you able to put a tender in \$2.30 lower?

A.—We saw four others up there, ones they had delivered with Goodyear tires on.

Q.—Where?

A.—15 Queen's Park.

Q.—And this tire you put on was a tire you could purchase cheaper?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You don't know what they were tendering on, those tenders that went in?

A.—All I know is that we put on a cheaper tire.

Q.—But you don't know what their tenders called for?

A.—No.

Q.—What does the tender say, what does the advertisement say?

A.—Complete with standard equipment.

Q.—Was that standard equipment?

A.—Standard equipment, with non-skids on the rear. It didn't specify traction, or nobby or chain tread. Non-skids on the rear is standard equipment.

Q.—Have you any knowledge whether the tire you put on would give as good service as the "nobby" or the "cord" tread would?

Q.—Did they ask for cord?

A.—No, they didn't.

MR. BIGGS: Was there a tool box? Wasn't a tool box mentioned there? Was the tool box standard equipment on Ford cars?

A.—No, it wasn't. There may be a difference in our price and theirs on the tool box.

Q.—Where you aware of the price which Warburton had tendered shortly

before?

A.—We didn't know what their tenders were.

..Q.—Shortly before that Warburton had supplied one to the Department. You don't know what they were supplying for \$929.30?

A.—We didn't know anything about it. I saw four that had Dominion treads on.

MR. DEWART: Who showed you those?

A.—I saw them.

Q.—How did you come to go across to 15 Queen's Park Avenue?

A.—We were delivering cars there. There were other people delivering cars there besides ourselves.

Q.—There is a letter here in regard to what the Minister of Public Works has said. This is from the Universal Car Co. On May 7, in sending in a tender, "We beg to state that the price of the car full equipped will be absolutely the same from all dealers and the additional cost of the tool box depends largely upon the style of box which is to be supplied. We have other tool boxes which will run into a little more money than the one estimated and if the one tendered for is not satisfactory we would be quite willing to make a change to any you desire. I might refer you to Mr. Dunlop, Inspector of Prisons, as to the service given the Government on cars supplied to that department." What tool box did you get?

A.—I don't know who made it. It was just a standard tool box, 9 inches wide and 7 inches high.

Q.—You didn't reckon on any particular advantage because of the style of tool box you put on?

A.—Not necessarily.

Q.—Did you or did you not. Was it only so far as the tires were concerned that you were looking to get the advantage?

A.—We put the tool box in as cheap as we could put it in.

MR. SINCLAIR: How much cheaper were the tires you put on than the ordinary nobby tread?

A.—About \$4.50. The Dominion, that we put on was a better tire than the Goodyear that came on from the other people.

Q.—You say the Dominion tire you put on was a better tire than the Goodyears that were there?

A.—It gave us less trouble.

MR. BIGGS: Isn't it a matter of choice which non-skid you purchase?

A.—Yes, one man would want the nobby and another wants the chain tread.

MR. SINCLAIR: This tire won't give the service that the nobby will?

A.—Sometimes a lot better. It is a matter of opinion.

MR. THOMPSON: In the early part of your evidence you didn't know whether you received a wire or a telephone message?

A.—I said we received a telephone message.

Q.—But you were indefinite for a long time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—If my memory serves me right you said you didn't know whether this message went to your brother or to yourself. Not sure yet are you?

A.—No.

Q.—Then if you are not sure how is it that you can record a conversation

that took place between you and Dr. McCullough. You say you are not sure yet, still you tell Mr. Dewart of a conversation that took place?

A.—It was a telephone message.

Q.—You say you are not sure whether your brother or yourself got it, that is peculiar. How do you recollect those statements?

A.—Just as I told you before. We discussed it between us. I don't remember every telephone message.

Q.—And you don't know whether you received it or your brother?

A.—As far as my recollection goes I received the telephone message.

Q.—You said a moment ago you didn't know?

A.—I say as far as I recollect.

Q.—You don't know whether you did or not?

A.—I would not take my oath.

MR. DEWART: But you got this business?

A.—A lot of cars were bought that we didn't get, at a later date.

Q.—What do you mean by that?

A.—We didn't get all the tenders.

MR. THOMPSON: You are not grumbling at the share you got?

A.—No.

MR. SINCLAIR: You sold cars at \$730, was this in response to an adver-

A.—I believe there is a difference in the sales tax.

Q.—Is this all the one bunch together, the seventeen?

A.—Yes, I think the difference in the price would be the difference in the sales tax. I know there were things like that coming along.

Q.—How can there be that difference in view of the tender you put in for \$927, for any amount up to twenty, you sold 12 at \$927, 3 at \$968.58, 2 at \$730?

A.—The difference in the sales tax makes the difference in price.

MR. BIGGS: On the 19th, of May, new regulations came through from Ottawa affecting the luxury taxes and the sales tax. That is the same change, effective the latter part of May. As a matter of fact these are all on the same tender

A.—Yes.

A.—There is one roadster, three Ford Runabouts at \$730. Is that arising out of the same tender?

A.—I believe that is another tender. The tender on one to twenty is on tourings.

MR. SINCLAIR: Were these tenders asked for?

I believe some were advertised and some they wrote us. I asked Mr. Hogarth that any time cars or trucks were being bought to give us a chance to tender on them.

Q.—How can he do that?

A.—I don't know what he does. I suppose they have a mailing list or something
Witness excused. The Committee then adjourned.

Public Accounts Committee.

April 20th, 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a. m. Mr. Curry in the chair.

Otter Elliot called and sworn; examined by Mr. Price.

Q.—What position do you occupy in the moving picture department?

A.—I am director of moving picture branches for the Province.

Q.—In what department was that?

A.—The Treasury Department.

Q.—How long have you been employed in the Department ?

I have been employed in the Treasury Department since 1911.

Q.—How long in the moving picture branch, the motion picture bureau ?

A.—Since January 1920.

Q.—What were you on immediately before that ?

A.—Inspection of Theatres.

Q.—How long did you hold that position ?

A.—A little more than two years.

Q.—Were you chief inspector all that time ?

A.—From 1911 until 1915 I was a member of the Board of Censors. From 1915 until 1917 I was assistant inspector of theatres.

Q.—Who was the inspector ?

A.—The late Mr. Newman.

Q.—On the death of Mr. Newman you were made inspector of moving picture theatres ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was the director of the bureau ?

A.—Mr. Johnston from 1917 until the Fall of 1918. He died and Mr. Dawson took his position.

Q.—Mr. S. C. Johnston wasn't it ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He was the first director of the bureau ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was established in 1917 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now under Mr. Johnston there were how many assistants ?

A.—I don't know that.

Q.—You would know Mr. Dawson and Mr. Tawse ?

A.—I knew about a year ago that Dawson and Tawse were in the bureau. I had never met the men.

Q.—When did you become head of the bureau—in January 1920 ?

A.—I would not say that. The various moving picture departments that had to do with the movie business were put under my charge and the respective heads remained the same.

Q.—You were made director ?

A.—No, sir. e

Q.—Who was ?

A.—Mr. Dawson.

Q.—What was your position ?

A.—I was simply in charge of the various branches, the amusement tax branch the theatre inspection branch.

Q.—Who was in charge of that before ?

A.—Mr. J. T. White. He resigned.

Q.—Theatre inspection branch, that is what you were in charge of before ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What others ?

A.— The motion picture bureau, the board of censors.

Q.—Anything else ?

A.— That is all.

Q.—What about the advertising branch, the censoring of advertising ?

A.—That is part of the board of censors branch.

A.—That was under your supervision ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, the moving picture bureau, what were your duties in the moving picture bureau ?

A.—My duties were to supervise it along with the other branches.

Q.—The amusement tax branch, what were your duties there ?

A.—I was simply in charge of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Tell Mr. Price when you came to work in the morning what you had to do during the day while engaged in this particular work ?

A.—It was really matters of administration.

MR. PRICE: You could say that about anything. I want to know what your duties were in that branch ?

A.—I answered certain correspondence. I certified to accounts payable and I authorized the expenditures. I also directed the man in charge as to his duties.

Q.—Then the collection of the tax on motion picture theatres in Ontario.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Take the theatre inspection branch, what did you do in that ?

A.—I directed inspection and did inspection myself and supervised the issue of licenses.

Q.—Each theatre was licensed ?

A.—Yes, and the operators of the theatres and assistant operators were also licensed.

Q.—Then in the motion picture bureau itself, what was the work carried on there ?

A.—They saw to the making of motion pictures having to do with the Province and getting circulation for them.

Q.—What kind of pictures did you get out there ?

A.—Agricultural pictures, scenic, industrial, pictures of the resources of the Province.

Q.—Originally they were mostly agricultural pictures ?

A.—Yes, as far as I know.

Q.—Who was it appointed you in charge of this work ?

A.—Hon. Mr. Smith.

Q.—You took over the work that Mr. White was doing and you continued to work in your inspection branch, you supervised Mr. Dawson and you acted on the Board of Censors ?

A.—No, sir, I never acted.

Q.—You said you were on the Board of Censors ?

A.—No, I never said that. I said I was placed in charge of that branch.

Q.—What were your duties in the Board of Censorship ?

A.—Just simply to look after the payment of accounts, the collection of censorship fees. I had nothing to do with the decisions of the Board of Censors on films.

THE CHAIRMAN: He was a member of the board prior to 1915.

MR. PRICE: When a film was to be censored, when you were first upon the Board of Censors, what was the usual practice ? Did the film come into your department first ?

A.—Do you mean at the time I was in the Board of Censors myself ?

Q.—Yes ?

A.—The film was brought in, the censor fee paid, the film censored and the decision was made, and the film was returned to the owners.

Q.—You were notified there was a film to be censored, and then you brought it up to the Board of Censors ?

A.—The only thing was the film was brought in. I was only with the Board of Censors until 1915.

Q.—I thought you were there at a later date than that ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then when you became director or supervisor of the moving picture bureau and had charge of the censorship branch what were the duties of the censorship branch.

A.—To censor films and to give a decision.

Q.—When a film came in to be censored what did you do. What action did you take.

A.—Films were coming in there steadily from 9 until 5. I never interfered with them coming in or going out. I had nothing to do with it except to collect the fee.

Q.—When a film came in to your department, did your department refer it to someone to be censored ?

A.—No, it went direct to the Board of Censors.

Q.—It went just as it came in ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was there a report from your department to the Board of Censors on these films ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—When a film comes in it is simply passed through your branch, it is simply passed through to the Board of Censors.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Without any record in your branch ?

A.—No record.

Q.—No record at all ?

A.—No.

Q.—They just walk into the branch and right through into the Board of Censors, and you have no record ?

A.—No, sir

Q.—Don't you collect a fee ?

A.—Yes we have to collect that.

Q.—Wouldn't there be a record in your books if you collected a fee ?

Q.—The Chairman: There would be a record of the fee ?

A.—Oh yes. It would just be a record of a fee having been paid for a certain number of rolls of film.

Q.—Would there then, be a record kept in the Board of Censors ?

A.—Oh, yes. And the record of that would have to balance with the record of fees.

Q.—So you did keep a record of the fees. The film came in, the fee was paid, another came in and there was a fee on that, and another and there would be a fee on that. And the names of the films and the particulars would be kept in the Board of Censors office ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that between the two places you had a complete record ?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Price: You said that when the film came in you just put down so much fee for the film ?

A.—I might put down, 4 rolls, so much money.

Mr. Hay: The fee was according to the reels ?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Price: Who was it did the censoring during the time you were head of the bureau ?

A.—There were three members, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Wilson and Miss Cassells.

Q.—Was that during the year 1920 ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then there was an appeal from that Board, to whom was that appeal made ?

A.—To the Board of appeal composed of Hon. Mr. Smith, Mr. Matthews, the assistant treasurer, and myself.

Q.—So that practically there were two boards, the board of administration composed of Armstrong, Wilson and Cassells and the appeal board composed of Mr. Smith, Mr. Matthews the assistant treasurer, and yourself as head of the motion picture department ?

A.—Yes, sir

Q.—Now, Mr. Elliott, when you were appointed assistant inspector of theatres and inspector of theatres what qualifications did you have for that appointment ?

A.—I had a general knowledge of the theatrical business.

Q.—You had a knowledge gained from inspecting theatres ?

A.—No, sir, but prior to working for the Government I had been employed in various capacities in the theatrical business.

Q.—Had you ever handled the manufacture of any films ?

A.—No, sir. I had a knowledge of it, but I never worked at it.

Q.—Had you any experience in that line ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—At the time you were appointed you held this other position. You were put at the head of the amusement tax branch that took one man before, to look after it ?

A.—Yes. Mr. White was in charge but Mr. McKinley the chief clerk practically carried on the routine of the work.

Q.—You were given Mr. White's work ?

A.—Mr. White carried on his duties as solicitor to the treasury and looked after the other branches.

Q.—You were put over the head of Mr. Dawson ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Dawson who had had charge of the letting of contracts for the manufacture of films the Government wanted ?

A.—Yes .

Q.—You had that duty after that ? If the Government wanted any picture manufactured you had those contracts to give ? They came to you for decision ?

A.—There was a call for contracts because I could find none when I took charge of the bureau there were none in existence.

Q.—How did you arrange to have different films manufactured when you

took charge ?

A.—From January until July, Mr. Dawson was still in charge of the branch.

Q.—He didn't leave the Government employ until July 1920 ?

A.—No.

Q.—When you took charge of the branch you had supervision over Mr. Dawson's work, you told us. You were the one to whom, eventually, everything came for decision ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You spent here \$80,000 odd with one company and \$40,000 to \$50,000 with another. That is right ?

A.—Yes, sir

Q.—\$85,461 to the Canadian Aero Co. and about one half that to the Pathe company ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Tell us when you got the supervision of this motion picture bureau how you arranged to supply the bureau with films ?

A.—Mr. Dawson submitted a report on the number of films that should be made and suggested that we divide the work between the two companies, which was done

The Chairman: Was that in writing or verbally ?

A.—I am not sure. I think it was done verbally between Mr. Dawson and I.

MR. PRICE: Then you looked to Mr. Dawson as the one to go to and consult about the manufacture of films about the acquiring of films for the bureau ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you did do that ?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—He made certain recommendations and if they didn't suit you you had authority to over-rule them ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And did you over-rule ?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—You were at the head of this Department. I want to get what policy you brought in as to acquiring films for the bureau ?

A.—I asked Mr. Dawson what his policy was. He gave me a policy and I suggested going on with that policy.

Q.—Will you tell us what that policy was ?

A.—A policy of making a large number of the pictures having to do with the scenic beauties and resources of the Province that could be used for propaganda purposes in Canada, Europe and the United States.

Q.—You had been manufacturing a lot of agricultural films ?

A.—There were a great many others, scenic pictures made as well.

Q.—But not nearly so many, the great bulk of your work was agricultural films to send out to the various clubs and associations throughout the Province ?

A.—I would say a great many. I would not say the great bulk of them.

Q.—I think you will find the great bulk of them, 80 or 90. You know of course that these films were sent out to the rural districts for the purposes of being shown there ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell me how many of these were sent out ? How many machines ?

A.—No, sir. I have no real knowledge of that.

Q.—You are at the head of this Department Mr. Elliot, don't you know they sent out machines to these associations?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much did these machines cost ?

A.—I think I have sent out two since I have had charge.

Q.—There are fifty or sixty out, aren't there?

A.—There is no record of that in the office.

The Chairman : (To Mr. Price) Bring out what you mean by associations and the various institutes where these rural films were exhibited. What do you mean by institutes ?

MR. PRICE: I think they were for farmers' institutes and farmers' clubs.

MR. BIGGS: There is no such thing as a farmers' institute in the Province to-day and hasn't been for years.

The Chairman: Ask him to what places they were sent and if there is a record kept of where they were sent.

Mr. Price: Can you tell me where these fifty or sixty machines are ?

A.—I believe they are with the agricultural representatives.

Q.—In the various counties ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And would be shown through the counties by the various associations and institutes ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Where would the agricultural representative in the county show these films ?

A.—I believe at various meetings of farmers of the county, horse breeders, cattle breeders, various affairs of that kind.

Q.—Were they shown at farmers' clubs in the various counties ?

A.—I don't know. The agricultural representative makes an application for the use of a number of films, which are sent to him and very rarely does he state what he is going to use them for.

Q.—Then, it was the policy of your department to send these out to the agricultural representatives ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You cannot tell us what these machines cost ?

A.—They cost \$235 each.

Q.—That is the portable projecting machine ?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long had that been carried on ?

A.—Since 1917.

Q.—And was just continued ?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: How many more of these machines did you add to that ? I think you said four ?

A.—No, two, that is all I know of.

Q.—Making a total of how many machines ?

A.—I have no record of how many machines are out. There is no record there to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was no record there when you took charge ?

A.—No.

MR. PRICE: You have been in charge two years, why can't you get a record of it ?

A.—I have only been in charge since July of last year.

Q.—You have no record in your department of these machines ?

A.—I don't think so, but I can find out.

Q.—When you came into the Department you told us you carried out the policy as outlined by Mr. Dawson ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Just what was that policy as outlined by Mr. Dawson in respect to the purchase of films ? You purchased \$120,000 worth of films, that is what you charged up to the country. We would like to know how it was you made those purchases and on what basis.

A.—There were contracts made with both companies. They were given orders to make certain films, they were made and were paid for at the contract prices.

Q.—What were the contract prices ?

A.—75 cents per foot for negatives, 10 cents per foot for positives and I think—I would not be sure, 2 cents per foot for toning and 1½ cents per foot for tinting. With the negative I was to get what is known as test print. That was included in the 75 cents per foot.

Q.—So you really got the positive, the first copy of that ?

A.—Yes but it couldn't be used for circulation.

Q.—So you really got a negative and the first copy, whatever it was worth for 75 cents per foot ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then you got another copy for 10 cents, a positive ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then the two cents, what was that charged for ?

A.—For toning to give it color, to take out the black and white.

Q.—What other charge ?

A.—1½ cents for tinting.

Q.—What else ?

A.—There was title cards at 75 cents each and art title cards—from memory I think they ran from \$1.50 up.

Q.—How many title cards would there be to a film, I suppose you could hardly tell that ?

A.—No, they would vary.

Q.—How many title cards would there be in 100 feet of film ?

A.—There might not be any.

Q.—Does this refer to exterior work as well as interior ?

A.—That is our exterior price I gave you . That is 75 cents per foot. The charges for positives don't change. On interior work it was \$1.00 per foot and then there was photography from the air, that is, from an aeroplane, that was \$1.50.

Q.—You had some of that work ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now are there any other charges that were made. We have exterior work, interior work and aero film work ?

A.—I think that is all.

Q.—Were there any charges as high as \$2. per foot ?

A.—Yes, there was on special work.

Q.—What do you mean by special work ?

A.—For instance there was a picture made from Toronto to Hudson's Bay. That was air photography and was made at the price of \$2. per foot.

Q.—To whom was that contract let?

A.—To the Aero Film Company.

Q.—Now, Mr. Elliot, do you say that these were the prices charged by all these companies that you do business with ?

A.—There were only two companies.

Q.—Who were they ?

A.—The Canadian Aero Film Company and the Pathescope of Canada.

Q.—And you claim there was the same charge by each company ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you bought a film and commenced to inspect it to see if it was one you would take or how much you should pay for it, what did you do ?

A.—I had nothing to do with that until July.

Q.—And after July ?

A.—I found the Government had no measuring machine, no means of measuring film and I had no record as to whether the films purchased had been measured or not. I immediately ordered a measuring machine. I understood that there were a great many films taken on the statement that there was a certain amount of footage to it. I changed that.

Q.—You ordered a measuring machine so you could measure these films ?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You got the machine ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When ?

A.—The latter part of September or October.

Q.—How long after you ordered it ?

A.—Six weeks or two months. It had to come from the United States.

MR. PRICE: Then, in measuring a film, tell us how you do that ?

A.—It is put on what we call a re-winding apparatus. The film is on a reel similar to a spool of tape. It is then rolled on to another wheel by a crank which runs through a sprocket on the measuring machine and the revolutions of that practically determine the footage.

Q.—Then do you look at the film to see whether there is anything in it that should be rejected. What are you entitled to reject or do you reject anything ?

A.—I am entitled to reject ten per cent. After that I can reject as much as I please by paying at the rate of fifteen cents per foot.

Q.—If you reject anything you have to pay 15 cents per foot for it ?

A.—That is over ten per cent.

Q.—So that when you first go over a film you reject ten per cent right away ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The next thing, you would be entitled to reject ten per cent more ? That is right, isn't it ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—How much would you be entitled to reject ?

A.—For instance, a film 1,000 feet in length is submitted. We are entitled to reject 100 feet of that without cost. That would bring the film to 900 feet,

then after that anything rejected we must pay at the rate of 15 cents per foot instead of 75 cents per foot for the accepted film.

Q.—Why should you pay fifteen cents a foot for rejected film ?

A.—Because it is made under the direction of one of the motion picture bureau officials. That is photographed and perhaps afterward for some reason, poor photography, or it doesn't fit into the story, it is not taken.

Q.—Film that isn't worth while accepting ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—A man might shoot a hundred feet that it was not worth while buying ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You might reject a lot of film that was bad in itself, that didn't show anything ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It would be a blank ?

A.—We wouldn't consider that at all. There would have to be a photograph on it.

Q.—You tell me that in rejecting those films that was the policy you carried on with the Pathescopé Company and the Canadian Aero Film Co. ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You carried out the same policy with the Pathescopé as with the Canadian Aero Film Co. ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you rejected, as you told us, ten per cent and probably ten per cent more, and a great deal more for which you pay at 15 cents per foot ?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—What would be the average rejection in a film of 1,000 feet ?

A.—Sometimes there would not be anything because both of the film companies trim the film before submitting it to us. They don't submit poor stuff if they can help it. They usually trim it out.

Q.—When those films came in who was it looked them over ?

A.—Some official of the bureau, I didn't personally.

Q.—Now, who would look them over ?

A.—At the end of April last year a man was employed as film editor.

THE CHAIRMAN:—What was his name ?

A.—H. M. Blake.

Q.—As film editor, in the spring of 1920 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then it would be either Mr. Dawson or Mr. Blake would look at the films and pass upon them ?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: And they would report to you the amount of footage ?

A.—No, they would accept the film, the account would go through and would be backed up by the voucher and sent on to me for payment.

Q.—When you got that account after it had been checked up by the officer in your department, you automatically O. K'd the amount ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Now, did both of these companies charge for tinting ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Both charged 1½ cents for tinting ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Who are assisting in your department at the present time, for the last year ?

A.—Mr Hurst, he started in August of last year, Mr. Blake, Mr. Severn, Mr. Bull, he started in October of last year.

Q.—Are these all new appointees ?

A.—Yes, they are new positions.

THE CHAIRMAN:—When was Mr. Bull appointed ?

A.—September or October last.

MR. PRICE: When was Mr. Hurst appointed ?

A.—August, last year.

Q.—Mr. Blake ?

A.—April, last year.

Q.—Mr. Severn ?

A.—He was with the department before I was associated with it. There is another, Mr. Norris, he started in two months ago.

Q.—What were Hurst's duties ?

A.—Assistant to myself. He assisted me in my work.

Q.—He really took Dawson's place ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—And Blake ?

A.—He is film editor.

Q.—Severn ?

A.—He is a field man.

Q.—Bull ?

A.—He is a shipper.

Q.—Norris ?

A.—A moving picture operator.

Q.—With that staff of five you are able to carry on the department ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Commencing at the time you became head of the department the Pathscope had been doing most of the business hadn't they ?

A.—Until about February of last year they had done all the business.

Q.—Was the Canadian Aero Films incorporated then ?

A.—As far as I know.

Q.—It was in existence ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were they doing business with the bureau when you became director of it ?

A.—I understand they had made some pictures under Mr. Dawson's instructions.

Q.—Can you tell me when they commenced to make pictures for the bureau ?

A.—Some time in the summer or fall of 1919.

Q.—And when did the Pathe Company discontinue making pictures for the bureau ?

A.—They haven't.

Q.—Are they still making some ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I see here their account is something over \$40,000 in the Public Accounts and that of the Canadian Aero Film Company is for over \$80,000—

\$85,000. Isn't it the fact that the Canadian Aero Films Company commenced actively to do work for your department some time in April or May 1920 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They may have done a little work before but they commenced to do quite a lot of work about that time ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—They got the bulk of the work ?

A.—I would not say that.

Q.—From April or May 1920 until the end of the fiscal year in October they got business to the extent of \$85,461, that is for six months work ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the Pathe work for \$40,000 was for the whole year ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And most of it before April or May ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—What proportion was before April or May ?

A.—A very small proportion indeed.

Q.—You claim that the Pathescope Company supplied their \$40,000 after April or May ?

A.—Not all of it.

Q.—How much of it ?

A.—I would say \$30,000 to \$35,000.

Q.—Roughly they got \$30,000 to \$35,000 when the other company got \$85,000 ?

A.—The other company had made two or three pictures prior to that time.

Q.—I am going on what you said that the bulk of it was in six months.

THE CHAIRMAN: That amount was for the last fiscal year, from the 1st of November, 1919, to the 31st of October, 1920 ?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Price: That is not what he says.

THE CHAIRMAN: When did that extend over ?

A.—The \$85,000 extended from some time in January or February through to 31st October.

Q.—So that it was for the fiscal year ?

MR. PRICE: Not for the fiscal year, for the fiscal year starts from the end of October.

THE CHAIRMAN: In November and December was there any work done ?

A.—I do not know, I was not connected with the branch then.

Q.—Does the account show for the fiscal year ?

A.—They only did business from January or February.

Q.—Their photography is it mostly aerial work ?

A.—No, they do both.

Q.—Is the bulk of it ?

A.—Almost one half of it is aerial photography.

Q.—That is done when ?

A.—It has to be done during the summer months.

MR. HOMUTH: Does the Pathescope do aerial photography ?

A.—No, they told me they were not equipped to do it.

Q.—Aerial photography is more expensive than the other ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That would account to a large extent for the extra charge for the aerial films ?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE : Can you get for me how much have been spent in aerial photography ?

A.—I can give it from memory. It is \$41,000 I think, but I will bring a statement for you.

Q.—About the time you became head of this moving picture bureau, Mr. Dawson reported to you ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did he say to you ? He had been the head and you were put over him. What arrangement did you make with him ?

A.—I told him to go ahead and carry on as if there had been no change.

Q.—Did he carry on ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then there came a time when Mr. Dawson left the employ of the department ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What time was that ?

A.—That was in July.

Q.—Did he ask you anything about it ?

A.—Yes, sir. He took the matter up with me and asked me my advice. I told him at the time that I would not care to advise him one way or the other. He finally decided to accept it. I told him then that it was a much better proposition than he ever would have with the Government.

Q.—As a matter of fact he had been made an offer by one of the film companies ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And he asked you for advice on it ?

A.—He asked me what I thought about it.

Q.—Did you take it up with the Minister ?

A.—No, sir. I took it up with the Minister though, when he had definitely decided to leave.

Q.—You told the Minister that Mr. Dawson was going ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did the Minister say to that ?

A.—He asked me where he was going and I told him. He asked me what his proposition was and I told him. He said he thought it was better than he could do with the Government, and to let him go as soon as he wanted to.

Q.—Had Mr. Dawson had any difficulties with any of the companies ?

A.—There had been misunderstandings by Dawson with both companies.

Q.—Did he refer them to you for consideration ?

A.—No, that was prior to my taking charge of the bureau when the real misunderstanding occurred. He told me about that.

Q.—He told you there had been misunderstandings ? During your time had there been misunderstandings ?

A.—I don't really think so.

Q.—Then you commenced giving business to the Canadian Aero Film Company and Mr. Dawson went to work for the Canadian Aero Film Company ?

- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Do you know Mr. Proctor, president of the Canadian Aero Film Co., ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—How long have you known Mr. Proctor ?
- A.—It was some time in the spring of last year that I met him.
- Q.—You don't object to Mr. Proctor—you have gone on a lot of trips with him ?
- A.—I have gone away two or three times with him.
- Q.—You know Mr. Proctor very well ?
- A.—I have only known him since sometime last Spring.
- Q.—You have known him about six months but have got very friendly ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—He is one of your pals isn't he ?
- A.—No, sir. I would not class him as a pal.
- Q.—You did go on various trips with him throughout the country ?
- A.—I have only been out of the city with him twice, to my knowledge.
- Q.—You have been to New York with him ?
- A.—Once.
- Q.—You have been to the races with him ?
- A.—That wasn't out of the city.
- Q.—You have been to a football match in Kingston with him ?
- A.—Yes, sir, that was coming back from New York.
- Q.—That was on the New York trip ?
- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You have been to the races at Windsor with him ?
- A.—He went up there one time when I went up, but I went up on business.
- Q.—You were both there together ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—You were on a hunting trip up North with him ?
- A.—I went away on my vacation.
- Q.—He was one of your party ?
- A.—That was my vacation. Are you going to inquire into my vacation ?
- Q.—You did a lot of business with him, and then you took your vacation with him ?
- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—You also know Mr. Blaine Irish, the secretary and manager of the company ?
- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—Have you done business with him ?
- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—The motion picture bureau has its offices at 46 Richmond street west ?
- A.—Yes, sir.
- Q.—And the Canadian Aero Film Co., are just to the rear of it ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—They are at 32 Queen West ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—And their premises back up to the Government premises ?
- A.—Yes.
- Q.—Do you get across from one to the other by fire escape ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that you have a very close connection with this Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You can go back and forth?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—They can come into the Government offices that way?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is not a lane there, is there. The fire escape is close enough so that you can walk out on the fire escape and step in?

A.—We put a plank across from the window to the fire escape. It saves us running around the block.

Q.—So that when they needed a film censored or any business done they just walk across the fire escape into your place—very handy isn't it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—During the time you were head of this moving picture bureau, what was the first film there was any dispute about?

A.—I think it was entitled, "Toronto the Gateway of Ontario."

Q.—When did you have that dispute?

A.—I had no dispute, it was Mr. Dawson.

Q.—You had no disputes with these people at all?

A.—Oh we had differences of opinion from time to time.

Q.—You didn't get into the dispute class?

A.—We fought sometimes.

Q.—You bought a film from the Canadian Aero Film Co. about Niagara?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What was the name of the first film you bought about Niagara?

A.—I don't know which was the first. I bought "Niagara in Winter" and "Niagara in Summer".

Q.—You bought "Niagara Falls in Summer" and "Niagara Falls in Winter." Then you bought another, a combination film?

A.—I bought a print made from these two.

Q.—"Niagara Falls in Summer" and "Niagara Falls in Winter" and "Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer". I see that "Niagara Falls in Summer" cost \$1,679.54, "Niagara Falls in Winter" \$1,160.30, and then "Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer" \$1,650?

A.—I might explain to you that all these accounts have been checked over since the end of the fiscal year and we found an error in the charge made for the negative on that subject.

Q.—It looks like more than an error to me—"Niagara, Nature's Masterpiece, \$3,053.84."

A.—That is where the mistake was made on "Niagara, Nature's Masterpiece".

Q.—There was first a negative taken of Niagara Falls in Winter?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you got that negative?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You can produce that negative?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then there was a negative “Niagara Falls in Summer” ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you produce that negative ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then there was a combination negative “Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer.” Have you that negative ?

A.—No, sir, that was made from the first two you have mentioned.

Q.—There was no new negative at all. It was simply a print, a combination of what had already been taken ?

A.—Yes, that was for the Agent General’s office in England.

Q.—It was charged up here at 75 cents a foot the same as if you had taken a negative ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How did you pass that ?

A.—It would come to me, as I have already stated and the voucher would come ready for my signature from the motion bureau office. There was practically no system when I took charge. That was sent in in the ordinary courses. The account has since been checked and I find the account is not in order and I am getting a credit at the present time from the Canadian Aero Film Co.

Q.—It took you a long time to get this credit. It seems to me a peculiar thing that you get a negative in the first two instances and no negative in the third instance and yet you permitted a charge of \$1,650. That is poor business isn’t it to allow that sort of thing ?

A.—It was a mistake, sir.

Q.—That is a mistake of \$1,650 there. Then you have a charge here of \$3,053 on “Niagara, Nature’s Masterpiece.” That is an overcharge ?

A.—One of those is prints.

Q.—Twenty prints \$148.63 and illustrated titles 34 at \$1.50. Twenty prints to send to the Agent General’s office ?

A.—The Agent General’s office ordered them from me.

Q.—Twenty prints ?

A.—Yes. They have made up twenty more.

Q.—They surely never use twenty prints at one time ?

A.—I have the letter from Dr. Creelman. I will show it to you.

Q.—This is the letter from Dr. Creelman written on the 27th of January 1921, “You will be interested to know, with regard to the films already sent, that they are being well circulated. With regard to five of these films there are over 40 copies of each now being shown throughout the country in connection with the Pathe pictorial. Each of these five subjects will go to over 1,000 theatres in all, and it is safe to say that each of these five subjects will be seen by four millions of people. In other ways we are also getting these films well circulated but I think with the exception of the two copies we are ordering in this letter, we have enough to be going on with for some time ” The account here is October 19th, did you have that letter of Dr. Creelman before you ordered them ?

A.—No, sir. Mr. Percival from the Agent General’s office was instructed to come in and see me before he left for England and select the films he wanted. He selected them and told me he would want twenty copies of each one he selected.

Q.—Was it a written order ?

A.—No, sir. It all happened verbally.

Q.—Now when you get films here for your own circulation how many copies do you find it necessary to get ?

A.—Five.

Q.—In your experience here, five copies would circulate pretty well ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They circulate to different theatres on different nights ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How did you get the information that there was an overcharge on this film ?

A.—In making up the entries in the new card system. I am putting in a new system. With that system there cannot be any overcharge at all.

Q.—That was in this year. This is the 16th of February 1921, six, seven or eight months after they were paid \$1,600, you discovered this discrepancy—who drew it to your attention ?

A.—Mr. Hurst.

Q.—He is your assistant ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you a credit from the Canadian Aero Film Co. ?

A.—No, sir. I notified them that they owed me a credit for that and the value of a machine, a motion picture machine I discarded here and sold to them. I asked them to let me have a cheque.

Q.—Have there been any more credits you are going to get from this firm ?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—That is the only one you discovered ?

A.—I discovered another picture charged for but not completed.

Q.—What picture was that ?

A.—It was entitled "Shadowland." I advised them that I had no knowledge of the order of the film. I told them it was an uncompleted subject. That bill was for a negative as we were not ready to go on with the picture.

Q.—Is it not a fact that a great deal of the work done by the Canadian Aero Film Co. was paid for before you got the film ?

A.—The negative was always finished.

Q.—But before you got the film and were able to show it they were paid for it ?

A.—That practice had been general with both companies.

THE CHAIRMAN : For how long ?

A.—As far back as I can say.

MR. PRICE : You claim that the same thing applied to the Pathe, that you paid for the film before you got it ?

A.—I might say there is \$12,000 on hand now in the Pathe offices for work that had not been completed, that has been paid for.

THE CHAIRMAN : I understand that was the policy of the old Government as well as this ?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE : You mean \$12,000 of film that had never been shown ?

A.—Yes, the final scenes have never been finished, and the films never completed.

Q.—You are aware that a picture “Northward Ho ” was shown here a short time ago ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was paid for away back in October ?

A.—The negative charge was paid.

Q.—The company was paid for the whole thing in October and you didn't get it until the last month ?

A.—No. I had some of it before that.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is the negative charge all the charge ?

A.—That was all the charge made in October.

Q.—Is that the whole charge ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You answered the question of Mr. Price, that the whole thing was paid for in October. The whole thing hadn't been paid for ?

A.—Just the negative charge was paid for.

MR. PRICE : You are quite clear that the whole charge was not paid for ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The negative charge is the biggest charge ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the other charges are comparatively small, two cents, one and a half cents and ten cents. The main charge of producing the film, the getting of the negative, was paid for months before you received it ?

A.—Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN : Was it done before the negative was completed ?

A.—No, sir.

MR. PRICE : It was done before the negative was delivered to you ?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : Are the negatives ever delivered ?

A.—From the Aero Film Co, yes, from the Pathe, no. They claim we don't own them.

Q.—Neither you do as a matter of fact, the company claims that all they owe you is a positive.

A.—I have legal advice of the Department that we own the negative.

Q.—The policy in your department both under the old and under the new Government, as you say, was to pay for negatives before you received them ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long would that payment be made ahead of time ?

A.—I have no knowledge, sir, any more than the fact that films commenced in 1918 have been paid for and never completed.

MR. HOMUTH : With which company ?

A.—The Pathescope.

Q.—Paid for by whom ?

A.—The Ontario Government.

Q.—In 1918 ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They were paid for away back in 1918 and havn't yet been delivered ?

A.—No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN : What were the subjects ?

A.—Here is a list of them.

List put in as Exhibit marked "A"

MR. PRICE: Mr. Elliott, this film "Northward Ho" I speak of—is that the correct name?

A.—There was a film "Eyes North" made up from some of the negative in order that we might use it at various Fall fairs. There is only a print charge on that. There is no negative charge on "Eyes North."

Q.—Has that all been paid?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is one here "Eyes North."?

A.—You will notice, as I said, that there is only a print charge of ten cents a foot.

Q.—Where is "Northward Ho"? Is that among the vouchers here?

A.—That should be there. It is under the name of "Hudson's Bay."

Q.—In finding out this discrepancy—when did you put in your card system?

A.—Commencing the first of November.

Q.—Your card system was put right there at that time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then when did you make this discovery, this \$1,600 overcharge?

A.—I judge it would be about six weeks ago, the cards were only entered up in the last six weeks.

Q.—That is what I thought, since we put our motion in in the Public Accounts here. In finding this discrepancy or overcharge of \$1,600 isn't it a remarkable thing Mr. Elliott that a charge of this kind would go through your department?

Objection from the chair to form of question asked.

Mr. Price: How can you explain that double charge there?

A.—The lack of system.

Q.—This is not a question of system. You had "Niagara in Winter" and "Niagara in Summer". You knew that, you knew you had those films isn't that right?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And then you knew you were getting another one "Niagara Falls Winter and Summer"?

A.—I might have seen fifty accounts that day.

Q.—You might have done a lot of things. I am not going into the things you have done. Let us get down to this. You knew you had these films "Niagara Falls in Summer" and "Niagara Falls in Winter" That is correct isn't it?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And then you were prepared to buy a combination film "Niagara Falls Winter and Summer" Why didn't you immediately check that up yourself when it came to your attention?

A.—That wasn't the only film I had on order, sir.

Q.—It was a combination of the two you had. You knew you were not getting a negative?

A.—I explained to you that these accounts----

Q.—I am asking the question. You knew you weren't getting a negative for "Niagara Falls Winter and Summer"?

A.—I never looked at the account when I signed it.

Q.—You signed these accounts without looking at them ?

A.—No, not all of them.

Q.—Do you mean to say that when this came up for your signature that you didn't know you were passing an account for “Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer” ? Do you mean to say you didn't know that ?

A.—I don't remember having seen it or I wouldn't have signed it.

Q.—You say now that if you had seen it you wouldn't have signed it ?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—You had seen the film, exhibited the film, “Niagara in Summer” was exhibited ?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And you had seen that other one “Niagara Falls in Winter” run off ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you see the combination run off ?

A.—No sir. It was packed and shipped to the Agent General's office.

Q.—Didn't you see it in the Department ?

A.—No sir.

Q.—The Department didn't look over it ?

A.—I didn't.

Q.—Who did ?

A.—Mr. Blake.

Q.—You said it was the fault of the system. How was is the fault of the system ?

A.—The accounts would be received and sent down to the motion picture bureau office. If everything was in order that would be put with the voucher and sent down to me for signature. I accepted that as a proper system.

Q.—You accepted that as a check ?

A.—I accepted the system I found when I came in.

Q.—You found that system there. Under that system when an invoice came up with a picture for your signature you signed it ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Relying on it having been checked up down there ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then when you found a mistake had been made you put in a new system ?

A.—I found the system was not right before I discovered there was a mistake.

Q.—You found the system was not sufficient of a check and then you put in a new system ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And in putting in a new system you discovered this mistake ?

A.—Yes.

MR. HOMUTH: The men in the Motion Picture Bureau, would they have known anything about these two films, “Niagara Falls in Winter” and “Niagara Falls in Summer” ?

A.—Yes. The film editor would know.

Q.—Would he know that this other picture you sent to the Agent-General's office had simply been a print from these ?

A.—Yes, because he edited the picture for the Agent-General's office.

THE CHAIRMAN: He would know there was no negative ?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: You are making excuses for your department. Is there any excuse for the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—I don't know sir.

Q.—They put this over on you, this \$1,600 charge, was there any excuse for that?

A.—I cannot answer for the Canadian Aero Film Company.

Q.—Is there any excuse for the man who signed the voucher and sent it to you, the man whose duty it was to check this film?

A.—The whole voucher was signed by me.

Q.—Then who was it signed it first? This is July 17th, 1920. I thought you told me it was checked over by Mr. Blake and sent up to you?

A.—If that is July 17th, it must have been checked by Mr. Dawson.

Q.—It is signed by Mr. Elliott?

A.—It must have been checked by Mr. Dawson.

Q.—Here is an initial here.

A.—That is the audit office initial.

Q.—Is there any excuse for the man, whether Mr. Dawson or anyone else who checked over this and allowed this \$1,600 item to go through?

A.—No, not if he checked it.

Q.—Then someone should check it. I want to know whose duty it should be to check it. You say you worked like a machine when it got to you. I want to get to a man who doesn't work like a machine?

A.—It would be Mr. Dawson or Mr. Blake.

Q.—When you put in a card system, how would that card system affect the accumulation of papers and accounts up to that time?

A.—Everything was obtained from the files.

Q.—I know. You are putting in a card system. Do you tell me you went back and put in a system for six or eight months?

A.—We put in a card system right back to 1917.

Q.—You are taking it the whole way back?

A.—Yes, and I feel we will get a lot of money back.

Q.—When you discovered this overcharge, this item of \$1,600, what did you do?

A.—I phoned the Canadian Aero Film Company right away.

Q.—You phoned—you didn't write a letter?

A.—I don't remember. I don't think so.

Q.—When did you phone them?

A.—Right in my office.

Q.—Mr. Hurst brought the three cards into my office as I have shown them to you. He told me there were not three negatives and I said no. But the three negatives were charged. I said I will phone him and tell him they owe us a credit for that.

Q.—What month and what date was it?

A.—I don't know. I cannot give you the date.

Q.—What month was it?

A.—Last month.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you get a credit?

A.—Not yet, sir.

MR. PRICE: Wouldn't it be a good idea to put yourself on record with regard to that? You discovered this \$1,600 over-charge in one film with this company.

Wouldn't it have been a better idea to put yourself on record demanding it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who did you get on the telephone?

A.—Mr. Irish.

Q.—What is his position?

A.—Manager.

Q.—What did Mr. Irish say?

A.—He said he would look it up and certainly if a negative was charged for we would get the money back if it was coming to us.

Q.—But you haven't got the money back?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You haven't got a credit yet?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—That is a matter to be readjusted?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In what other case do you know there has been an overcharge, when they billed you for money they hadn't any right to?

A.—No other case that I can think of.

Q.—Outside of this one item you think the accounts of the Canadian Aero Film Company are all right?

A.—Yes, sir. Of course they were paid for film not completed, as has already been brought out.

Q.—How much would that aggregate?

A.—I don't know. It would likely be around \$25,000 or \$30,000.

Q.—That is, this company was paid \$25,000 or \$30,000 for negatives they hadn't yet delivered?

A.—Yes, sir. As it is being delivered it is being measured and compared with the amount charged. If the account is not in order we will insist on a credit, but everything has been in order so far.

THE CHAIRMAN: The negatives had been completed and they had been paid for the negatives?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And now they are delivering the film?

A.—The film has to be edited and as the editor goes through that and puts the titles in it that explain the story, he passes the film and it is then measured. That is compared with the account paid and if we find any discrepancy we will take the matter up with the company.

Q.—What have you paid in respect to these things now coming through. have you paid for the film?

A.—Just the negative.

Q.—And when the film comes through you get a bill for the film?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And then there is to be a further payment?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And your payment on the negative depends upon the number of feet of film used?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The negative may have been charged at so many hundred feet, and if the used film was only so much you deduct that from the negative?

A.—Yes.

....MR. HOMUTH: At the present time with the Pathéscope Company you have paid them \$12,000 for undelivered films?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—So that they have already received \$12,000 for work for which you have not as yet received film?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a 1918 matter?

A.—It carries from 1918.

MR. PRICE: You have told us the charge for outside work was 75 cents a foot with extras?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And interior footage is \$1.00?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And aerial film work \$1.50?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You say that in some cases where there is special work like the Hudson's Bay work it is \$2.00?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Well, now, why is it in the invoice for the Hudson's Bay film that you are charged with 4,225 feet of aerial footage at \$2.50?

A.—Then the contract is \$2.50—I won't be sure of the price.

Q.—4,225 feet at \$2.50, \$10,652; then 5,029 feet of ground film. What does that mean?

A.—That was taken from the ground.

Q.—\$2.00?

A.—That was the arrangement. The ground photography on that trip was \$2.00 where ordinarily we pay 75 cents, and we were paying \$2.50 for aerial photography.

Q.—When was the Hudson's Bay film delivered? Is that "Northward Ho?"

A.—The complete story isn't delivered yet.

Q.—Here is an invoice of delivery on September 24th, 1920, and paid for?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is one in the list. There is an advance on that of \$21,000?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. CURRY: Was the negative complete?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How much did the negative amount to?

A.—That is for the negative.

Q.—And that was complete?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So you paid for work actually done?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: It was not accepted at that time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—The negative hadn't been delivered?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You paid this amount on that before delivery of the negative?

A.—They weren't supposed to deliver the negative until the prints were made.

Q.—It was before you checked up the amount?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The amount was not checked up and the negative was not delivered but you paid \$21,120.50. That is correct?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You may be able to get back a rebate on that?

A.—I think we will have to pay them some more money.

Q.—Don't you think there has been an overcharge on all the accounts by both of these companies, both the Pathéscope and the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—I think there has been in the past.

Q.—Don't you think there has been an overcharge by both of these companies?

A.—Not at present.

Q.—Has there been during the last fiscal year?

THE CHAIRMAN: During the time covered by these accounts?

A.—I think so.

Q.—Wouldn't it be a good idea if some one, independent, should check over these films and find out?

A.—I would be glad to have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you are making out this new system, is it checked then?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is all checked?

A.—Absolutely checked.

Q.—As soon as you get the cards completed they will be an absolute check?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How far have you gone over the accounts for the last fiscal year? Is that complete?

A.—I do not know. We have started from this time backward, rather than from 1917 forward. We are going back.

Q.—How far are you back?

A.—I don't know, sir.

Q.—But it will be a complete check when you go back, and this has been done?

A.—Yes, sir, and every foot of film is measured before there is any entry in the cards.

Q.—As soon as the card system is complete you will have a correct count of the number of feet of film in each negative?

A.—Yes, sir. And I will know if the film companies owe us any money.

Q.—You will have a check on the Canadian Aero Film Company negatives?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But the Pathéscope negatives are not given in?

A.—No.

MR. PRICE: The only way to check up and find out whether you have been overcharged is to check up the negative with the invoice?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is the only way?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That work would have to be completed carefully before one would be able to ascertain whether there had been tremendous over-charge or not?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Someone would have to go through it and measure it carefully?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And in addition to that check out what should be paid for and what should not be paid for?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—To see whether ten per cent. of the film was taken off and whether other poor film was cut out?

A.—Oh no, they are accepted stories.

Q.—In checking those up you need three things, the invoice, the negative and the positive, those three things?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You would have to find out what should have been deducted when the film was passed by your department in the first instance. You may not have deducted anything?

A.—We can't deduct it now, we have accepted the picture.

Q.—But you may have accepted a picture that you should not have accepted in that shape?

A.—No, we accepted it and said it was a good story.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any pictures you should not have accepted that you know of?

A.—None that I know of.

Q.—You are checking up these films?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You check up the negative and you check up the film you have got there and you see whether you have the proper footage do you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And that is checked up with the account?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And then you know at once whether you have been overcharged or not?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You were asked by Mr. Price whether you could tell whether there were any tremendous overcharges before you checked up?

A.—Not before, after.

Q.—What do you mean by tremendous?

A.—That was just merely Mr. Price's suggestion that I could find out whether they were small or tremendous.

Q.—What has been the result of the checking up so far?

A.—I have found this one item.

Q.—This one \$1,600?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you found any others?

A.—That \$12,000 that was referred to.

Q.—Those you know as outstanding since 1918? When you get through down to 1917 then you will have the details of every over-charge if there is any?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You will have the picture there, the accepted picture with the footage and the footage of the negative?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—So that you will know accurately what you got, what they are entitled to be paid for that and what you did pay them?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: Suppose you take one film, any film you like, and you have a positive haven't you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that film when it comes into the department should be inspected by your officers shouldn't it?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you ever do that personally?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you inspect any of them personally?

A.—I have looked over an occasional film but I leave it to the film editor to pass final judgment upon it.

Q.—Who did it before the film editor got there?

A.—Mr. Dawson or some member of the staff.

Q.—When was the film editor appointed?

A.—He was not appointed until some time after Mr. Dawson left. He was appointed in April last and Mr. Dawson left in July.

Q.—I thought you said he was appointed in April of this year?

A.—No sir, last year.

Q.—In going over a film it would not be a common thing to reject 25 or 30 per cent. if the film was a poor one?

A.—I have no knowledge of that.

Q.—You cannot say whether that is correct or not?

A.—No.

Q.—You cannot say whether the rejections should be 20 or 25 per cent.?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then I cannot get evidence from you as to whether the proper reductions were made or not?

A.—The only evidence I can give you is that the man who finally accepted the film said it was a good story and passed upon it.

Q.—If it was not properly checked it would amount to a big over-charge?

A.—It would not amount to a great overcharge.

Q.—Would it amount to ten per cent. or twenty per cent.? You take off ten per cent. first and then ten per cent. again?

A.—No, sir. I corrected you before on that. We are allowed to reject ten per cent. If there is a thousand feet in a film we are entitled to take off 100 feet without any charge, then after that we pay fifteen cents per foot for any we take off.

Q.—Then supposing you bought the rest after the ten per cent. was taken off, at 75 cents or \$2.50 a foot, instead of paying for a lot of it at 15 cents a foot on the poor stuff which should be rejected—then there would be a big overcharge?

A.—Are you talking about film we have already paid for and for which the negative has been delivered?

Q.—I am talking about the film that goes in the department. If it is not properly checked, if the officer doesn't cut out the ten per cent. or doesn't cut out what he should have at fifteen cents a foot then there would be a big over-charge against the department?

A.—I am afraid either one of us doesn't understand it. My point is this: The film company gives us a negative to look at. We cut it to suit ourselves and we say, this is all right. We say this is what we are paying for. If, after measuring it afterwards, we find the company charged too much we are not going to start and

cut the film.

Q.—You inspect the negative first—do you inspect the negative or the positive copy?

A.—The negative and the positive.

A.—You run the positive through?

A.—Yes, we run the positive on the curtain.

Q.—Then what the Province pays depends upon what you reject, the amount of footage you reject?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then if you don't reject any, or very little the Province would be paying too much?

A.—Some times it is not necessary to make any rejections at all.

Q.—When a film comes up for examination in your department, supposing there is 1,000 feet in the film. If the department allowed the 1,000 feet in the charge to the Government that would amount to quite an overcharge?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—When they allow a thousand feet you claim that is not correct, whether they have cut off nothing or not?

Q.—If we are going to discard something, all well and good, but if we accept a thousand feet we have to pay for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that whole film is kept and you accept it you pay for 1,000 feet. If the film is bad and you cut it out what do you pay then?

A.—On all over ten per cent. at the rate of 15 cents per foot.

Q.—When you measure up now are you able to determine as to whether you have paid for more than you should?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—That is capable of determination now?

A.—Yes sir.

MR. PRICE: Aren't there many places where you haven't cut out anything at all and have simply taken the negative as produced?

A.—Assuredly.

Q.—Cases where you haven't cut out anything at all?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—You don't take advantage of the ten per cent.?

A.—If the story was good we might not cut at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you took advantage of the ten per cent you would cut out something you want?

A.—Yes sir.

MR. PRICE: There are many films where you haven't rejected anything?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You claim the Province should pay for the whole film as you take it?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Do you think that is protecting the Province, to go over a film and reject nothing?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—What proportion of the purchases from these film companies would show there had been no rejection, how many films?

A.—I don't know. I have no idea.

Q.—What proportion?

A.—I have no idea.

Q.—Fifty per cent., seventy-five per cent.?

A.—I don't know, Mr. Dawson or Mr. Blake might be able to tell you that.

MR. PRICE: Take some particular film. Take the film passed recently, "Damaged Goods." Do you remember when it came into the moving picture bureau?

A.—It was never in the bureau.

Q.—Are you sure about that?

A.—Positive.

Q.—Are you sure it didn't come into your bureau in the first instance?

A.—Positive.

Q.—I am told that it came into your bureau addressed to you from Chicago?

A.—It came into my office. It was addressed to me. A number of the film companies do that. They send films in that they don't know will pass the censors and the customs officials allow them to send them to the Ontario Government office in bond for censorship purposes. If they don't pass they are returned.

Q.—So the film "Damaged Goods" came addressed to you?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—To the director of the motion picture bureau for Ontario?

A.—I don't know how it was addressed.

Q.—It came addressed to your department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When it came to you did you open it?

A.—No, as a matter of fact it didn't come into my office. I got the notice from the customs officials.

Q.—How did you know what to do with it? This film was not shown in Canada before?

A.—Yes it was.

Q.—Where was it shown—it was just shown for censorship purposes. It hadn't been shown to the public?

A.—It had been in Canada, not in Ontario. In practically every other Province.

Q.—This department here had acted on it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When did it come into your bureau? The bureau got the picture, it was addressed to them and they got it?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Do you mean to tell me that picture didn't come into your bureau?

A.—I am swearing it.

Q.—You or someone in your employ down at the bureau?

A.—I will swear they didn't.

Q.—You swear you don't know anything about it?

A.—I won't swear that.

Q.—Will you swear you don't know anything about it coming into your bureau?

A.—I will swear I didn't see it in a Government office until it was submitted for censorship.

Q.—Who submitted it for censorship?

A.—The Canadian Aero Film Co.

Q.—When was that submitted?

A.—I don't know, it would be in winter, January or February.

Q.—When was it announced it was going to be shown? When was it shown?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—You are at the head of this picture bureau in the Province, you should know when it was shown. You are keeping track of these things.

A.—No sir, it doesn't belong to the Government.

Q.—Did it come up before you for inspection?

A.—The only time it came before me was when I was a member of the Board of Appeal.

Q.—There was an appeal, did it go to the Board of Appeal?

A.—There was an appeal on it about the 8th of November, 1919.

Q.—Was the film here in November, 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It had been up before the Board of Appeal and the censors and rejected?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—It came up before the Board of Appeal composed of Mr. Smith, Mr. Matthews and yourself?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What did you do?

A.—We rejected it.

Q.—When did it come up again?

A.—Just this time here in the winter.

Q.—Just the two occasions you had it before the censor board?

A.—No, it was up before the censor board back in the late Government's time when Mr. McGarry was chairman of the Appeal Board.

Q.—And it was rejected then?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When it came before the Board of Censors in January or February was it passed then?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It didn't get before the Board of Appeal the second time?

A.—There is no appeal board now.

Q.—That has been wiped out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did it come before the new Board of Censors?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And passed by the new Board of Censors?

A.—Yes.

MR. SMITH: Is there not a board of appeal?

A.—There is a board of appeal—the full Board of Censors.

Q.—What does the Censor Board do when they pass a film like that?

A.—They issue a certificate.

Q.—A certificate that it may be shown?

A.—Yes.

Do you know who owned this film, "Damaged Goods" before it was purchased by the Canadian Aero Films Co.?

A.—I just know the company that made the picture.

Q.—You don't know who was the owner of it?

A.—The company that owned it attempted to sell it two or three times in Ontario for use, a company in Chicago.

Q.—In your relationships, or your work with the Canadian Aero Film Company you were in touch with the president of the company, Mr. Proctor?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And they were pressing from time to time to have certain contracts made—this Hudson's Bay contract?

A.—No, they never pressed.

Q.—“The Silver Trail” contract?

A.—There was no contract in connection with that in my time.

Q.—When you wanted to buy a film you did business either with Proctor or Irish for the Canadian Aero Film Co.? You were directly in touch with them?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Where is the head office of the Canadian Aero Film Co.?

A.—39 Queen Street West.

Q.—That is in Toronto, is that the head office of the company, do you know?

A.—The only office I know of.

Q.—Don't they have meetings in Hamilton?

A.—I don't know anything about that.

Q.—Have you attended meetings of the board of this company in Hamilton?

A.—No sir.

Q.—You are not on the board for this company?

A.—No sir.

Q.—I am told you have attended these meetings in Hamilton with Mr. Proctor?

A.—No sir, I never attended a meeting of any kind with Mr. Proctor, in Hamilton or elsewhere.

Q.—You never attended a meeting of the board of the Canadian Aero Film Co.?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Do you remember an occasion when last October you went to Hamilton with Mr. Blaine Irish?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—To a meeting of the company there?

A.—Mr. Irish went to a meeting of the company. I was not at the meeting. Mr. Irish was going to Hamilton and I motored him up.

Q.—You have been at shareholders meetings of this company?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Now Mr. Elliott, aren't you a shareholder in this company?

A.—No.

Q.—Don't you hold stock in the company?

A.—I don't hold stock in any theatrical venture of any kind.

Q.—I am not asking broadly. Don't you hold stock in this company?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Is it held in the name of a trustee?

A.—No sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any interest, directly or indirectly in any way, shape or form in the stock of this company?

A.—No sir.

MR. PRICE: Isn't this stock held for you in the name of a trustee?

A.—If it is I have no knowledge of it, sir.

Q.—Isn't it a fact that Mr. Irish offered you stock in the company?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Blaine Irish offered you stock in the Canadian Aero Film Co.—when?

A.—In the summer of 1919.

Q.—How much stock did he offer you?

A.—He didn't offer me any amount. I told him I wasn't interested.

Q.—What were you doing then?

A.—I was inspector of theatres.

THE CHAIRMAN: What time in 1919?

A.—I judge it would be in the summer.

Q.—What was the offer?

Objection by MR. PRICE to interruption in his examination.

MR. PRICE: At the time this offer was made, you were inspector of moving picture theatres?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In what month in 1919 was that offer made?

A.—I don't know, it was prior to the election.

Q.—Now give us what he said to you. Where did it occur?

A.—In my office.

Q.—What was he doing in your office?

A.—I met him in the corridor. I was personally acquainted with him. I asked him to come into my office and sit down. He came in. It was just a little friendly talk. I wasn't busy just then. While we were talking he said "Say, I want to know how you would like to take some stock in my company." I said I couldn't afford it.

Q.—You knew his company?

A.—It had only been started as far as I know. I said I couldn't afford it. He said "Well, I don't mean that. I wanted to give a lot of my personal friends some stock." I said that as far as I was concerned I wouldn't hold stock in anything that had to do with the theatrical business. I had been offered it repeatedly and have refused it.

Q.—Did he mention the amount of stock?

A.—No sir. The amount was never reached.

Q.—Did he at any other date subsequently make you an offer of stock in the company?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Do you know of your own knowledge whether he made offers to other people?

A.—Yes, he made an offer, at least Mr. Dawson told me he made an offer to him about the same time.

Q.—You weren't present when that offer was made?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Just to follow that up, did Mr Proctor make you an offer?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Did Mr. Proctor make you a loan?

A.— Yes, sir.

Q.—For how much?

A.—\$1,700.

Q.—What was the date of that, about what time was it?

A.— In March, a year ago, March, 1920.

Q.—Where did that occur, in your office?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—At 39 Queen, West?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Tell us how that occurred, tell us the circumstances of it?

A.—Do I have to go into my personal business?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you should.

MR. PRICE: Tell us about it?

A.—He told me he would loan it to me on a note if I could get a satisfactory backer. He would not accept my own note.

Q.—How was it you needed the money?

A.—I was buying another motor car. He said if I could get a backer he would loan it to me. He would not loan it on my note. I got him a backer satisfactory to him and a note was drawn.

Q.—Why did you go to Proctor?

A.—I knew Proctor had lots of money

Q.—Proctor was president of the Canadian Aero Film Company that you were giving contracts to at the time?

A.—They had one contract.

Q.—You were giving them subjects to work on at the time?

A.—Dawson and I divided them up.

Q.—You were at the head of this department giving them work at the time?

A.—Dawson was really giving them more work than I was.

Q.—The moving picture bureau you were head of was giving the Canadian Aero Film Company work to do?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And it depended on your say so, isn't that right?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You went to Proctor to get a loan?

A.—Yes.

Q.—For \$1,700?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You went into his office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You wanted to buy a car?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Proctor said to you that you would have to get security?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you give him a note?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long was that note for?

A.—It was on demand.

Q.—Has it been paid?

A.—Not fully.

Q.—What has been paid on it?

A.—I think there is a balance of either \$80 or \$180 owing. I am not sure

Q.—You have been paying it off?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Isn't it the fact that the intention was to give you a car?

A.—No.

Q.—Isn't that right, that the Canadian Aero Film Company intended to give you a car?

A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—This money was given to you for that purpose?

A.—No sir, this money was loaned to me. Mr. Proctor knew what I was going to do with it.

Q.—He knew you were putting it in a car?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What car did you buy?

A.—A Dodge.

Q.—When was it bought?

A.—Some time in March, 1920.

Q.—You have paid this back all but \$100 or so, how was it paid back?

A.—I don't remember. There was no set amount. I paid it back from time to time.

Q.—What arrangement did you make with Proctor to pay it back?

A.—Merely that it would be paid on demand. As a matter of fact I don't want to go into my personal affairs until I have a ruling from the chair.

Chairman ruled that questions should be answered.

WITNESS: Proctor has a note and the amounts paid are endorsed on the back of the note.

Q.—At the time you paid it?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: How did you pay it? Did you pay it by cash or cheque or how?

A.—I paid it practically in cash.

Q.—All the payments that went to Proctor were in cash?

A.—Yes.

Q.—No cheques at all?

A.—No sir.

Q.—What times did you pay it? When did you start to pay it?

A.—I don't remember.

Q.—Did you start to pay it in April or May of 1920?

A.—I think it would be April.

Q.—How much did you pay in April?

A.—I don't remember, that would show on the note.

Q.—Did you get an endorser for the note?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was the endorser?

A.—I don't care to say unless I am forced to it.

Q.—Who was the endorser?

A.—Mr. Matthews, the Assistant Treasurer.

Q.—Then we have this situation Mr. Elliott, that you as head of the moving picture bureau get a loan of \$1,700 on your own note endorsed by the Assistant Treasurer of the Province?

A.—He was secretary to the Minister at that time.

Q.—And both of you were on the board of appeals at that time? Isn't that right?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What do you say was the amount of the note?

A.—\$1,700.

Q.—This very overcharge happened to be \$1,800. I don't know whether there is any connection there or not—is there any connection there?

A.—Absolutely none.

Q.—To get away from that; you had a trip on your vacation, to the North country, didn't you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Mr. Proctor was along on that trip?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Matthews was along?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who else?

A.—Mr. Long.

Q.—What was this, a moose hunt?

A.—Yes, but we didn't get any moose.

Q.—You went along, and Mr. Proctor and Mr. Irish?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You didn't seem to be offended at Mr. Irish because he made you that offer or stock, you still kept friendly with him?

A.—No, I never took it to heart at all.

Q.—Mr. Irish was along on the trip—that was in October, 1920?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Proctor, Mr. Matthews and yourself—who else?

A.—Mr. Long, Mr. Smith, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pepall.

Q.—Anyone else?

A.—That is all I think.

Q.—You were very friendly with this Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Which Mr. Pepall was that?

A.—Mr. A. H. Pepall.

Q.—Is he in the Jarvis firm, or was he the gentleman who went overseas?

A.—He is the gentleman who went overseas, I think.

Q.—The one who was here as a witness?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you went on this trip how long were you away?

A.—Only eight days.

Q.—You had a private car?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who supplied the private car?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—You didn't help to pay for it?

A.—\$90 was what I was charged.

Q.—Do you know who supplied the private car?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Was it the Canadian Aero Film Company that paid for it?

A.—I think it was Mr. Pepall but I am not sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by that—that Pepall made the arrangement and was paid by the others.

A.—That is what I understood.

MR. PRICE: You said Pepall paid for the car?

A.—I will put it this way—he arranged for the car.

Q.—You didn't say that. You said Pepall paid. I said "did the Canadian Aero Film Company pay" and you said Pepall paid.

A.—I said I thought so.

Q.—You meant that he paid for this private car?

A.—Not with his own money, I don't think so.

Q.—Was the \$90 charge for food and refreshments?

A.—I understod that was for everything.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just explain the whole thing in regard to the private car and your paying, just as you understand it.

A.—I went on the trip and I understood the expenses would be divided up. I was told on the way home on the last afternoon on the train that my share of the expenses would be \$90.

Q.—And you paid \$90?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Whom did you pay it to?

A.—To Mr. Proctor.

Q.—How many were on the trip?

A.—Nine, I think.

Q.—And your share amounted to \$90?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. LENNOX: Who invited you to go on that trip?

A.—Mr. Proctor, I think.

Q.—Was it a Government car?

A.—No, an ordinary pullman coach.

Q.—When you said, before the chairman suggested that Pepall had made the arrangements, that you thought Pepall had paid for the car, what did you mean by that?

A.—That I thought Pepall paid for the car until such time as we paid up our shares and he got his money back.

Q.—Do you think now he paid for the car?

A.—I always thought we all paid our share of it.

Q.—Were you shown any statement as to how the amount of expenses was made up?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Was the car kept there all the time you were on the trip?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you live in it?

A.—No, sir, we went down the river.

Q.—It was kept there during the whole time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why did you pay it in to Mr. Proctor?

A.—I was having a game in the car and he came along and said "your share is \$90" and I said all right.

Q.—Why did you pay it to Proctor if Pepall was paying for the car?

A.—Proctor came along and said "Your share is \$90" and I paid it.

Q.—Then it looks as if Proctor paid for the car?

A.—I said I didn't know, that I thought it was Pepall. There was some discussion about the car, at the siding. Pepall said something about the car and I just gained the idea from that that Pepall arranged for the car.

MR. HOMUTH: That is simply a conclusion you came to from a conversation you overheard?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: Where was it you went on this trip?

A.—We went to a place called Fauquier. It is above Cochrane. We went down what is known as the Ground Hog River.

Q.—Did you have any tickets?

A.—I didn't.

Q.—Did anyone have any tickets?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Was it C.P.R. or G.T.R.?

A.—G.T.R.

Q.—Do you know the name of the car?

A.—No, sir, I don't.

Q.—How many miles would it be up there?

A.—Fifty miles past Cochrane.

Q.—You were away how many days?

A.—Eight days.

Q.—Did the party stay together, or separate?

A.—We separated for hunting purposes.

Q.—You had a film man along with you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is his name?

A.—Roy O'Connor, he was not on the car going up.

Q.—Where did he join you?

A.—He joined us at Fauquier.

Q.—O'Connor went up with one party—what party were you in?

A.—I was with the party O'Connor was with.

Q.—What film was the Canadian Aero Film Company producing?

A.—There was no film produced for the Government at all on that trip, just photographs of the party.

Q.—Were the films produced for anyone?

A.—No sir.

Q.—What was O'Conner along for?

A.—I don't know unless Mr. Proctor had him come along to make private photographs of the party.

Q.—You had some private photographs made?

A.—Yes, moving pictures.

Q.—Did you make any film of the party?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Have you shown that film?

A.—Yes, just amongst ourselves.

Q.—What is the name of that film?

A.—There is no name on it.

Q.—Is that the film that was shown in Hamilton the other night?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Did you know that film was shown in Hamilton?

A.—I don't know that any special film was shown there.

Q.—When films like this are gotten together, are they censored by you?

A.—A film like that for private parties would not be. It was not intended to be shown at all. Sir John Eaton and others make pictures of their children—we don't censor those.

Q.—If anyone wanted to get in any particular film and use it privately it could be done without being censored?

A.—Yes.

MR. HALL: I suppose you had guides?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Their expenses would be included in the \$90?

A.—Yes, that is all I paid.

Q.—You don't know whether that included the cost of the car?

A.—No.

Witness excused.

The Committee then adjourned.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE, APRIL 22ND, 1921.

The Committee met at 10 a. m., Mr. Curry in the chair.

Mr. William Dawson called and sworn, examined by Mr. Price;

Q.—Mr. Dawson, you were at one time in the employ of the Provincial Treasurer's Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What position did you hold there?

A.—The last position I held was director of the motion picture bureau.

Q.—Before that time what position did you hold?

A.—Assistant director.

Q.—How long had you been in the employ of the Government?

A.—From September 1917 until July 1920.

Q.—Your first position was assistant director of the motion picture bureau and you held that until you became director of the motion picture bureau?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What time were you made director of the bureau?

A.—March 1919.

Q.—Who did you succeed?

A.—Mr. Johnston.

Q.—Did you hear Mr. Elliott give his evidence here yesterday, were you here then?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At that time, when you succeeded Mr. Johnston, who were the others employed in that branch?

A.—Mr. W. J. Hawse and Mr. Beatty.

Q.—What positions did they occupy?

A.—Mr Johnston was motion picture director and Mr. Beatty was a field man.

Q.—What work did you carry on in that department, explain what you considered your duties then?

A.—The duties of the bureau are to see to the production and circulation of educational motion picture films chiefly in the rural districts.

Q.—You say educational motion picture films—agricultural films?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you a graduate of the agricultural college?

A.—Yes.

Q. Have you done any farming?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you carried on that work in not only educational films but agri-

cultural films?

A.—Agricultural films chiefly.

Q.—Just tell the Committee how you carried out those duties. I don't think they have a good idea of the duties of that office.

A.—In the early stages of the motion picture bureau, films were produced for such departments as required them.

THE CHAIRMAN: What date?

A.—The bureau was started in 1917. In the spring of 1917 I was appointed assistant director of the bureau. At that time the chief aim and object was to produce a series of films chiefly for the Department of Agriculture. The duties of the officers of the bureau was to be responsible for the subject matter as contained in the film, to arrange for their completion and later for their distribution.

Q.—And that was carried on until you left the motion picture bureau?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At the time you left the motion picture bureau how many were there in the Department? How many employees in the various branches of the Department?

A.—Mr. Blake as film editor, Mr. Severn as field man, that is the staff.

Q.—Who took your place in the Department?

A.—Mr. Elliott was given complete charge of the bureau. No one was appointed in my place until Mr. Hurst was appointed as assistant.

Q.—During the time you were there did you personally direct the making of agricultural films?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And other films as well?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—These agricultural films and others were made for the Government?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many were made?

A.—Approximately over 100 I would say.

Q.—Then until the early part of 1920 you had been giving considerable work to the Pathé Company?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How many companies were there that you could give work to?

A.—Two—The Canadian Aero Film Co. and the Pathé.

Q.—Had the Canadian Aero Film Co. been in existence any length of time?

A.—Not very long, sir.

Q.—When did the bureau begin to give them a considerable part of the work?

A.—After February or March, 1920, dating from the date of the contract.

Q.—There was a contract with them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In making contracts with any of these motion picture companies what was the basis on which contracts were made?

THE CHAIRMAN: The contracts will show that.

MR. PRICE: What were the rates charged?

A.—75 cents per foot for the negative and the test print, that is for exterior negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what is spoken of as the positive?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: The contracts for both of these companies were on the same basis, is that right?

A.—Yes sir, as far as I know.

Contract produced—

MR. PRICE: The negative and first print were 75 cents according to the contract here dated February 24, 1920. The suggestion was 80 cents, that was cut down to 75 cents?

A.—I did not have the drawing up of those contracts. Those were in Mr. Elliott's hands entirely. I cannot give any very definite answer in regard to the contracts.

Q.—You had nothing to do with drawing up these contracts?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then I see by the letter of the Canadian Aero Film Co., dated February 24, 1920, "for negative and first print for aero work for a territorial limit not exceeding two hours' flying distance from Burlington, \$1.50." Do you know anything about this?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That is correct?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Negatives on interior work \$1.15 per foot, cut down I believe to \$1.00 per foot. Then what was the charge for prints?

A.—Ten cents per foot.

Q.—What for toning?

A.—2½ cents I think, I would not be sure of that.

Q.—Tinting—was there tinting additional—what was that?

A.—One cent or 1½ cents.

Q.—What was the charge for copies?

A.—Ten cents per foot.

Q.—Now just tell the committee; when a film was ordered and the negative and test print brought into you, how did you check it up and ascertain if it should be passed?

A.—I didn't carry out the contract with the Canadian Aero Film Co., to any extent, practically what experience I had was with the Pathé. The policy followed then was this; one of the men accompanied the photographer, he being responsible for the subject matter. The film was brought in and fully developed and we required the Pathé company to cut out from the negative all camera stops and all waste negative.

Q.—When you first went to inspect a negative to find out whether the bureau would accept it for the Province, you first cut out all camera stops?

A.—Yes, the company were required to do that before we saw the negative.

Q.—Were the company required to do that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When they brought you the negative the camera stops were cut out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What else was cut out?

A.—The waste negative.

Q.—Explain what you mean.

A.—Very often when the camera is started two or three feet of negative is

wasted. And we find pieces of negative either from conditions of weather or some other cause that are practically of no use to the picture. That was always cut out.

Q.—Who was it cut that out?

A.—It was cut out by the Pathé Co.

Q.—It would be cut out by any company doing business?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Why are you speaking particularly of the Pathé Co.?

A.—Because my experience was with that company, as director of the bureau.

Q.—Then we have the camera stops and the waste negative cut out, anything else?

A.—Practically nothing else.

Q.—On what basis then do you cut out things from the film?

A.—After that had been done the company made a test print of the negative brought in by the photographer. Then we saw that test print screened and we had a right to exercise a ten per cent. reduction from that.

Q.—Was that a ten per cent. reduction after the camera stops and the waste negative had been cut out?

A.—Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you call it a negative if it hadn't anything printed on it?

A.—Yes, you would call it negative, it is negative film.

MR. PRICE: Go on and tell me how you protected the Province in your inspection and rejection of film?

A.—As I was saying we had that test print screened and if necessary we exercised a right to cut out up to ten per cent. That might include poor photography or anything not of material benefit to the picture. If the test print as screened was accepted then the test print was measured and the invoice based on the measurement.

THE CHAIRMAN: If nothing had to be cut out then you didn't take advantage of the ten per cent.?

A.—No, sir. The ten per cent. allowed us to take out poor photography or anything not of material advantage to the picture.

MR. PRICE: Who was it measured up the film?

A.—It was measured by officials of the company and witnessed by myself or a member of the staff and signed for by a representative from the bureau.

Q.—Mr. Elliott said here yesterday that there was no measuring machine owned by the Government?

A.—No, we had no measuring machine of our own because we had no place to keep film in, and all negatives and film were kept in the Pathé Building and everything was measured there, but always in the presence of a representative of the motion picture bureau and signed by that witness.

Q.—Either by yourself or some other representative?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is a standard measuring machine, I presume?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Which records automatically?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you give us an estimate of what the average reduction would be on

a film?

A.—It is difficult to strike an average because at times we find it necessary to reject almost fifty per cent. and sometimes we reject nothing. Always, of course, there is the first rejection for camera stops.

Q.—Which would be made by the company as something they could not put in as a business proposition.

A.—Yes.

Q.—If you felt there were sections that wouldn't show up and draw a crowd you would cut it out?

A.—Exactly.

Q.—You cut down that film to what was commercially useful?

A.—Yes but we always accepted responsibility for the subject matter, if the photography was good, we accepted it.

Q.—Now can you tell me the first time the Canadian Aero Film Co. got in touch with you to do business?

A.—The first time I discussed business with the Canadian Aero Film Co., was when they were at their King Street place, King and Spadina. I saw a film screened there called "The Silver Trail"—the Toronto-Hamilton Highway, which I liked very much. I discussed that film with them at the time, and my impression is clear that at that time I understood the film was being made for the Canada Cement Company.

Q.—You happened to be in this company's premises and the question of this film came up?

A.—I saw that film screened there.

Q.—Who was the inspector of motion picture theatres at that time?

A.—Mr. Elliott.

Q.—You were then head of the bureau?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell me what date or month that would be?

A.—No, I would say early in 1919 or the early part of the summer, that is approximate

Q.—Then just tell us about "The Silver Trail." What happened about "The Silver Trail."

I liked the film very much. At that time I was endeavoring to arrange for the distribution of films throughout the theatres of Canada. I felt that it would be possible that we could make good use of that film in that distribution, and I suggested to the Canadian Aero Film Co., that if an arrangement could be made with the Canada Cement Co. I would be glad to purchase the necessary number of copies to take care of my distribution.

Q.—You understood it had been ordered and manufactured for the Canada Cement Company, how did you understand that?

A.—Well I cannot say definitely how I got to understand that.

Q.—It wasn't ordered by the Government?

A.—No, certainly not.

Q.—But you thought it was a good enough film that you could order some copies of it?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did you do?

A.—I asked Mr. Irish to take it up with the Canada Cement Company.

The thing hung fire for some time, I cannot say definitely what happened. But the crux of the whole thing, as I remember it, is that an invoice came from the Canadian Aero Film Company for the negative and print.

Q.—Give me that date, the month?

A.—I would say January 1920 or thereabouts.

Q.—The invoice came from the Canadian Aero Film Co., for how many prints?

A.—Four, I think, and not having ordered the negative or the prints I refused to pass their account. The thing hung fire and we had a lot of discussion over it and it was still in that state when the change was made and Mr. Elliott was made director of the Motion Picture Bureau.

Q.—You had quite a lot of discussion about this, was your discussion with Mr. Irish?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Who is Mr. Irish?

A.—He was the general manager of the Canadian Aero Film Company.

Q.—And you were refusing the invoice?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then what did Mr. Irish do when you refused the invoice?

A.—We had quite a lot of discussion in the office about it.

Q.—In your office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In the Buildings here?

A.—No, at 46 Richmond Street.

Q.—How long have these offices been at 46 Richmond Street?

A.—I would say two years.

Q.—Then at 46 Richmond Street you had considerable discussion about it, Mr. Irish came in there and you refused the invoice. Tell me what occurred at that interview?

A.—I told him my reasons for not passing the account, that my clear understanding was that the film was produced for the Canada Cement Company, was not ordered by the Government and that we were not entitled to pay for the negative. He asked me if I thought he was trying to put something over. I said, no, I was not taking that stand but I wanted to know what I was doing before I signed an account. He gave me a lot of abuse, swore at me pretty strong, and I invited him to leave the office.

MR. PRICE: Go ahead.

A.—I invited him to leave the office and in plain language he told me then that he would get me.

Q.—What did he mean?

A.—I don't know what he meant.

Q.—Then, Mr. Dawson, what was the other thing he said?

A.—He said he would get me, and after that there was nothing more at that meeting. I told him to sit down until he cooled off, that the whole thing was evidently a misunderstanding and that if they could make it clear to me that the film was not made for the Canada Cement Company I might see the thing in a different light. I still held the account. That was about the time that Mr. Elliott was made director of the bureau. I don't know whether Mr. Irish

went to him, or he went to Mr. Irish, but the conclusion of the whole thing was that Mr. Elliott recommended that the account be passed. He said that he had been given an opportunity to go through the correspondence files relating to this picture and he was satisfied that everything was O.K. I signed the account then on Mr. Elliott's recommendation.

Q.—Then while these talks were going on about this film, you had these talks with Mr. Irish, what else occurred with Mr. Irish?

A.—Nothing in particular except that some time previous to that he made me an offer of stock in the company.

Q.—What time would that be?

A.—Early in the winter of 1920.

Q.—Was this offer of stock in the company prior to, or after the time he said he would get you?

A.—Prior I would say.

Q.—Where was the offer made?

A.—In my office.

Q.—At 46 Richmond Street?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was it led up to that offer? What was the discussion?

A.—Nothing at all. He came in for a friendly visit, I supposed, and that was the outcome of the visit.

Q.—How did he put the thing, how did he broach it to you?

A.—I cannot recall the exact words except that he offered me a block of stock, that if I would name a trustee to hold the stock the thing would be put through.

Q.—How much stock?

A.—As near as I can recollect it was somewhere around \$2,000.

Q.—He said that if you would name a trustee to hold the stock the thing would be put through; what did you tell him?

A.—In plain language I told him, nothing doing.

Q.—What reason did he give for offering you this?

A.—None at all, sir.

Q.—Now following these two interviews—had the invoice of "The Silver Trail" been before the Bureau all that time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Had you the negative at all?

A.—No sir, the negative was not delivered.

Q.—Were the prints delivered?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Nothing had been delivered, there had been a bill sent in for four prints and nothing had been delivered?

MR BRACKIN: When was the bill sent in?

A.—I cannot recall the exact time, I held it a month or six weeks in my office.

MR PRICE: When was it Mr. Elliott was appointed as head of the Bureau?

A.—In March 1920.

Q.—Was that before or after this interview with Mr. Irish

A.—After.

Q.—Mr. Elliott said here, you told him you had been made this offer?

A.—Yes, I did tell him.

Q.—Did you tell him at the time?

A.—I don't remember when I told him but I remember telling him about it.

Q.—How did it come that you were replaced as head of the Bureau?

A.—I cannot answer that.

Q.—How did you get the information about it?

A.—I got a letter from the Hon. Peter Smith advising me to that effect, that Mr. Elliott was given complete charge and that I was to take charge of the agricultural work of the Bureau.

Q.—Do you remember the date of that letter?

A.—I would say about the 15th of March, 1920. (Copy of letter sent for).

Q.—The purpose of the letter was that Mr. Elliott was put at the head of the Bureau and you were to carry on with the agricultural business?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did you do when that happened?

A.—I discussed the work with Mr. Elliott and he told me to carry on, that he didn't want to interfere with me. I was to carry on. We discussed the work that was to be done and the understanding was that the work was to be divided between the two companies, the Pathéscope and the Canadian Aero Film Company, and my recollection is, that we had a list of subjects received from each of these companies in addition to some subjects that we recommended. A definite programme was decided upon.

Q.—What was your programme?

A.—When I say that, I mean that the work was to be definitely divided between the two companies.

Q.—What do you mean by that—definitely divided?

A.—That as nearly as possible the work was to be divided evenly between the two companies, provided conditions were right.

Q.—How did you proceed then in letting this work?

A.—Well, I started to take care of the agricultural work in particular and made provision for getting that programme under way.

Q.—How many agricultural films did you then have under way?

A.—We had not so many on general subjects. We had a series of live stock films under way which later developed into ten or twelve different subjects. I was devoting my attention to that series.

Q.—Can you recollect the names of those subjects?

A.—That particular series dealt with the various breeds in the Province and would be practically subdivided according to the number or breeds—Holsteins, Ayrshires and so on.

Q.—What company got those?

A.—The Pathé.

Q.—What did the Canadian Aero Film Company get?

A.—I can't recollect. I had very little to do with the work done with that company from that time until I left in July.

Q.—Did you have anything to do with a picture called, "Nature's Classics"?

A.—That "Nature Classics" was a trade name or slogan or whatever you call it of the Canadian Aero Film Company. All the pictures produced by them were called under that name.

Q.—Were there any of these delivered during the time you were at the Motion Picture Bureau?

A.—I cannot recall any.

Q.—That was after you left?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you recall from memory any films that were delivered during the time you were there?

A.—No sir, I cannot.

Q.—Then, Mr. Dawson, there came a time when you left the Bureau, how did that occur?

A.—Mr. Blaine Irish, manager of the Canadian Aero Film Company at that time, made an offer which was in excess of the salary I was drawing. I simply accepted because I thought I was bettering my position.

Q.—What date was that—that was in 1920 some time?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What date?

A.—I would say in June, the latter part of June.

Q.—Just tell us how that occurred, this was the third time Mr. Irish had come to you with different offers?

A.—As a matter of fact, in discussion with him I referred to the fact that if I could get a good opening in commercial life, I would prefer it to Government work because I thought there were greater possibilities for advancement. When he came to me he recalled that and said they had a place for me in their company and made a definite offer of so much per year and asked me to consider it.

Q.—How much was that in advance of what you were getting?

A.—\$1,000.

Q.—When you got this offer what did you do?

A.—I considered it carefully for some time and discussed it with Mr. Elliott.

Q.—Did he want to keep you in the Bureau?

A.—Well, he didn't advise me one way or the other. He practically came out and said he would rather the choice would be mine.

Q.—Did you write to the Department about it?

A.—No sir. I discussed it with Mr. Elliott.

Q.—Did you take it up yourself with the Minister?

A.—No sir, I didn't.

D.—Did you ask to have it taken up with him?

A.—I spoke to Mr. Elliott and I expected he would take it up with the Minister.

Q.—Can you recall what Mr. Elliott said to you?

A.—He told me he had discussed it with the Minister, that the Minister said I was a nice little fellow, that he was sorry to see me go but that he couldn't compete with these commercial salaries.

Q.—So then you did go to the Canadian Aero Film Company and left the employ of the Government?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Getting back to the letter of March 13th, 1920, Mr. Dawson, you received a letter from the Provincial Treasurer. This is the letter:—“After consultation with the Civil Service Commissioner I have decided to have you devote your efforts to the production of agricultural films, in view of the special qualifications

you possess along agricultural lines. The general direction of the work of the Bureau is henceforth in charge of Mr. O. Elliott from this date. For your information I may say that the Government has decided upon an extensive programme in connection with agricultural films which will require your very best efforts, to promote the interests of the Province. I should be much obliged if you will give this programme your earnest attention, Yours very truly," signed I presume by the Provincial Treasurer, to "W. Dawson, Motion Picture Bureau."

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you the original?

A.—The original was left in the files.

MR. PRICE: Now you told us you had produced up to that time upwards of one hundred agricultural films?

A.—That is the approximate number.

Q.—And in March Mr. Johnston had been head of the Bureau and he also had been a graduate of the Agricultural College?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Tawse also?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How many agricultural films did you produce before you left the Department.

A.—During the Spring of 1920?

Q.—Yes?

A.—As I said, we were working on that live stock series. We produced a film, co-operative egg marketing. These were the two different subjects I was working on.

Q.—How many would that be, up to the time you left?

A.—Twelve, or thirteen or fourteen. They were under way. They were

Q.—Then you went to the Canadian Aero Film Company, what position did not completed at that time. you hold there?

A.—My position was similar in some respects to the one I was holding in the Department. I was to arrange for the production of motion picture films, line up the subjects and assign the photographers to it.

Q.—Who was president of the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Mr. Proctor.

Q.—Can you give me the other officers of the company?

A.—Mr. Irish was the general manager.

Q.—Is that Alexander Irwin Proctor?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was the vice president?

A.—Mr. Thompson, I think.

Q.—Where does he live?

A.—In Hamilton.

Q.—Can you give me the names of the Board?

A.—As I remember, Mr. W. B. Cleland, he was on the license board, or had something to do with the dispensaries.

Q.—That is Mr. Proctor, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Cleland, what others?

A.—Mr. McGill.

Q.—Where does he live?

A.—In Hamilton I understand.

Q.—Then Mr. Irish was general manager, was he on the Board?

A.—I understood he was.

Q.—Who was the secretary-treasurer of the company?

A.—I really don't know, sir.

Q.—Then when you got to the Canadian Aero Film Company you were carrying on much the same work for them as you were carrying on for the Government here?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—The films were made up on the orders of the Department and supplied to the Department?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell me the names of some films made up for the Government when you were there?

A.—There were quite a number of films the company was working on when I went over there and quite a number started after I went there—"The Hydro-Electric System in Ontario." There was a farm picture made at St. Catharines and a great many more but I can't recall the subject.

Q.—Do you remember this picture "Niagara in Summer?"

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember that being made up?

A.—That was made up before I went over there. The company was working on it.

Q.—What time did you leave the Department?

A.—On the 10th of July.

Q.—You heard Mr. Elliott give his evidence about that picture, tell us what you know about it. "Niagara in Summer," "Niagara in Winter" and "Niagara, Winter and Summer" and there was an overcharge for an extra negative of \$1,600.

A.—As I understand it there were two pictures produced, "Niagara in Summer" and "Niagara in Winter," and "Niagara, Nature's Masterpiece" was a composite film from those two subjects.

Q.—It was not a negative?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Just a film made from those two subjects?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did any invoice come in while you were there, before you left the Bureau, for that film?

A.—No, sir. The work was done on that "Niagara, Nature's Masterpiece" after I joined the Canadian Aero Film Company.

Q.—You had nothing to do with the passing of that film?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Now supposing you had to pass that film, that it had come before you when you were in the Bureau, what would you have done, what was the practice there in dealing with a film of that kind?

A.—Naturally I would have checked it up and if I had found any overcharge I would have returned it to the company for correction.

Q.—What would be the proper charge in a case of this kind?

A.—The proper charge would be ten cents per foot for film with an extra charge for new titles.

Q.—Now there is another film "The Shores of Lake Ontario" and "A Day's Pleasure." Do you know anything about that?

A.—Yes, that film was produced while I was with the Canadian Aero Film Company.

Q.—Is that the same film?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Why should there be two names?

A.—The first name "By the Shores of Lake Ontario" was the title under which the film was produced, as a working title. We often have a working title and when the film is finally edited that may be changed. The film as it went out was called "A Day's Pleasure." It was commenced and the scenes made under the title of "By the Shores of Lake Ontario."

Q.—I would like to have produced the invoices for "By the Shores of Lake Ontario" and "A Day's Pleasure". Do you know what charge was made for that film?

A.—I was not responsible for the charge at that time.

Q.—I am not asking you whether you were responsible. I am asking you whether you know anything about it. You were in the company and were making a charge for certain work?

A.—I recall that the negative as finished was charged under the title "By the Shores of Lake Ontario." When the film was finished under the title of "A Day's Pleasure" it was charged under that title. There may have been an adjustment there necessary.

Q.—There was only the one negative?

A.—Yes, only one negative.

Q.—And there should only be one charge?

A.—As I say "By the Shores of Lake Ontario" was the working title. After a certain portion of the work was completed, the invoice respecting it would read probably under that title. When the film was completed the invoice would read "A Day's Pleasure."

Q.—So there might be a charge under one name and a charge under another name?

MR. BRACKIN: Here are the two invoices, one is entitled "A Day's Pleasure" and then below, the other one "Beauty Spots on Ontario's Shores." What commenced as "Beauty Spots on Ontario's Shores" is part of the picture "A Day's Pleasure" and Mr. Hurst tells me the two were invoiced together, the "Beauty Spots" being part of the other picture and making up the total footage of this particular film. So that the Committee may understand—it is one film although there were two invoices, and the total of the two amounts represents the price of the picture. There was no payment twice for the same picture.

MR. PRICE: The first invoice here—what would this one be—"Beauty Spots on Ontario's Shores"—is that the same one?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the other name for that?

A.—"A Day's Pleasure."

Q.—On August 4, 1920, 200 feet of air stuff at \$1.50 a foot and 500 feet of

ground exterior at 75 cents—\$375. Was that the total charge for that film?

A.—No, when it was finished it was a full reel as I remember it.

Q.—Then there is another film, September 24, "A Day's Pleasure." How much would be a full film?

A.—Approximately 1000 feet.

Q.—Then we have under "A Day's Pleasure" 997 feet of negative ground and test print, 75 cents. Do you mean to say that 997 feet would be a full reel?

A.—It will make approximately a full reel.

Q.—Can you recollect whether there was a full reel in this film?

A.—Yes, I think there was.

Q.—Was there more than a full reel?

A.—There was more negative taken than was used in the final picture.

Q.—They took more and cut it down to a thousand feet, this being too long to use?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So then we have the two charges here, we have the charge for 997 feet at 75 cents under the title of "A Day's Pleasure" and we have a charge in a separate invoice on August 4, 200 feet of air stuff at \$1.50 per foot and 500 feet of ground exterior at 75 cents, making a total of \$675. That is, on that film there is a total charge for footage of 1,700 feet. Now was there 1,700 feet of negative?

Objection by Mr. Brackin that witness could not speak as to measurement.

MR. PRICE: There is a charge here for altogether, one reel of 997 feet and then 700 feet in addition. Can you tell me if there was that in the negative?

A.—I cannot swear to the footage in the negative. I would not like to put myself on record as stating the amount of the negative in that picture. The only way to get at that is to check up the negative with the invoice.

Q.—Were you there when this negative was made up?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Now just tell us how it was made up. Tell us about it.

A.—It was just made up in the usual way. The photographer was sent out to work on that subject on definite locations and it was brought in and developed as usual and made up in the usual way.

Q.—Whose duty was it to send it to the Government?

A.—I would take it, it was the manager of the company would make the final charges.

Q.—That would be Mr. Blaine Irish who would finally check it up, and send it out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Here is an invoice for August 4th, 1920. There was a bill sent in for 700 feet. Was the negative delivered at that time?

A.—No, sir, the negative would be kept there until the prints were made from it.

Q.—Was it the practice to bill as soon as the negative was made?

A.—I would say it was.

Q.—How long after that would the Government receive the film, the positive?

A.—That would depend on the work of the film editor who was responsible for editing the titles and making up the picture.

Q.—Who was the editor in the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Mr. Riches at that time, I understood was working on that picture.

Q.—Then we have on September 24th, six weeks after, a bill for 997 feet under the title of "A Day's Pleasure." You have told us this was the same negative and that the title was changed. Are you sure of that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It is the one negative?

A.—That is my recollection.

Q.—Do you know anything about the change of name?

A.—The name was changed when the film was finally edited and completed. It was changed to "A Day's Pleasure." It went out to the public in that form.

Q.—Then what is your explanation of these two invoices? We have two invoices here and we want some light on that.

A.—The only explanation I can give is that part of the picture was produced under the title "By the Shores of Lake Ontario" and was invoiced under that title and when the film was completed under the title "A Day's Pleasure" the invoices sent to the Government were sent under that title.

THE CHAIRMAN: And a double charge made?

A.—I would not say a double charge. It was invoiced under two names. The first part was produced under that title, "By the Shores of Lake Ontario."

MR. PRICE: What was the length of the positive delivered to the Government?

A.—As near as I can recall that picture, it went out as one reel which would be approximately 1,000 feet.

Q.—If it went out as one reel of approximately 1000 feet, then the Government has been overcharged 700 feet?

Question ruled out by the Chairman;

MR. PRICE: You have told us this positive went to the Government as one reel of approximately 1,000 feet?

A.—That is my recollection of that picture, that is, that positive.

Q.—And the billing here of it is 1,700 feet? (Question over-ruled)

Q.—There was 1,000 feet in this reel?

A.—Yes, that film was released under the title of "A Day's Pleasure." I am not going to swear whether it was 1,000 or 997 feet.

Q.—We are not asking you to swear that. All we want is a frank statement of what you can give us. Do you know anything about the billing of these separate invoices?

A.—Well, they were billed under two separate invoices.

Q.—Do you know anything about that?

A.—I know they were billed on those two.

Q.—How would it occur that there are these two invoices, one for 997 feet and one for 700 feet?

A.—As I said before, when the work was being done under the first title the work done under that title must have been invoiced under that title.

Q.—If the work was invoiced under that title in the first instance and then invoiced under another title, the first for 700 feet and then for 997 feet, and you tell us, from your recollection that there was only 1,000 feet in the positive—do

you think there has been an overcharge to the Department?

A.—It is either a case of an over-charge or a big rejection. There is 1,700 feet of negative invoiced and the completed film as I remember it was 1,000 feet so there is a difference of 700 feet. It is either an overcharge or a big rejection.

Q.—What do you mean by a big rejection?

A.—In the footage used in the positive. There was evidently 1,700 feet of negative produced, according to the invoices.

THE CHAIRMAN: This 997 feet was charged in the final bill under a new titles. Do you swear that there was a charge for 1700 feet, or that the amount charged for was the final billing under the new title? The invoices show two titles. Do you know whether what was charged for under the previous title was charged for under the final title at 997 feet?

A.—No.

Q.—Then if they only charged for the 997 feet there would be no overcharge?

MR. PRICE: But they were paid for under both titles. Here are the invoices that show payment was made in both cases.

Q.—Now, Mr. Dawson, how would you check up and find if there has been an overcharge to the Government?

A.—There is only one way to check up and that is to have the negative checked up and measured and the positive measured as well.

Q.—And checked with the invoices?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That would show whether there has been an overcharge or not? That is correct, isn't it?

A.—I think so.

Q.—Now we have just touched one account and I propose to go into some others, but before we go into that—what did the Canadian Aero Film Company do when they were invoicing films to the Government? What was their policy or practice?

A.—As I saw it there, the negative as it came from the laboratory was measured, and the measurement of that negative was sent into the office.

Q.—Do you mean that the whole negative as taken was measured and the Government billed for it?

A.—The whole negative as taken was certainly measured.

Q.—There was no ten per cent reduction, as you spoke of, in the first measurement?

A.—Not in the first measurement.

Q.—What happened then? The Canadian Aero Film Company were going to pass that negative over to the Government. How would you proceed with that work when with that Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—As I understand it the negative was measured, all waste negative taken from it, and a print made. The editor of the Motion Picture Bureau would see that print.

Q.—That would be the first print of the negative for the purpose of checking up by the head of the Bureau.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Go ahead.

A.—That is practically all there was to it. He would see the first print

as made and would pass it or reject it as he saw fit. I understand he had the option of refusing or rejecting a picture on account of photography or any other reason he might see fit.

Q.—That was not the practice, then, that you followed while you were in the Department?

A.—No, not exactly.

Q.—What was the practice when you were in the Department? You told us the practice in billing the total amount of the negative by the company.

A.—I said the total negative was measured. The total negative as it came from the laboratory was measured.

Q.—Was there any rejection after it came from the laboratory?

A.—On whose part?

Q.—On the part of the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—It was fully measured. I will stick to that.

Q.—Was there any rejection?

A.—I cannot say so when the negative was all measured.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were asked was there any rejection by the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Not before the measurement, sir.

Q.—Was there not after?

A.—Oh yes, surely there was.

MR. PRICE: When was the rejection made?

A.—It was made right there with us. There is always a piece of black negative which happens in any film, that is not worth printing and that was taken out before printing.

Q.—Anything blank that would not create a positive was taken out?

THE CHAIRMAN: And camera stops?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That left everything that had been shot by the photographer except stops and what you have explained?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us whether that was what was billed to the Government?

A.—It is pretty difficult for me to say because I did not have charge of the billing. I know that the measurement of the negative as it came from the laboratory was turned in to the office.

Q.—Whom did you say had charge of that billing?

A.—Mr. Irish had charge of the billing and there was a book-keeper working with him, of course.

Q.—What was her name?

A.—She is now Mrs. Stencil. She was the book-keeper then.

Q.—What is her address?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—She is not with the company now?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are you with the company?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Where are you now?

A.—With the Imperial Life Assurance Company.

Q.—When the bill was sent to the Motion Picture Bureau to be checked over,

based on the measurement that you made in the Canadian Aero Film Company, will you tell the Committee what occurred in the inspection of that film by the Department?

A.—The film editor was made responsible for the final acceptance of the picture. I will say this. There were pictures billed before prints were made. I know that.

Q.—Before the first print was made and sent to the Department in some cases?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long would they be billed before that time?

A.—It would vary because the laboratory was pretty busy.

Q.—How would the Department be able to check up?

A.—There was only one way to check up and that was by witnessing the measurement of the picture as finished.

Q.—Could they check that up on the positive?

A.—They could check the positive against the negative.

Q.—Could they check up with simply the information sent to the Department in the invoice.

A.—The negative should check up with the invoice, absolutely.

Q.—Then when it got to the Department—I am speaking now of the time when you were with the Canadian Aero Film Company and were sending these invoices up here—when the invoices got to the Department what procedure did they take?

A.—Up to October 31st, I don't know whether there was any regular system followed except that Mr. Blake as editor would see the positive as soon as it was ready. I do not think the negatives were checked.

MR. BRACKIN: Why do you say that? How do you know the checking was done in that way?

A.—Because that was the arrangement that was definitely made, that Mr. Blake was responsible for the final acceptance of the picture. He couldn't refuse or accept until he saw it in the positive.

MR. PRICE: Now, Mr. Dawson, was there any difference between the checking up of these invoices for the various negatives and films after you left the Department. You were on the one end with the department and the other end with the company. Was there any change made in checking up?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—The department checked them up the same as you checked them when you were there?

A.—Approximately.

Q.—Were the same rejections made that were made while you were there?

A.—I would not say they were made on the negative, because all the negative wasn't measured. The film editor refused or accepted from the positive. That is my understanding?

Q.—What difference would that make? If there was any waste negative it would be taken out before the print was made and the footage of the negative and the footage of the positive might differ to that amount?

(No answer).

THE CHAIRMAN: If the negative was paid for on the footage of the positive, the negative would be paid for on the right footage?

A.—The first measurement as I understand it—

Q.—If the negative was paid for on the footage of the positive, would the negative not be paid for on the proper footage?

A.—I do not quite understand that question.

Q.—The positive is taken from the negative?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The negative which produced that positive would have the same footage as the positive, and if the negative footage was paid for on the same footage as the positive it would be paid for right?

A.—It might, under those conditions.

Q.—Would there be any other conditions that could possibly happen?

A.—Not that I know of, unless there was waste negative.

Q.—Any waste in the negative would have to be out before the positive was taken?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that if the Government paid for the footage of the negative on the footage of the positive it would be paying for the proper footage.

MR. PRICE: You said you measured the negative on the basis of the whole amount shot?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that was sent in to the office?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, if the Department were billed with that whole amount before any rejections were made, then there would be an overcharge to the Government.

Question ruled out by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you know how the negative was billed?

A.—I do.

Q.—How was it billed to the Government?

A.—It was billed, I understand sir, and I think I am right in saying it was billed from the measurement of the negative.

Q.—And did that negative contain footage that should not have been billed?

A.—In a great many cases, yes.

Q.—Then you say the company billed the Government for footage that they were not entitled to bill them for, is that what you say?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: How many of these negatives did you bill to the Government during the time you were there?

A.—I cannot recall the number.

Q.—Approximately what number?

A.—I would say there must have been twenty or thirty. I do not know whether that is correct or not, that is approximate.

Q.—And these negatives being billed, as you told the chairman, on the negative copy as it came in, what should be the deduction from the negative copy? What is the average deduction from the negative copy as it comes in?

A.—That varies very largely depending on the amount of wastage, camera stops and so on.

Q.—What was your average reduction on negatives when you were with the Department?

A.—I would say they would vary from five to ten per cent.

Q.—What else would there be—the stops would be out, the waste negative would be out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How much would the whole thing be, what proportion of the negative?

A.—I said five to ten per cent would cover it.

Q.—We got the impression from Mr. Elliott, that there was an even larger reduction. He said they made a ten per cent. reduction right away, that they had a right to do that?

A.—My experience is that the negative was measured as soon as it came from the laboratory.

Q.—I know that, but to get back to what Mr. Elliott said yesterday. He said there was a reduction of ten per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: He said they had a right to reject ten per cent. without paying.

MR. PRICE: I got it into my head, Mr. Dawson, that that was a reduction that was made right away anyway. Was I right or wrong in that? What was the practice when you were with the Department in regard to rejecting films?

A.—I held the company responsible for removing camera stops and waste negatives, then the test print was made from the balance.

Q.—What is this ten per cent. reduction we have heard of?

A.—It means waste negative.

Q.—Does it mean negative rejected, or that you can reject?

A.—That can be rejected.

Q.—But it is not necessary to reject it?

A.—No, not if the negative is good.

Q.—Supposing a lot was cut out by the company before it was brought to the Department, then the rejection would be much less by the Department?

A.—Oh yes.

Q.—If the whole negative was measured as it came from the laboratory then the rejection would be a great deal more?

A.—It should be. But the ten per cent. we were entitled to, took care of the waste negative.

Q.—Then with the measurement of this negative and the billing of it, is there any other way that the interest of the Department should be looked after?

A.—I believe in having the negative checked.

Q.—What do you mean? Would the negative be brought into the Government offices and checked over?

A.—That would depend on whatever arrangement could be made, either in the offices of the company producing it or in the Government.

MR. HOMUTH: What do you mean by checking?

A.—Measuring.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not call it a negative for measurement purposes, with blanks?

A.—The negative as it is exposed is known as negative.

Q.—For measurement purposes that would come out immediately after it was developed before there would be any print from it at all?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The stops would be taken out before there was any print from it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Anything that was hazy, that would not make a proper print was taken out?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So then it might be measured before or immediately after the first positive, which? Would it be measured after the first positive or before, after these were taken out?

A.—The negative should be measured after the stops are taken out.

MR. PRICE: I got it in my head Mr. Dawson that that was a reduction that without anything being taken out?

A.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of billing, how was it measured?

A.—That is the only measurement I know anything of.

Q.—The only measurement you know of is the amount of the film that came from the laboratory as the developed film?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then what was cut out afterward and what was billed, you don't know anything about?

A.—As I said, that measurement was sent into the office.

Q.—You told me that. I am asking another question. After that was cut out do you know what was billed as the negative?

A.—Well, I took it the first measurement was the footage used.

Q.—As a matter of business you have so much film and so much film is given to the operator?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When it comes from the laboratory there had been so much film developed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the laboratory is entitled to be credited for the amount of film developed, I suppose?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In the laboratory costs?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then after it is cut out and gone over you print your first positive?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did they bill? Not what the laboratory sent out as the amount of the film developed, because that measurement would be necessary for cost purposes, and would have nothing to do with the rendering of the bill?

A.—I said that in a great many cases the negative was measured and I am satisfied was billed before the first print was made.

Q.—Do you know it was?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You do?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—As a matter of absolute positive knowledge you swear it was billed that way?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. PRICE: I see a bill here, an invoice for "The Gateway of Ontario" dated December 9th, 1919. The bill was put in at 65 cents a foot?

A.—That was before the contract was made, sir.

Q.—Were the old contracts at 65 cents?

A.—There were no contracts, we started with the Pathé at 50 cents and the price was raised two or three different times to 75 cents. At the time that was produced it was 65 cents.

Q.—The Pathé agreement was first at 50 cents?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long ago was that?

A.—That was in 1917.

Q.—When did they get 60 and 65 cents?

A.—I would say a year later or so.

Q.—In December, 1919, it was at 65 cents per foot?

A.—I think that would be correct.

Q.—This is a bill of the Canadian Aero Film Co. "The Gateway of Ontario" at 65 cents a foot. The Canadian Aero Film Company were supplying at 65 cents a foot?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then their new contract was at 75 cents a foot?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And was the new contract of the Pathé at 75 cents per foot too?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—The contracts were both the same?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Were there any other contracts you had?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—There were no other companies you contracted with?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Then what about the air work. We have had some talk about that. The air work was charged here at \$1.00 a foot?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is on the 9th of December, 1919, they put in a bill for the "Gateway of Ontario" and the bill for air work was \$1.00 a foot. Then on a lot we had yesterday from Mr. Elliott, we have air work at \$1.50 a foot, \$2.00 a foot and \$2.50 a foot. That was on the Hudson Bay picture. How do you explain that tremendous raise from \$1.00 in December, 1919, to \$1.50, \$2.00 and \$2.50?

A.—The only explanation that can be given is added costs. Increased costs of production from the companies' standpoint. These were the prices submitted in their tenders for the business and they were accepted.

Q.—What companies were doing aero work?

A.—The Canadian Aero Film Company was the only one I know of.

Q.—There was no competition there?

A.—No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That \$2.50 was just on the Hudson's Bay film. When they took some on the ground for that film they charged \$2.00.

MR. PRICE: In comparing this work we have this bill of December 9th, 1919, "The Gateway of Ontario" 550 feet at 65 cents per foot, then 337 feet or aero work at \$1.00 per foot. And on August 4th, 1920, eight months after that we have it at \$1.50. Do you mean to say that that fifty cent increase in eight months, in fact in two months, for the contract was signed February 24th, 1920, was due to increased costs? That contract says, "For negative and first print for

aero work, for a territorial limit not exceeding two hours flying distance from Burlington, \$1.50 per foot." In December they were supplying at \$1.00 for aero work, while in February, they wanted \$1.50. Isn't that a tremendous increase?

A.—That is fifty per cent. increase. I would not like to discuss the reasons for it. I am not familiar enough with aero work to give an opinion on that.

Q.—But from these invoices there was that increase in that period?

A.—Evidently so.

Q.—And the negative and first print on ground work is put in at .80 cents, that was formerly .65 cents, and the prints remain the same at ten cents per foot?

A.—The prints remain the same.

Q.—Now the great increased charge appears to be for the production of negatives. The prints remained the same. What increased charge would there be for the production of negative?

A.—I do not think I would venture an opinion on that.

Q.—On another of the bills of the same picture, "The Gateway of Ontario" the toning was two cents, that was increased to three cents. Can you give us an idea of that?

A.—I cannot explain that at all.

Q.—Tinting and toning two and a half cents. Under the new contract the toning was three cents and the tinting one and a half cents. That would mean together four and a half cents where two and a half cents was charged before

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is nearly an 85 per cent. increase, what do you say to that?

A.—I would not offer an explanation of that. I do not know the details.

MR. HOMUTH: As far as you know it was necessary to make these extra charges because of the extra cost of production?

A.—And special conditions. There was an increase in the cost of material used.

HON. MR. HENRY: Would that account for this increase in price between December and February? That was before this new contract?

A.—Previous to that we did not have a contract.

Q.—The Canadian Aero Film Company was incorporated in July 1919. Its contract then could only have been running for four or five months?

A.—We did not have a contract previous to this.

MR. PRICE: How did you base the charges?

A.—We accepted their price. They tendered and we accepted that, the same charges as the Pathé were making.

Q.—This looks like an increase of from fifty up to nearly one hundred per cent. in two or three months. You cannot explain that?

A.—I would not attempt to explain that.

Q.—Do you remember "The Gateway of Ontario?"

A.—It was a picture made in the City of Toronto.

Q.—That was made before you reached the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—I see the bill for "The Silver Trail"—that was the Toronto-Hamilton Highway—ran to \$1,081.57—"The Silver Trail" 921 feet. We had some talk about the prints that were sent to the Old Country. How many prints do you generally get when you buy a film?

A.—That depends entirely on the distribution you are arranging for it. I

have always found that from four to five took care of my requirements here in Ontario.

Q.—Four or five. Do you think that is a sufficient number?

A.—I think so.

Q.—What scheme is there for the distribution of those?

A.—They are definitely routed from theatre to theatre. In one they would play a week, one three days, another two days and so on.

Q.—Do you get any reduction on a number of these prints?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Supposing you take twenty prints would you get any reduction?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—In this "Silver Trail" we have twenty prints sent to England. You heard it discussed here yesterday. What do you think about twenty prints being sent to England? Did you send any to England at any other time?

A.—No, sir, the only films we sent to England were to the khaki University

Q.—How many did you send there?

A.—I cannot recall the number.

Q.—How many prints would you send?

A.—Four, I think, or five. They were for use in the University.

Q.—They sent twenty prints. From your experience in the Department what do you think of the sending of twenty prints of "The Silver Trail" to England?

THE CHAIRMAN: Kindly ask him if he knows whether it was necessary to send twenty prints or not. If he does know then his opinion would be of value, if he doesn't, it wouldn't.

MR. PRICE: What do you know about that?

A.—I don't know anything about it.

Q.—You can't give us an idea of whether that would be too many to send or too few?

A.—Of course twenty prints would take care of a big distribution.

Q.—The Committee are trying to get at whether sending twenty prints was too many.

A.—I say it is a good many prints. If they are all working it would cover an enormous country in a short time.

Q.—How many prints would be in use in a night? If you had twenty prints how many places would you show in, in a night?

A.—Twenty places.

Q.—You might show more than that if it didn't take the whole time to run off?

A.—Twenty places I think would be right.

MR. HOMUTH: If you found it necessary to have four or five in Ontario, isn't it quite plain that in sending a picture to England which is so thickly populated with so many more towns than Ontario that it would be almost necessary to have twenty prints sent to England to cover all the towns?

A.—My own experience in that regard is this. Before I left the Bureau I was taking up with the Agent-General's there the distribution in the Old Country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you ever been in England?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And do you know the conditions there?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you acquainted with them better than the Agent-General?

A.—No.

Q.—So that you would not undertake to say that his request was unreasonable?

A.—Not with his knowledge, no.

MR. BRACKIN: Do know that after the twenty prints got over there they made twenty more, and that as a matter of fact they are using forty instead of twenty?

A.—No.

Q.—Would you be surprised to know that is the case?

A.—No.

Q.—You would not be astonished?

A.—No.

MR. HOMUTH: You say they sent five over to the University?

A.—My recollection is that we sent three or four to be used by the officials of the khaki University.

MR. PRICE: Take the one of the City of Hamilton, I see here on September 7th, 1920, twenty prints of the City of Hamilton, \$3,101.60. Twenty prints at \$155.08 for each print, 1,022 feet of positive print 10 cents a foot, 1022 feet of positive print at one and a half cents, that is rejection—\$17.63—poor stuff I suppose?

A.—No, that is tinting I think.

Q.—1022 feet at ten cents—altogether \$155.08 per print. Do you remember that being manufactured by the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did that film show, what was in that film?

A.—Just a travelogue of the City of Hamilton.

Q.—Was that the film that had in it Mr. Proctor's house and Mr. Proctor?

A.—I don't know.

MR. BUCKLAND: Was it just the City of Hamilton?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: Where were these twenty prints to be used?

A.—They were sent to the Agent-General's office

Q.—So that we have twenty prints of the City of Hamilton sent to the Agent-General?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And twenty of "The Silver Trail"?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In what number of cases were there twenty prints?

A.—The City of Hamilton, The City of Toronto, "The Silver Trail" and "Niagara, Nature's Masterpiece."

Q.—That would be four of which twenty prints were sent?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that in one night they would be able to show Ontario films in eighty places?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there any necessity for showing them all at one time? Why

would there be twenty prints manufactured by your company to be sent over there. Was there any time limit for showing them?

A.—No, sir, I don't think so.

Q.—They could be used for months or years?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I see we have "Technical Education in Ontario" at the Hamilton Technical School, "Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer." Twenty prints of "Niagara Falls, Winter and Summer," were sent over?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was a combination print that was sent? You didn't send twenty prints of "Niagara Falls: Winter," and of "Niagara Falls: Summer"?

A.—Oh no.

Q.—Now, was "Beauty Spots on Ontario's Shores" one of these sent to England?

A.—No.

Q.—The McSloy farm, was that an agricultural film made at St. Catharines?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was August 4th, 1920, at 75 cents a foot?

A.—Yes.

Q.—"Egg packing" August 4th, 1920, 500 feet of interior at \$1.00 and 200 feet of exterior at 75 cents—no extra prints on that. Was the Hydro picture sent along?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are there any pictures, Mr. Dawson, any subjects sold to the Government, in addition to what you have told us, where you know there was an overcharge?

MR. BRACKIN: He is speaking of pictures while he was in charge.

MR. PRICE: While you were in charge for the Government?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can speak generally in regard to any pictures which you know were overcharged. Tell us what they were, if any.

MR. PRICE: We expect you to say as definitely as you know it. Do you know any cases where there was an overcharge?

A.—I can't recall any special cases.

Q.—Can you give us any specific cases, in addition to what you have already told us, any specific cases?

A.—I'm afraid I can't.

Q.—Didn't this question of an overcharge come up in the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—It did after the first of November.

Q.—Of last year?

A.—Yes.

Q.—1920?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Tell us how it came up.

A.—After the first of November when Mr. Sampson was put in there, in the Canadian Aero Film Company—he was made general manager.

Q.—Mr. Blaine Irish was no longer general manager?

A.—Not at that time. He was sales director. Now in the first instance at Mr. Sampson's instructions I was placed on the order desk and he asked me

to go over the work very carefully.

Q.—Just explain what that was, the order desk?

A.—It was where orders came in to the office for work to be done. I went through the files very carefully and that “Niagara: Summer and Winter” was one of the things I brought to his attention. I thought there was a mistake or overcharge or something. If it was an overcharge I thought it should be fixed right. That was one that made a clear impression on my mind because I remember giving it to him.

Q.—Which one was that?

A.—“Niagara: Summer and Winter.” I also drew his attention to this film “Shores of Lake Ontario” and “A Day’s Pleasure.” I told him it was billed under two heads and they ought to be careful that the thing was correct as it stood. Then there was “Northward Ho”—I remember drawing his attention to that—it was all billed through, as I understand, before the print was made.

Q.—Billed through to the Department?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, as he understood it.

MR. PRICE: Major Sampson in taking over the management of the company asked you whether there was any overcharge?

A.—He asked me to go through the work. It was not in apple-pie order.

Q.—Was it Mr. Sampson who placed you on the order desk?

A.—The work was not in the finest order. The company was considerably behind with the work and he was anxious to get the work straightened out so we could go ahead. He asked me to go over the orders and check them up and make sure the work was got out as soon as possible. In so doing I sorted out these few orders and gave them to him.

Q.—You drew his attention to those?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What did you tell him about each one?

A.—I told him that in the one case, “Niagara: Winter and Summer” I thought the negative was charged a second time, and he was to draw the attention of the directors to it. The other case was one of a picture being billed in two subjects and there might possibly be a misunderstanding there, and “Northward Ho” was billed through without prints.

Q.—That “Northward Ho” is the Hudson’s Bay picture?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When was the Hudson’s Bay picture taken?

A.—August, I think, I cannot recall the exact time. I think the trip was made in August. They left here in August on that trip.

Q.—Who were on that trip?

A.—Capt. Maxwell, he was the pilot, Mr. Proctor also made the trip, and and Tash, the photographer.

Q.—Was he in the employ of the Department?

A.—No, sir, he was the photographer for the Canadian Aero Film Company.

Q.—Mr. Proctor and Capt. Maxwell—is he on the Board?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Proctor, the president of the company, Capt. Maxwell, a director.

and Tash, the photographer. They made the trip to Hudson's Bay to take this picture?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I see on October 20th, there is a bill here, "negative and test print on 1,980 feet additional, \$1,200.?" There is a Hudson's Bay bill that I haven't got produced here, of two \$10,000 items. The total billing was somewhere about \$20,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—About \$23,000?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Tell us what your objection to that was, what you drew to Mr. Sampson's attention?

A.—The only objection I had to the thing was that it called for a negative and test print. The test print hadn't been finished.

Q.—Go ahead, that was about the first of November you were talking to him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—On October 20th, I see, this bill had been sent in. What did you suggest should be done?

A.—I told him I thought the test print in all cases should be finished as soon as possible and delivered to the Department. That is the stand I took. I thought the test print should be delivered, as the invoice called for.

Q.—So that the Department could check it up?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Having gone before Major Sampson with this information about these four or five films, "Northward Ho," which is the Hudson's Bay film, the Niagara film and "A Day's Pleasure" you pointed out to him that you thought there had been an overcharge or that it should be taken up with the Department?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was this reported to the board? Did you report it to the board?

A.—No sir. I gave that to Mr. Sampson and he said he would take the matter up with the Board.

Q.—What was done after that information got in?

A.—I cannot recall anything being done. I know that the test print of "Northward Ho" was completed.

Q.—When was it completed, what date?

A.—I cannot recall the date.

Q.—I don't mean the exact date. Was it completed in December of last year or January or February of this year?

A.—They were working on it for a long time. I don't know just when it was completed.

Q.—When did you leave the employ of the company?

A.—On the 12th of February.

Q.—Prior to that time had it been completed?

A.—The first test print was completed, to my knowledge.

Q.—We have here the payment of these items by the invoice of October 20th, of this year. These were paid for in the last fiscal year. Had they been paid for at the time you drew it to Mr. Sampson's attention?

A.—The invoice had gone forward.

Q.—Can you tell us when payment was made by the Government?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—You would know that the test print had been completed by the time you left on February 12th, and had been received by the Government?

A.—It was completed.

Q.—And had been sent on to the Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Up to the time you left the company on February 12th, had you received any notice in the company that the company had been taking up this overcharge with the Government or these adjustments?

A.—There was a definite working system being placed in the office of the Canadian Aero Film Company and in the office of the Department, a definite working system which would take care of that right along.

THE CHAIRMAN: Take care of what?

A.—Of the work, everything would be carefully recorded and checked.

Q.—So that there couldn't be an overcharge?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is being put in, when?

A.—Since Major Sampson came in. He arranged with Mr. Hurst a definite working system.

MR. PRICE: That doesn't apply to last year's account?

A.—No, sir. That system was being put in.

Q.—Were there any other things taken up with Mr. Sampson, any other things you spoke to Mr. Sampson about?

A.—Not that I can recall.

Q.—Why was it that you left the employ of the company?

A.—I only left because of ill-health.

Q.—Was that your only reason?

A.—I wasn't particularly enamoured with the place at all. I wasn't anxious to stay.

Q.—Did you leave the employ of the company because of any improper transaction between the company and the Government?

A.—From the time I started to work for the Canadian Aero Film Company I heard a great many rumors that I didn't understand and didn't appreciate.

MR. HOMUTH: Was that after you left the employ of the Government?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: I am going to ask you this; you say one reason was on account of ill-health and another was that you weren't particularly enamoured with the company—now why weren't you particularly enamoured with the company?

Objection by the Chairman, who pointed that Mr. Price might ask witness "if he left the employ of the company because of any improper relations between the Government and the company which were known to him," that if witness said "yes," then he might ask any further questions.

MR. PRICE: I am going to ask Mr. Dawson why he left the employ of the Canadian Aero Film Company. Why, Mr. Dawson, did you leave the employ of the Canadian Aero Film Company?

Question over-ruled, and a discussion having ensued the Chairman then put to the witness the following question.

Q.—Did you leave the employ of the Canadian Aero Film Company because of any irregularity or any improper relations in the way of accounts or the pay-

ment of accounts or the rendering of accounts by the Canadian Aero Film Company to the Government?

A.—My only answer to that is that I heard very many things that I was told and which I was led to believe would be the cause of investigation and that could be proved.

Q.—Did that have any effect in causing you to leave?

A.—That influenced my mind as to my connection there.

Q.—Did that have any effect on your leaving?

A.—It hastened my decision when my health was going down.

MR. PRICE: It hastened your decision?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it did have an effect?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: What were these things, these irregularities?

Objection by Mr. Brackin to the recital of rumors of irregularities.

MR. PRICE: Were these irregularities you knew yourself, Mr Dawson?

A.—I would not say I knew definitely of any except those things I have pointed out to you this morning. I knew these things existed and the many rumors I heard.

Q.—Can you give us any other irregularities that caused you to hasten your decision?

A.—No, sir, if you won't let me tell what I heard.

Q.—We want your own knowledge about it. Were you there when "Damaged Goods" came into the company?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell us how it came into the company?

A.—That film came in, as I understand it, addressed to Mr. Elliott as director of the Motion Picture Bureau. It came in over the fire escape, to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know it came in over the fire escape?

A.—Yes.

MR. PRICE: It came in over the fire escape into the Canadian Aero Film Company plant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—From where?

A.—From the Government building.

Q.—Were any other films sent that way?

A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—What happened to the "Damaged Goods" film when it came in?

A.—I was taken directly into the office of Mr. Proctor who was to take care of having it censored.

Q.—Mr. Proctor had it censored?

A.—I think he took charge of the film when it came in.

Q.—What did he do?

A.—He made arrangements to have it censored.

Q.—What date was it that film came in?

A.—I cannot recall the date.

Q.—Was it a date in 1919 or 1920?

A.—It was last January I think it came in.

THE CHAIRMAN: This fire escape was in general daily use?

A.—Oh, yes, we were using it all the time, going back and forth.

MR. HOMUTH: You yourself had used that way?

A.—Many times.

MR. PRICE: When was this film censored?

A.—Shortly after it came in. I don't know just when.

Q.—When was it first produced?

A.—I don't know anything about that.

Q.—Did the Canadian Aero Film Company buy "Damaged Goods"?

A.—I cannot give you a definite answer on that question. My understanding was that it was the property of the company.

Q.—You don't know who owns the film?

A.—I have no way of knowing except that the film came in to the company and I understood that it was the property of the company.

Q.—You weren't there when the film was put on?

A.—I have never seen it.

Q.—Have you provision for a private view of films at the Canadian Aero Film Company?

A.—Oh yes, we have a projecting room.

Q.—Where you can throw it on the screen and see what it is?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have they the same thing in the Motion Picture Bureau?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Mr. Elliott stated yesterday that there was a card system, being put in the department for checking up. What system did you have in the department for checking up?

A.—We had a card system for the positives, all positives.

Q.—What other system?

A.—When we measured a negative there was a book kept in the office of the Pathé Company and the measurements were signed in duplicate and we secured one copy of that. When we measured a negative at the Pathé offices the measurement was placed in the book in duplicate and signed in duplicate, and we retained one copy and that was placed on file in the office.

Q.—Mr. Elliott rather left the impression that there was no system there. that the system was at fault?

A.—I am willing to admit that the system was not as complete as it should have been but I feel that there was a working system there.

MR. BRACKIN: If Mr. Dawson was cognizant of these irregularities did he make a complaint to the Minister or the inspector and if not why not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you notify the Government?

A.—I did not. I told Mr. Sampson.

The witness was then excused and after passing a certain motion which appears elsewhere in the minutes, the Committee adjourned.

—The Committee met at 9 A. M. Mr. Curry in the Chair; E. J. Callahan called and sworn; examined by Mr. Dewart.

Q.—What is your name?

A.—Edward J. Callahan.

Q.—Do you live in Fort Frances?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you carry on a business there as a wholesale grocer in the name of

E. J. Callahan and Co, and you having the controlling interest in the business ?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And you did receive a wire from the secretary of this Committee advising you that the Public Accounts Committee had summoned you to appear before the Committee on Wednesday March 16th ?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—And I believe you advised the secretary of the Committee that his wire of the 9th of March had been received and that you were confined to the hospital with a slight operation and that the doctor would not allow you to leave ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you subsequently found that you had to remain longer than you expected ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you come at the first available time since receiving that telegram ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The telegram not having been countermanded ?

A.—Yes.

In speaking in the House on the 15th of March a question arose as to certain circumstances in connection with what is known as the timber probe. I then made a statement that I referred to as your "plain statement of the facts". I want to read that statement to you and then ask you a question with reference to it.

"At my request and upon advice Mr. Callahan made a plain statement of the facts to the Commissioners and subsequently to the Premier and to the Attorney General. Mr. Callahan had been the Liberal Candidate in the Rainy River District at the last general Provincial election and attended a meeting of elected members and Liberal candidates in Toronto, called after the election. At that time he had a long conference with me personally when he explained his views with reference to the way in which the Shevlin-Clarke Company Ltd., had defrauded the Province. He knew that I had taken up the exploitation of our timber resources during the campaign. As Mr. Mathieu, the Managing Director of the Shevlin-Clarke Company, had been his opponent in the campaign Mr. Callahan felt that the methods by which Mr. Mathieu had succeeded should be made the subject of investigation.

"He promised to give the fullest estimates that he could make and did so by letter on the 5th of January 1920. Upon discussion I assured him that I could not as a solicitor take up this matter, and that it would require the time and thought of a solicitor who must be paid for his services to put the case in shape against the Shevlin-Clarke Company. Upon my advice and with a view to securing the evidence that might be used in the House, he went with me to the office of Mr. R. T. Harding, my former partner, whom he retained, and Mr. Harding undertook the matter of the investigation. It was expected then and intended that the evidence he obtained should be available for the use of the Leader of the Opposition, in view of the attitude that I had taken with reference to timber and mineral matters and the Department of Crown Lands generally.

Mr. Callahan's statement to the Commissioners was; "My agreement with Mr. Harding was that I should pay him the sum of \$4,000 to put the evidence in shape against the Shevlin-Clarke Company. Accordingly I paid him by cheque dated February 23rd, 1920, the sum of \$1,000 and have since paid him by two cheques dated April 23rd. for \$1,000 and June 16th, \$1,000 the added sum of \$2,000. I am still under obligation to pay him a further sum of \$1,000 in accordance with

the written agreement between us."

"It is fair to Mr. Dewart to say that apart from the introduction to Mr. Harding as a competent counsel, Mr. Dewart had no knowledge of the details of the arrangement that I had with Mr. Harding.

"I am well aware that Mr. Dewart has been very much annoyed at the attitude Mr. Harding took in unexpectedly turning over to the Government the information which he had got and which I had expected would have been used by him as Mr. Dewart's Liberal supporter in the interests of the Liberal party. I was not aware of the fact that Mr. Dewart did not know that upon the opening day of the Session, the 9th March, the Commission of Judges had been appointed which apparently he only discovered by inquiry in the House on the 25th of March. I understand that since Mr. Dewart ascertained the fact that the Commission of Judges had been appointed (and I have Mr. Dewart's word for it) that he has turned over to Mr. Harding ever bit of information that he had obtained so that the course of the Government in making this inquiry might not in any way be interfered with.

"My object in taking this matter up now, is to see that the Shevlin-Clarke Company and every other Lumber company or operator in the Province of Ontario pay their just dues to the Province, and I strongly object to the recommendation made by Mr. Harding for the settlement of the Farlinger case as it creates a dangerous precedent for others to try and get the same settlement.

He also added;

"I have only recently laid these facts before Mr. Dewart and have been surprised to find that when he was supporting the Government in this action with reference to the timber probe, so fully he had not the slightest knowledge of what had transpired between Mr. Harding and myself nor as to the sums that I had paid him."

"My objections to the settlement recommended by Mr. Harding of the George F. Farlinger case is not to single out Mr. Farlinger in particular, but I am objecting on the ground that it creates a precedent for other lumbermen or operators to claim a settlement on the same basis on which Mr. Farlinger settled. They have just as good grounds to plead ignorance as Mr. Farlinger had. I feel positive that the only proper method on which to settle with any of these lumbermen is to put competent men to stump and top their limits-- then you get an accurate measurement of the amount of stuff they took-- of the timber they have cut and the amount they destroyed and left to waste in the bush-- and to get the amount of timber they might have left standing, and then agree on the price for the amount of stuff they did not pay for, or what they are intended to be penalized for, for attempting to defraud the Government. To that amount add the expenses of stumping and topping the limits -- then you can get an accurate basis of settlement for them and each and every one of them should settle on the same basis. There should be no favor shown."

Then I added myself-- so that you may have the whole facts, "It is unnecessary and perhaps unfair, when this matter is still under investigation to go further into Mr. Callahan's views upon the question of over-run, scaling and matters of evidence."

Q.—You have had an opportunity of reading that statement since you came down here, and have had it in your possession ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then may I ask you whether so far as that sets out the statement you made to me, is it a correct statement ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And so far as it was a statement of the facts, then to your knowledge are the facts correctly stated ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And the views that you expressed to me ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—At the time of the sitting of this Committee on the 2nd. of March Mr. R. T. Harding was examined by the Hon. Mr Ferguson and I find on page 50 of the evidence this question, put to Mr. Harding, “ You know who Callahan is. that he is an employee of E. W. Backus, do you know that ? ” What do you say as to that question, Mr. Callahan ? Are you employed by or have you been employed by E. W. Backus ?

A.—I am not and never have been in the employ of E. W. Backus.

Q.—Or in the employ of any of these companies ?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—Have you any business relationship between you and any of his companies ?

A.—I have a contract for handling pulpwood this year for the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company-- my company holds a contract.

Q.—To sell pulpwood to the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And making a profit ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that a customary arrangement ?

A.—Yes, sir, other men have had it for years.

Q.—In the course of the debate I have referred to, in the House on the 15th of March it was stated by Mr. McCrae that you were a former employee of the Shevlin-Clarke Co. Is that correct ?

A.—I was never employed by the Shevlin-Clarke Company.

Q.—Was there any relationship between Mr. Mathieu and yourself ?

A.—We were associated in the wholesale grocery business for about four years, as stockholders in a limited corporation.

Q.—What was the company ?

A.—The Northern Grocerie Company Ltd., of Fort Frances.

Q.—There is no business relationship between you now ?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—I believe you are the President and general manager and the controlling stockholder of E. J. Callahan Ltd. ?

A.—Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferguson: Just two or three questions-- The Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company is a Backus Company ?

A.—I understand it is.

Q.—You say in your statement that you had an agreement with Mr. Harding. Was that just an ordinary retainer as counsel ?

A.—Yes, sir. I agreed to pay him \$4,000.

Q.—Was it more than a retainer ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—As Mr. Dewart read it it occurred to me that there was an agreement

with Harding. You say that was just an ordinary retainer as counsel ?

A.—Yes, I agreed to pay him \$4,000.

Q.—It is not specially set out in an agreement as to what he was to do ?

A.—No, not in that agreement, no, sir.

Q.—Was there in any other agreement ?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—May I ask you this; you made a full and complete statement from which Mr. Dewart has quoted portions, extracts. There was a full statement of some kind ?

A.—That is substantially the statement I made to Mr. Dewart.

Q.—There was more of it some place. Apparently he had only quoted portions of it. What I want to know is this, did you leave a copy of that statement with the judges ?

A.—I can't remember. Did we Mr Dewart ?

Mr. Dewart: I think not. I may say that my honorable friend is quite right in saying that that is not exactly all the statement Mr. Callahan gave me. It was thrown into the third peron as I made it to the House. The original statement was in Mr. Callahan's "I so and so." If there is anything in the original statement that hasn't been included there, I will see that you get it.

Mr. Ferguson; My honorable friend will undertake to give me a copy of that statement ?

Mr. Dewart: Yes.

Q.—You wrote, apparently, to Mr. Dewart, on the 5th of January giving estimates. In the statement he says "He promised to give the fullest estimates he could make and did so by letter on the 5th of January." I suppose that is available ?

Mr. Dewart: Well, I don't know. That assumes a different position because after all it was turned over to Mr. Harding as part of the material on which he undertook Callahan's work. Apart from that I have no objection to you seeing it.

Mr. Ferguson: I see, Mr. Harding has that. Now just one other question Mr. Callahan. Have you ever been engaged in the lumbering business ?

A.—Some.

Q.—When was that-- buying pulpwood and selling it to Backus ?


A.—I worked in the lumbering business some.

Q.—Are you a practical operator ?

A.—No sir.

Witness excused.

The Committee, after assenting to a report being made to the House of the work done by the Committee during the Session then adjourned.



EXHIBITS.

DUNDAS, ONT., MARCH 9TH, 1920.

ROY A. REYNOLDS ESQ.,
DUNDAS,*Without Prejudice.*

DEAR SIR:—

I have been considering your demand for commission on the truck sale to the Provincial Government, and I wish to state frankly and unconditionally that you are not entitled to any commission whatsoever on this sale. I personally originated the negotiations and carried them through to a finish, and you had no part whatever in making the sale. It is true that you went to Toronto with me but you took no part in the negotiations, and I did not take you with me even for the purpose of assisting me in the sale. I also took you to Milwaukee and paid all your expenses, because I wanted some one with me for company and who was accustomed to travelling, and you wanted to go for your own benefit from an educational point of view, so that you could see the plant and the way the trucks were made, etc.

I have supplied you with a demonstrator and have not charged you anything for the use of it, although other salesmen are required to provide their own demonstrator and pay the upkeep of same and all their own running expenses. You have used the demonstrator not only for business but for your own private use and benefit and pleasure, and I have made no objection to your doing so.

However as I have my hands full with my own business I have no desire for litigation, but I wish you to distinctly understand that I will not stand for any unjust claim being made upon me but in order to avoid the unpleasantness of litigation I have decided without prejudice to offer you the sum of \$400 in full settlement of the claim you have made to commission on the Government deal, and in full settlement of other claims which you may think you are entitled to on all other cars sold through my agency with which you have been connected as a commission salesman.

I wish it distinctly understood that this offer is made strictly without prejudice and without any admission on my part that I owe you anything except the commission which I am tendering you to-day a marked check for \$459.62, and commission on the sale to George when it can be ascertained.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) L. C. PARKIN.

DUNDAS, ONT., MARCH 9TH, 1920.

ROY A. REYNOLDS ESQ.,
DUNDAS.

DEAR SIR:—

I tender you herewith a marked check for \$459.62 made up as follows:—

1.	Commission on sole of Chevrolet car to Mr. Bhscher.....	\$44.75
2.	" " " of Chevrolet car to Binkley.....	44.75
3.	" " " of McLaughlin car to Miss Grafton.....	142.37
4.	" " " of McLaughlin car to Patterson.....	104.50
5.	" " " of McLaughlin car to Grafton & Co.....	123.25

 \$459.62

In addition to the above you will be entitled to commission on sale to Herbert George five per cent. of the Factory price depending upon whether he decides to take a K 63 McLaughlin or a K 45 McLaughlin.

Yours truly,
(Syd.) L. C. PARKIN,

DUNDAS, ONT., MARCH 9TH 1920.

L. C. PARKIN ESQ.,
DUNDAS, ONT.

DEAR SIR:—

Mr. Roy Reynolds has handed your two communications to me, each of which is dated to-day.

The one letter contains a statement showing a credit due to Mr. Reynolds of \$459.62, which is accompanied by an accepted cheque. This appears to be correct in so far as it goes. However, I am advised, that there are other items which should have been included in your statement. This is only a partial settlement. The balance must be straightened up at once.

With regard to the other letter, which you have written, I am instructed to state, that unless a strict accounting is made by you at once to Mr. Reynolds, showing the amount of sales which have been closed through your office since the commencement of your contract with my client, and an accepted cheque with same for the commission due, a writ will be issued asking for the appointment of a receiver, for an accounting, for payment of the amount found to be owing, and for such other relief as I am advised, including an attachment of monies owing to you by the Ontario Government part of which belongs to my client.

This matter is extremely urgent. Unless I hear from you by Thursday of this week, proceedings will be instituted.

A. L. SHAVER.

“ A ”

SALES PROPOSAL

DUNDAS, CANADA, DATED DECEMBER 27TH, 1919.

TO THE HON. F. C. BIGGS,
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS,
PARLIAMENT BLDGS., TORONTO, ONT.

The undersigned hereby proposes to furnish you 6 Sterling Dump Trucks of 3½ Ton capacity, the price for which f.o.b. Dundas with catalogued equipment is, Each\$7,516.50

The following extra equipment will be furnished as described at the following prices:—

These Trucks to be Standard Worm Drive, with all Steel Body, and Wood's Hydraulic Hoist, Cab and Storm Curtains, and Electric Light Equipment, also Draw-Bar for Trailer.

6. Trucks @ \$7,516.50\$45,099.00
Total Proposal Price \$45,099.00

Terms; 10% on execution of contract, balance settlement on delivery as follows:—

Balance on Delivery at Destination at your Points.

Delivery; It is our purpose to deliver these Trucks by March 1, 1920.

Acceptance: This proposal becomes void if not accepted within ten days from date. Your signature at the foot of this proposal will constitute an order.

Respectfully submitted,

BY L. C. PARKIN.

ACCEPTED THIS 30TH DAY OF DEC., 1919.
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT,
BY F. C. BIGGS,
MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

ORDER FORM

TORONTO, DECEMBER 30TH, 1919.

L. C. PARKIN, Esq.,
DUNDAS, ONT.

DEAR SIR:—

We are receipt of your quotation of the 27th instant, giving us a price of \$7,516.50 each, f.o.b. Dundas, Ontario, for six (6) Sterling Dump Trucks of 3½ ton capacity, the trucks to have standard worm drive, all steel body, Wood's hydraulic hoist, cab and storm curtains, electric light equipment and draw bar for trailer.

The painting of each entire truck will be battleship grey, and on each side of the steel body they will be lettered in white paint letters 1 inch high "Department of Public Highways Ontario Truck No. 8." These 3½ ton trucks will be numbered consecutively from 8 to 13.

All standard equipment with the trucks will be furnished, and we would request you to notify the manufacturers that these trucks are for road construction purposes and will be used for hauling road-building materials, so that we will obtain all standard and proper equipment furnished by the truck builders for this special purpose.

Your quotation on the above six trucks is accepted, and we would request you to place the order immediately with the manufacturers.

Shipping instructions and destinations for the trucks will be forwarded to you in the course of a few days.

Yours truly,

Chief Engineer.

" B "

SALES PROPOSAL

DUNDAS, CANADA, DECEMBER, 27TH, 1919.

TO THE HON. F. C. BIGGS,
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS,
PARLIAMENT BLDGS., TORONTO, ONT.

The undersigned hereby proposes to furnish you 6 Sterling Dump Trucks of 5 Ton capacity, the price for which f.o.b. Dundas with catalogued equipment is, Each\$9,100.00

The following extra equipment will be furnished as described at the following prices:—

These Trucks to be Chain Driven with six speeds forward and two reverse, with all Steel Body, and Wood's Vertical Hydraulic Hoist, Cab and Storm Curtains, and Electric Light Equipment, also Trailer Draw-Bar.

6 Trucks @ \$9,100.00\$54,600.00

Total Proposal Price \$54,600.00

Terms; 10% on execution of contract, balance settlement on delivery as follows:—

Balance on delivery at destination at your points.

Delivery; It is our purpose to deliver these Trucks by March 1, 1920.

Acceptance: This proposal becomes void if not accepted within ten days from date. Your signature at the foot of this proposal will constitute an order.

Respectfully submitted,

BY L. C. PARKIN.

ACCEPTED THIS 30TH DAY OF DEC., 1919.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

BY F. C. BIGGS,

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

ORDER FORM

TORONTO, DECEMBER 30TH, 1919.

L. C. PARKIN, ESQ.,

DUNDAS,

ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:—

We are in receipt of your quotation of 27th instant, giving us a price of \$9,100.00 each, f.o.b. Dundas, Ontario, for six (6) Sterling 5 ton capacity Dump Trucks. These trucks will be chain driven, with six speeds forward and two reverse, all steel body, Wood's vertical hydraulic hoist, cab and storm curtains, electric light equipment and draw bar for trailer.

The entire painting of each of the trucks will be battleship grey, and each truck will be lettered on each side in white letters one inch high "Department of Public Highways Ontario Truck No. 14." The numbering of these trucks will be consecutive from 14 to 19.

Your quotation on the above six trucks is accepted, and we would request you to advise the manufacturers immediately and request the earliest possible attention to this order, so that prompt shipment can be obtained. Please advise the manufacturers that these trucks are for hauling road-building material.

Destinations and points at which we will accept these trucks will be forwarded to you in the course of a few days.

Yours truly,

Chief Engineer.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

COUNTY OF WENTWORTH, TO WIT.

IN THE MATTER OF the Action instituted by L. C. Parkin against George Harwood and Leo Harwood trading under the firm name of George Harwood & Son, and

IN THE MATTER OF evidence given at the trial of the said Action by one, Roy Reynolds of Dundas, Ontario.

I, PERCY WOODWARD, of the Town of Dundas, in the County of Wentworth, Mechanic, Do SOLEMNLY DECLARE:

1. THAT on Friday December 17th, 1920, after Roy Reynolds gave evidence on behalf of the Defendant in the above mentioned action and denied that the Defendant George Harwood had agreed to pay for the repairs to the truck in question in the above-mentioned action, the said Reynolds after he came out of the box immediately took a chair beside or near me in the Court House, Hamilton. I said to Reynolds, "Reynolds, you are an awful liar, you know darned well that Harwood said he would pay the damages." Reynolds replied to me, "I

know he did but Parkin will swear my life away when his case comes up, why shouldn't I swear his away."

The said conversation took place in the presence and hearing of Wallace Matthews.

AND I MAKE THIS SOLEMN DECLARATION conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under Oath and by virtue of The Canada Evidence Act.

H. P. WOODWARD.

DECLARED before me at the Town of Dundas, in the County of Wentworth, this 17th day of December, A.D. 1920.

A. L. SAMSON.

A Commissioner etc.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

COUNTY OF WENTWORTH, TO WIT.

IN THE MATTER OF the Action instituted by L. C. Parkin against George Harwood and Leo Harwood trading under the firm name of George Harwood & Son, and

IN THE MATTER OF evidence given at the trial of the said Action by one, Roy Reynolds of Dundas, Ontario.

I, WALLACE MATTHEWS, of the City of Hamilton, in the County of Wentworth, Mechanic, Do SOLEMNLY DECLARE:

1. THAT I was in the Court Room when Roy Reynolds of Dundas gave evidence in the above-mentioned action and heard him deny that George Harwood one of the Defendants in the above-mentioned action had agreed to pay for the repairs to the damages to the truck in question in the above-mentioned action.

2. As soon as the said Roy Reynolds left the witness box, he took a seat beside or near me and Percy Woodward in the Court House, at Hamilton, and thereupon the said Percy Woodward said to Roy Reynolds, "You are an awful liar." "You know darned well that Harwood said he would pay the damages." Whereupon the said Reynolds replied to Woodward, "I know he did but Parkin will swear my life away when his case comes up, why shouldn't I swear his away."

AND I MAKE THIS SOLEMN DECLARATION conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of The Canada Evidence Act.

WALLACE MATTHEWS.

DECLARED before me at the Town of Dundas, in the County of Wentworth, this 17th day of December, A.D. 1920.

A. L. SAMSON,

A Commissioner etc.

TORONTO, MAY 31ST, 1920.

PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
PARLIAMENT BLDGS.,
TORONTO.

GENTLEMEN:—

We are pleased to quote you on Ford Coupelets complete with Coat of Arms on each door, delivered to the following cities:—

	Toronto	Hamilton	London	Cornwall	Soo	N. Bay	Ft. William
Coupe	\$1050.00	\$1050.00	\$1050.00	\$1050.00	\$1050.00	\$1050.00	\$1050.00
Freight	20.00	20.00	20.00	26.00	30.00	25.00	40.00
Excise Tax	129.94	129.94	129.94	129.94	129.94	129.94	129.94
Sales Tax	8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66
Coat of Arms on doors	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
	\$1218.60	\$1218.60	\$1218.60	\$1224.60	\$1228.60	\$1223.60	\$1238.60

Trusting to be favored with your valued order, we are

Yours very truly,

TORONTO MOTOR CAR COMPANY, LIMITED.

T. A. RANKIN,

Sales Manager.

TORONTO, MAY 26TH, 1920.

DR. J. W. S. McCULLOUGH,
PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, CITY.

DEAR SIR:—

We beg to submit the following prices on sixteen automobiles of the Coupelet or Runabout type, for which you are calling tenders.

Ford Runabout,—Each:—

List Price	\$710.00
Government Tax 1%	7.10
Government Tax 15%	87.86
Freight	20.00

\$824.96

Complete with Demountable equipment, Spar rim and Carrier, and Non-Skid tires on the Rear.

Ford Coupelet. Each:—

List Price	\$1,050.00
Government Tax 1%	10.50
Government Tax 15%	129.94
Freight	20.00

\$1,210.44

Complete with Electric starting and Lighting system, Demountable rims, Spare rim and rim Carrier, and non skid tires on the rear.

Trusting the above quotation meets with your approval and that we may have the pleasure of receiving your order, which will have our most careful attention, we are,

Yours very truly,

A. D. GORRIE & CO., LTD.,

J. ARTHUR GRIFFITH,

Secretary-Treasurer.

"A"

This exhibit marked "A" referred to in the evidence of William Dawson taken on oath before the Committee of Public Accounts this 22nd day of April, 1921.

JAMES W. CURRY,
Chairman.

Toronto, March 13th, 1920.

DEAR SIR:—

After consultation with the Civil Service Commissioner, I have decided to have you devote your efforts to the production of agricultural films, in view of the special qualifications you possess along agricultural lines. The general direction of the work of the Bureau is henceforth in charge of Mr. O. Elliot from this date.

For your information I may say, that the Government has decided on an extensive programme in connection with agricultural films, which will require your very best efforts to promote the interests of the Province. I shall be very much obliged if you will give this programme your earnest attention.

Yours very truly,
Provincial Treasurer.

W. DAWSON, ESQ.,
PROVINCIAL MOTION PICTURE BUREAU,
46 RICHMOND ST. W.,
TORONTO.

Date	No.	Title	Footage	Amount
June 28/18		Travelogue thru Northern Ont.	2128 @ \$0.50	\$1,119.50
Apr. 30/18	124	Forcing Rhubarb	381 @ .50	190.50
Oct. 6/17	126	The Parts of a Plant	631 @ .50	315.00
Aug. 5/20		The Parts of a Plant	320 @ .75	244.80
Aug. 7/17	137	Horse Parade, Confederation Day	83 @ .50	20.75
July 31/18	137	Horse Parade, Confederation Day	83 @ .50	20.75
June 10/19	141	Orchard Methods that Pay	33 @ .65	21.45
Aug. 28/19	141	Orchard Methods that Pay	148 @ .65	96.20
Oct. 31/19	141	Orchard Methods that Pay	78 @ .65	50.70
	1918 142	The Sediment Test of Milk ...	111 @ 1.00	111.00
May 9/18	143	The Acidity Test of Milk	262 @ 1.00	262.00
May 9/18	143	The Acidity Test of Milk	205 @ .50	102.50
	1918 149	Agricultural Representatives ..	457 @ .50	228.50
	1918 149	Agricultural Representatives ..	406 @ .50	203.00
	1917 150	Ontario Agricultural College ..	723	532.40
	151	McDonald Institute	222	55.50
	163	Unsoundness in Horses	262 @ .65	170.30
1918-1919	167	Potato Diseases	664 @ .50 and .65	359.75
	1919 170	Homes for the farmer and his help	18 @ .65	11.70
	1918 171	The Use and Care of Farm Machinery	65	34.30

1919	174	The Farm Water Supply and Sewage Disposal	74 @	.65	48.10
1918-1919	176	The Milking Machine as a labor saver	744		614.40
1918	179	The Premium Horse	971 @	.50	485.50
1919	186	Mining in Northern Ontario ..	1,784 @	.50	892.00
	194	Mineral Wealth of Ontario	25 @	.50	12.50
1918	195	Monteith Farm	656		373.45
1917-1918	200	Women's Institute	86 @	.50	43.00
1918	207	Barn Building and Ventilation	29 @	.50	14.50
1919	218	Barrel Packing of Apples	189 @	.65	92.30
1918	230	How to Spray	226 @	.50	113.00
1918	233	A Trip through the Niagara Peninsula	227		122.80
1918	239	Fats	45 @	.50	22.50
1918	241	The Pulp Industry	25 @	.50	12.50
1918	242	Resources of Northern Ontario	94 @	.50	47.00
1918	248	Timagami	2,729 @	.65	1,773.85
		Neg. Titles	394 @	.65	256.10
		(approx. 380 ft. of this neg. used)			
1918	249	T. & N. O. Railway	152 @	.50	76.00
1919	252	Clearing land	25 @	.50	12.50
1919	256	Pioneer Life, The Social Side	78 @	.50	39.00
1919	257	Pioneer Life, The Women's Side	103 @	.50	51.50
1919	259	Pioneer Life, The Women's Institute	123 @	.50	61.50
1918	261	Lake of Bays	1758		936.00
		(Parts of this picture may have been used in No. 301.)			
1918	263	Beauty Spots of Ontario	390 @	.50	195.00
1919	314	Niagara Glen	164 @	.65	106.60
1919	325	Rideau Lakes	933 @	.65	606.45
		(Mr. Dawson claims that this picture is no good.)			
	402	School Garden Story	1470 @	.75	1,102.50
		Sales Tax			22.05

(This picture was not completed as scene descriptions have been lost).

- No. 141. *Orchard Methods That Pay.* 259 ft. taken, balance of this picture should have been taken in season.
- No. 142. *The Sediment Test of Milk.* A number of scenes to be taken to complete.
- No. 143. *The Acidity Test of Milk.* A few scenes to take to complete.
- No. 149. *The Agricultural Representatives.* This picture is rather topical and is not out of date. Taken in 1918, includes number of Ministers of that time.
- No. 150. *Ontario Agricultural College.* Taken in 1917 and never titled
- No. 151. *MacDonald Institute.*..... 222 ft. exterior taken. Interior scenes should have been made of Domestic Science classes, eac., but were never done.

- No. 163. *Unsoundness in Horses*..... Note—Since been taken by Aero Film.
- No. 179. *The Premium Horse*..... Mr. Dawson says this picture is no good.
- No. 218. *Barrel Packing of Apples*... Mr. Dawson says this picture is no good. Finishing scenes for this picture should have been made in season.
- No. 248 *Timagami*..... 380 ft. Negative and 394 ft. Neg. Titles.
2729 ft. original neg.
394 ft. neg. titles.
-
- 3123 ft. ”
774 ft. neg. used
-
- 2349 ft. not used.
- No. 314. *Niagara Glen*..... 164 ft. taken in 1919. Photography no good. Blurred, due to very bright sunlight, showing through heavy foliage.
- No. 325. *Rideau Lakes*..... 933 ft. taken in 1919. Mr. Dawson says this picture is no good.

“ A ”

This is Exhibit marked “ A ” referred to in the Evidence of J. W. Flavelle given before the Public Accounts Committee this 11th day of March, A.D. 1921.

JAMES W. CURRY,
Chairman.

ONTARIO TEMPERANCE ACT.

APPLICATIONS FOR CLEMENCY REFUSED.
From 1st Nov., 1919 to 1st March, 1921.

Name.	District	File No.	Date.
Arnold, M. A.	Niagara Falls.	20	Mar. 4/20.
Avon, A.	Ottawa.	54	Apr. 6/20.
Alexander, G. A.	Sault Ste. Marie.	10	June 5/20.
Adair, T.	Lincoln.	6	July 19/20.
Alesio, P.	Sault Ste. Marie.	25	Sept. 23/20.
Aziz, W.	Lennox and Addington.	8	Sept. 16.
Applebaum, A.	Windsor.	39	Nov. 24.
Beck, G.	Niagara Falls.	13	Nov. 12/19.
Bull, G.	Northumberland & Durham	13	Nov. 20/19.
Bureka, H.	Sudbury.	34	Dec. 6/19.
Blore, W.	Hamilton.	38	Dec. 9/19.
Brusseau, J.	Ottawa.	35, 30	Jan. 6/20.
Bryen, E	Sault Ste. Marie.	21	Jan 12/20.
Bapschuk, W.	Ottawa.	38	Jan. 27.
Besserer, W.	Ottawa.	46	Mar. 4.
Besserer, Jno.	Ottawa.	47	Mar. 4

Badder, M.	Toronto.	101	Mar. 5.
Bellinsky, J.	Sudbury.	55	Apr. 17.
Boyko, M.	Welland.	28	
Beatty, A. C.	Northumberland and Durham.	3	May 18.
Beaton, A.	Toronto.	8	May 11.
Barnhart, W.	Ontario.	4	May 20.
Butterby, J.	Ontario.	3	May 25.
Baker, H. J.	Toronto.	34	June 25.
Bland, Mrs.	Toronto.	46	July 19.
Blair, S.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	7	July 27.
Butkovitch, M.	Sault Ste. Marie.	23	Aug. 26.
Beland, C.	Temiskaming.	16	Sept. 2
Bycraft, J.	Windsor.	26	Sept. 27.
Budd, E.	Renfrew.	8	Oct. 8.
Black, J.	Middlesex.	8	Oct. 19.
Bourgon, B.	Russell.	7	Nov. 2.
Beaver, H.	Waterloo.	16	Nov. 12.
Brown, B.	Toronto.	93	Nov. 12.
Brand, G.	Hamilton.	25	Nov. 9.
Bayless, F.	Hamilton.	28	Dec. 2.
Bashaw, V.	Algoma.	12	Dec. 10.
Broker, S.	Ottawa.	17	Dec. 21.
Boneberg, E.	Welland.	22	Dec. 23.
Booth, H.	Toronto.	120	Jan. 3 / 21.
Byrne, M.	Welland.	28	Feb. 1.
Babcock, N.	Victoria and Haliburton.	18	Feb. 7.
Bell, H.	Toronto.	137	Feb. 7.
Billings, E.	Essex.	21	Feb. 11.
Boan, H.	Bruce.	10	Feb. 15.
Budarick, A.	Temiskaming.	31	Feb. 23.
Baldwin, N.	Kent.	35	Feb. 25.
Curtain, J.	Toronto.	56	Nov. 3 / 19.
Cinamon, J.	Toronto.	70	Dec. 6.
Cadaret, R.	Toronto.	72	Dec. 12.
Carrick, J.	Toronto.	82	Dec. 30.
Cox, T.	Middlesex.	22	
Cardinal, E.	Ottawa.	57	May / 20.
Chinese National League,	Frontenac.	3	May 10.
Ciano, A.	Welland.	5	May / 20.
Casey, M.	Dundas and Stormont.	5	
Connolly, E.	Toronto.	51	July 24.
Carere, J.	Guelph.	4	Aug. 28.
Consitt, E.	Perth.	5	Aug. 26.
Collini, L.	Hamilton.	19	Sept. 20.
Connolly, J.	Ottawa.	14	Nov. 2.
Cohen, J.	Toronto.	98	Nov. 17.
Cipolla, R.	Welland.	21	Dec. 16.
Cole, C.	Prince Edward.	20	Dec. 28.

Denison, C.	Burwash.	69	Dec. 6.
Dixon, W.	Toronto.	73	Dec. 13.
Downs, M.	Toronto.	91	Jan. 14 / 20.
Doredint, M.	Ottawa.	34	Jan. 17.
Dean, C.	Ontario.	27	Feb. 20 / 20.
Davidson, G.	Prescott.	16	Feb. 23.
DeRose, E.	Niagara Falls.	19	Feb. 25.
Dixon, J.	Halton.	34	
Diamond, J.	Ottawa.	6	May 12.
Dixon, W.	Toronto.	18	May 26.
Dewell, T.	Simcoe and Muskoka.	5	July 19.
Davidson, D.	Grenville.	7	July 7.
Drouillard, W.	Windsor.	18	Aug. 6.
D'Appolia, Mrs. A.	Sault Ste. Marie.	29	Oct. 2.
Decaire, T.	Glengarry.	18	Oct. 13.
Doult, E.	Toronto.	79	Oct. 19.
Davidson, W.	Toronto.	108	Dec. 8.
Dunning, W.	Toronto.	109	Nov. 29.
Dychlowey, H.	Toronto.	115	Dec. 15.
Doberstein, Mrs. M.	Toronto.	122	Jan. 7 / 21.
Donnegan, W.	Perth.	8	Feb. 23.
Davis, J.	Lincoln.	16	Mar. 5.
Davis, Mrs. J.	Lincoln.	16	Mar. 5.
Elieff, M.	Niagara Falls.	11	Nov. 6 / 19.
Ertel, Mary.	Perth.	11	Jan. 17 / 20.
Edwards, S.	Windsor.	69	Apr. 10.
Englis, J.	Leeds.	5	May 25 / 20.
Etloin, J.	Toronto.	30	June 24.
Easton, N.	Prince Edward.	6	Aug. 27.
Economoff, G.	Waterloo.	18	
Egan, E.	Sudbury.	27	Dec. 21.
England, O.	Rainy River.	23	Feb. 25 / 21.
Franklin, G.	Toronto.	76	Dec. 16 / 19.
Finnegan, J.	Hamilton.	40	Jan. 12 / 20.
Flood, C.	Halton.	22	Jan. 21.
Fraser, G.	Guelph.	7	Feb. 25.
Ferris, G.	Windsor.	58	Mar. 15.
Fucherien, A.	Hamilton.	3	May 25.
Foran, T.	Temiskaming.	8	June 24.
Fransisco, M.	Welland.	11	July 7.
Falconi, A.	Sault Ste. Marie.	24	
Finkelstein, J.	Toronto.	60	Sept. 9.
Fitzgerald, W.	Windsor.	29	Sept. 13.
Fagan, J.	Toronto.	81	Oct. 23.
Fitzgerald, G.	Windsor.	38	Nov. 12.
Ferro, T.	Sudbury.	25	Dec. 2.
Flynn, C.	Hamilton.	31	Dec. 30.
Fratecelli, Mrs. B.	Sault Ste. Marie.	36	Feb. 15 / 21.
Franklin, K.	Welland.	29	Feb. 28.
Gray, Mrs. S.	Middlesex.	14	Nov. 3 / 19.

Griffiths, F.	Toronto.	57	Nov. 6.
Giles, J.	Toronto.	61	Nov. 11.
Gray, R.	Toronto.	62	Nov. 12.
Gigio, G.		67	Nov. 22.
Gardiner, W.	Toronto.	95	Jan. 23.
Galvin, W.	Ottawa.	39	Jan. 28.
Getmanchuk, H.		35	Feb. 2.
Geisler, G.	Ottawa.	31	Jan. 12 / 20.
Goldstein, J.	Hamilton.	41	Jan. 12.
Graham, A.	Carlton.	33	Jan. 15.
Graff, J.	Toronto.	96	Feb. 5.
Goldberg, Mrs. A.	Toronto.	4	May. 10.
Galt, T.	Toronto.	43	June 22.
Grasser, I.	Bruce.	5	July 7.
Grispano, J.	Welland.	11	July 7.
Grimaldi, C.	Hastings.	4	July 29.
Gallagher, J.	Toronto.	100	Nov. 19.
Gordon, P.	Toronto.	119	Jan. 3 / 21.
Garvin, T.	Toronto.	126	Jan. 7 / 21.
Galansky, T.	Toronto.	128	Jan. 19.
Gauthier, P.	Temiskaming.	29	Jan. 28.
Greene, W.	Toronto.	141	Feb. 23.
Glass, E.	Toronto.	146	Mar. 5.
Hamilton, G.		93	Jan. 17 / 20.
Horvsky, M.	Ottawa.	52	Mar. 25.
Humaina, L.	Sault Ste. Marie.	27	Apr. 14.
Hirvolsky, W.	Hamilton.	55	Apr. 15.
Hatton, D.	Toronto.	57	Aug. 28.
Huddleston, J.	Nipissing.	11	Sept. 15.
Herscovitz, I.	Toronto.	73	Oct. 5.
Holmes, H.	Grey.	15	Oct. 8.
Hall, W.	Toronto.	89	Nov. 8.
Heft, S.	Toronto.	91	Nov. 10.
Hartman, Mrs. K.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	15	Nov. 18.
Henderson, W.	Toronto.	125	Jan. 19 / 21.
Holbeck, H.	Rainy River.	22	Jan. 22.
Hill, J.	Welland.	26	Jan. 7.
Haggarty, G.	Lincoln.	14	Jan. 28.
Holland, P.	Peterboro.	13	Feb. 15.
Hartley	Halton.	20	Feb. 25.
Helpert, S.	Sudbury.	30	Mar. 8.
Ivell, T.	Toronto.	105	Mar. 10 / 20.
Irwin, C.	Kent.	34	Feb. 23.
Johnson, W.	Niagara Falls.	17	Nov. 14 / 19.
Joseph, A.	Sault Ste. Marie.	17	July 14.
Johnston, J.	Toronto.	49	July 7.
Jacques, S.	Hamilton.	22, 18	Sept. 28.
Johnson, J.	Toronto.	75	Oct. 8.
James, A.	Middlesex.	8	Oct. 19.

Jifkins, F.	Guelph.	9	Mar. 8/21.
Jones, R.	Toronto.	149	Mar. 8.
Katzamarski, L.		71	Dec. 5/19.
Kostal, J.	Guelph.	5	Dec. 16.
Knott, J.	Frontenac.	8	Jan. 6/20.
Kelly, Thos.	Toronto.	90	Jan. 14.
Kosloff, R.	Hamilton.	46	Jan. 30.
King, P.	Middlesex.	23	Feb. 25.
King, N.	Guelph.	7	Feb. 25.
Koslosky, W.	Ottawa.	52	Mar. 25.
Kinpotch, N.	Sault Ste. Marie.	11	June 9.
Kerchuk, G.	Ontario.	10	Sept. 27.
Karoluck, S.	Hamilton.	17	Sept. 30.
Krupovinski, W.	Ontario.	11	Nov. 1.
Kurconski, B.	Ottawa.	15	Nov. 10.
Kitt, M.	Sudbury.	23	Nov. 18.
Kerelowski	Waterloo.	20	Dec. 21.
Kilty, P.	Toronto.	123	Jan. 7/21.
Kenny, P.	Perth.	10	Mar. 5.
Leader, F.	Guelph.	5,	Dec. 16/19.
Lycak, H.	Toronto.	85	Dec. 31.
Lapine, A.	Ottawa.	33	Jan. 12/20.
Lewis, D.	Hamilton.	43	Jan. 23.
Lee, S.	Lennox and Addington.	13	Feb. 19.
Lupine, E.	Ottawa.	42	Feb. 28.
Lawless, A.	Peterboro.	25	Mar. 17.
Landrigan, A.	Toronto.	114	Apr. 16.
Luke, J.	Toronto.	118	May 5.
Lalonde, J.	Toronto.	14	May 5.
Lawless, A. G.	Peterboro.	4	June 5.
Lorenzetti, R.	Toronto.	27	June 15.
Lusty, W.	Toronto.	47	July 7.
Lane, Mrs. A.	Toronto.	48	July 19.
Ladouceur, F.	Sudbury.	8	July 24.
Logan, J.	Toronto.	56	Aug. 4.
Lanham, W.	Lambton, West.	8	Aug. 26.
Legrosse, H.	Toronto.	64	Sept. 22.
Lennon, J.	Toronto.	67	Sept. 15.
Lipkie, P. J.	Rainy River.	10	Sept. 16.
Laing, W.	Ontario.	10	Sept. 27.
Lalonde, D.	Russell.	5	Oct. 19.
Lee, F.	Windsor.	34	Oct. 23.
Lardie, Mrs. C.	Prince Edward.	9	Nov. 9.
Love, F.	Glengarry.	20	Nov. 11.
Lesnick, S.	Ontario.	12	Nov. 10.
Lambroff, L.	Temiskaming.	24	Nov. 24.
Lakusky, W.	Toronto.	113	Dec. 16.
Luca, F.	Toronto.	127	Jan. 19/21.
Leith, W.	Toronto.	141	Feb. 23.
Labell	Toronto.	145	Feb. 25.

Lachoski, W.	Toronto.	113	Mar. 5.
Moran, J.	Hamilton.	35	Nov. 21 / 19.
Malone, B.	Toronto.	80	Dec. 30.
Moskowitz, L.	Welland.	19	Jan. 6 / 20.
Marchi, P.	Carlton.	37	Feb. 19.
Morrison, S.	Ottawa.	43	Feb. 28.
Meyatt, E.	Peterboro.	23	Feb. 28.
Moulton, B.	Toronto.	107	Mar. 24
Modig, M.	Sudbury.	50	Mar. 29.
Mercer, G.	Ottawa.	53	
Michaud, G. H.	Carleton.	43	
Malec	Windsor.	70	
Marchiniak,	Windsor.	70	
Mullin, T.	Toronto.	7	May 18.
Meddonick, N.	Sault Ste. Marie.	11	June 9.
Martin, H.	Kent.	4	June 9.
Mictuletti, L. P.	Sudbury.	6	June 21.
Morin, J.	Ottawa.	11	Aug. 27.
Mathieu, C.	Sudbury.	11	Aug. 21.
Montgomery, J.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	9	Aug. 26.
Murano, T.	Hamilton.	13	Aug. 26.
Myles, H.	Toronto.	66	Sept. 15.
Maker, M.	Lennox and Addington.	8	Sept. 16.
Maker, N.	Lennox and Addington.	8	Sept. 16.
Marier, E.	Sudbury.	17	Oct. 8.
Martin, Wm.	Temiskaming.	19	Oct. 2.
Meeyert, J.	Kent.	19	Nov. 2.
Miernicke, F.	Windsor.	35	Nov. 2.
Moision, F.	Windsor.	36	Nov. 2.
Moody, A., Dr.	Sault Ste. Marie.	31	Nov. 1.
Meretsky, I.	Toronto.	88	Nov. 10.
Mills, C.	Rainy River.	20	Dec. 8.
Mattiola, G.	Sault Ste. Marie.	33	Dec. 8.
Marucci, W.	Hamilton.	37, 20	Dec. 10.
Moline, J.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	17	Nov. 27.
Moline, Wendla.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	17	Nov. 27.
Marcus, L.	Toronto.	121	Jan. 5 / 21.
Moore, W.	Bruce.	8	Feb. 1.
Martin, M. J.	Victoria and Haliburton.	16	Jan. 26.
Merrall, W.	Brant and Haldimand.	15	Feb. 11.
MacIntosh, G.	Windsor.	31	Nov. 6 / 19.
McInnis, C.	Niagara Falls.	16	Nov. 18.
McGlennig, J.	Toronto.	15	Dec. 16.
McDonald, P.	rAlgom.	11	Mar. 5 / 20.
McDonald, Wm.	Windsor.	19	Aug. 26.
McIntyre, J. H.	Leeds.	16	
McLachlan, F.	Toronto.	92	Oct. 29.

McDonald, J.	Algoma.	11	Dec. 10.
McCann, Mrs. M.	Toronto.	112	Dec. 16.
McShane, J.	Welland.	25	Jan. 7. / 21.
McLaren, G.	Temiskaming.	28	Jan. 7.
McCurdy, J.	Carlton.	9	Feb. 3.
Norton, M.	Sault Ste. Marie.	28	Apr. 20 / 20.
Namastofsky, Sam.	Toronto.	16	May 20.
Nahragang, Alec.	Hamilton.	15	Sept. 7.
Newton, Jno.	Northumberland and Dur- ham.	8	Oct. 2.
Nurse, Fred.	Dufferin.	4	Dec. 2.
Nelson, Jesse.	Welland.	20	Dec. 15.
Ostoff, Mrs. Lina.	Temiskaming.	5	June 5 / 20.
Oliver, Reginald.	Toronto.	61	Sept. 1.
Olsen, Richard.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	16	Dec. 2.
Orr, Samuel.	Parry Sound.	9	Mar. 5 / 21.
Popechuk, Jno.	Welland.	18	Nov. 13 / 19.
Pryor, T.	Middlesex.	19	Dec. 9.
Parent, Jos.	Prescott.	14	Dec. 19.
Phillips, A.	Toronto.	81	Dec. 30.
Payne, Ida.	Ottawa.	35	June 22 / 20.
Prolan, Peter.	Hamilton.	44	
Picher, Phillip.	Prescott.	15	
Pryor, L.	Middlesex.	22	
Perry, A.	Ottawa.	48	
Pillon, Mrs. Zoe.	Windsor.	69	
Popesen, Vasile.	Toronto.	112	
Pickens, Robt.	Toronto.	115	
Przybala, M.	Hamilton.	59	
Peters, Wm.	Welland.	29	
Ryan, Jas.	East Peterborough.	20	Nov. 14 / 19.
Ricker, Mrs. Annie.	Ottawa.	35, 25	Dec. 8.
Richards, Major.	Grenville.	16	Dec. 23.
Rochon, O.	Prescott.	15	Feb. 20 / 20.
Rosenfield, Mrs.	Victoria and Haliburton.	61	Apr. 23.
Ryan, Pat.	Sault Ste. Marie.	32	Apr. 23.
Rosenthal, Jos.	Sault Ste. Marie.	18	July 19 / 20.
Reddy, J. A.	Nipissing.	10	Sept. 17.
Rose, Clarence J.	Toronto.	81	Oct. 23.
Runnions, Z.	Dundas and Stormont.	15	Dec. 2.
Rorer, Sarah.	Toronto.	118	Jan. 3 / 21.
Rotko, Jno.	Toronto.	134	Jan. 28.
Reaume, Arsene.	Windsor.	49	Feb. 7.
Smith, Jno.	Toronto.	60	Nov. 11 / 19.
Simpson, E.	Toronto.	77	Dec. 17 / 19.
Sanbron, S.	Toronto.	84	Jan. 2 / 20.
Smallman, C.	Frontenac.	9	Jan. 8.
Scarritt, N. S.	Toronto.	89	Jan. 15.

Soule, Lena.	Ottawa.	35	Jan. 22.
Shaw, F. J.	Toronto.	98	Feb. 19.
Scott, Jas.	Carleton.	36	Feb. 19.
Souyoman (Simon) P.	Ontario.	29	Mar. 1.
Shamess, Sol.	Parry Sound.	8	Mar. 29.
Scott, Ed. C.	Toronto.	10	May 19 / 20.
Sullivan, Jos.	Toronto.	21	May 26.
Smith, J. L.	Hamilton.	6	June 12.
Seguine, Chas. H.	Northumberland and Durham.	7	June 21.
Smearcux, Anthony.	Brant and Haldimand.	6	Aug. 27.
Smith, Mrs. E.	Ontario.	9	Sept. 16.
Stewart, Roy.	Hamilton.	16	Sept. 13.
Sauriol, Eugene.	Sudbury.	16	Sept. 27.
Stenley, Wm.	Sault Ste. Marie.	26	Sept. 27.
Switzer, Ed. (Robt.)	Sault Ste. Marie.	27	Sept. 27.
Sawyern, Bill.	Sault Ste. Marie.	28	Sept. 27.
Saville.	Rainy River.	11	Oct. 8.
Stephens, Geo.	Windsor.	30	Oct. 2.
Silverman, H.	Toronto.	76	Oct. 13.
Simmons, Perry.	Hastings.	9	Oct. 13.
Spring, N.	Toronto.	83	Oct. 23.
Sylvester, L.	Lincoln.	8	Oct. 23.
Stamntogonis, L.	Port Arthur and Fort William.	13	Nov. 2,
Sutherland, Mrs. G.	Leeds.	19	Nov. 9.
Slippor, L.	Toronto.	90	Nov. 12.
Shier, G.	Northumberland and Durham.	10	Nov. 10.
Sciarrone, D.	Welland.	19	Dec. 2.
Smith, Wm.	Lincoln.	9	Dec. 2.
Sawshuk, R.	Sault Ste. Marie.	35	Dec. 15.
Seigel, J.	Toronto.	116	Dec. 23.
Shay, E.	Parry Sound.	7	Dec. 30.
Shain, Mrs. S.	Windsor.	47	Jan. 5 / 21.
Singer, Mrs. S.	Toronto.	124	Jan. 11.
Sauve, V.	Glengarry.	27	Jan. 13.
Smith, M.	Lincoln.	15	Jan. 28.
Sullivan, R.	Peterboro.	12	Feb. 7.
Seguin, W.	Prescott.	8	Feb. 7.
Smith, C.	Toronto.	136	Feb. 7.
Silver, J.	Toronto.	140	Feb. 19.
Snyder, Mrs. A.	Ottawa.	19	Feb. 21.
Tremblay, A.	Ottawa.	35	Jan. 22 / 20.
Tyrrell, R.	Kent.	20	Apr. 15.
Tichantshuk.	Oshawa.	5	June 1.
Toye, Ed.	Toronto.	37	June 5.
Travers, J.	Toronto.	39	June 29.
Thomas, L.	Temiskaming.	15	Sept. 2.
Truster, R.	Toronto.	63	Sept. 23.

Teepell, E.	Ontario.	14	Nov. 18.
Topping, G.	Middlesex.	13	Feb. 15 / 21.
Ulch, T.	Kent.	33	1920-21 File.
Vilta, J.	Toronto.	117	1919-20 "
Vigneaux, O.	Essex.	13	Oct. 19 / 20.
Veroni, J.	Welland.	19	
Varey, M.	Halton.	19	Dec. 30 / 20.
Vandenenyder.	Kent.	31	Jan. 13 / 21.
VanDusen, W.	Brant and Haldimand.	14	Feb. 1 / 21.
Woodrow, D.	Toronto.	59	Nov. 10 / 19.
Wiley, J.	Lincoln.	9	Nov. 26 / 19.
Weir, P.	Toronto.	83	Dec. 30.
Webb, P.	Toronto.	106	Mar. 15 / 20.
Willick, A.	Welland.	25	Mar. 6 / 20.
Watson, G.	Rainy River.	7	May 25.
Warsknek, J.	Toronto.	17	May 26.
Wright, F.	Ontario.	4	June 1.
Willick, A.	Welland.	7	June 5.
Welch, H. A.	Elgin.	3	June 8.
Watts, G.	Temiskaming.	6	June 12.
Whuhach, J.	Hamilton.	36	Jan. 13 / 21.
Wilach, J.	Lincoln.	11	Jan. 23.
Williams, W.	Hamilton.	39	Jan. 7.
Yersmzink, M.	Hamilton.	42	Jan. 20 / 20.
Yarrows, I. S.	Windsor.	12	Aug. 26 / 20.
Zapora, J.	Hamilton.	8	June 5 / 20.

RETURN OF CONVICTIONS MADE TO THE CLERK OF THE PEACE

AUGUST 1906—

Name of the Prosecutor	Name of the Defendant	Nature of the Charge	Date of Conviction	Name of Convicting Justice
			1906	
1 John Woods	Wesley Harpe	Killing deer in close season.	Aug. 25	J. Farrer.
2 Daniel Blea	Jacob Reinhardt	Violation of Game Law	July 3	H. C. Boorse.
3 "	John Good, Sr.	" "	" 6	"
4 "	Thomas Mitchell	" "	" 6	"
5 "	Wm. Campbell	" "	" 9	"
6 "	Robt. Haupchild	" "	" 11	"
7 "	James Prunty	" "	" 11	"
8 Henry White.	Wm. J. Smythe	Having deer skin in possession.	Sept. 10	J. Farrer.
9 Hy. Whyte	Levi Doran	Killing deer out of season.	" 20	"
10 A. G. Cardwell.	John A. Morrison	Having 2 beaver skins in possession.	Nov. 12	"
11 "	"	Having one otter skin in possession.	" 12	"
12 John Wood	Narcisse Miner	Killing deer out of season.	" 24	"
13 A. G. Cardwell	Jno. A. Morrison	Having in poss. two muskrat skins.	" 24	"
14 Hy. White	Arthur Francis	Killing deer out of season.	" 30	"
15 Daniel Blea	Geo. McIntyre	Breach of Game Laws.	Sept. 17	J. Duke.
16 "	Geo. Stevens	Shooting Beaver	Nov. 2	H. O. Boorse
17 "	Fred Commanda	Shooting otter and beaver	" 2	"
18 Rex	Horatio Hains	Being in poss. beaver skins	" 5	G. E. Gibbon
19 Rex	Horatio Hains	Being in poss. beaver skins	" 5	G. E. Gibbon
			1907	
20 John Wood	Chas. Cook	Hunting deer in close season	Feb. 16	J. Fletcher
21 Henry White	Jonathan Hymer	Dog running deer out of season	Dec. 5	J. Farrer
22 Hy. White	James Bloom	Hunting deer out of season	" 8	"
23 John Woods	Harvey Adam	Settler selling deer without license	" 17	"
24 Henry White	James W. Eckels	Shooting and having deer	Sept. 6	J. Gardiner
25 John Woods	F. Shock	" "	" 6	"
26 Deputy Game Warden	H. W. Cronburg	" "	" 6	"
27 "	R. H. Coulon	" "	" 6	"
28 "	B. Boyce	" "	" 6	"
29 "	George LaClaire	" "	" 6	"
30 "	John Deckers	" "	" 6	"
31 "	J. B. Pyek	" "	" 6	"
32 John Woods	Ross Brownlee	Hunting deer without permit	Jan. 28	J. Fletcher
33 "	Sandy Green	" "	" 28	"
34 "	Simcoe Green	" "	" 28	"
35 "	Samuel Kilgour	" "	" 28	"
36 "	Henry Nixon	" "	" 28	"
37 "	Thomas Reid, Jr.	" "	Feb. 16	"
38 "	William Chisholm	" "	" 18	"
39 "	Charles Cook	" "	" 18	"
40 "	R. S. Henderson	Hunting deer in close season	" 18	"
41 John Russell	J. J. Matthews	Having deer during close season	Mar. 13	J. Farrer
42 Daniel Blea	Wm. Clement	Shipping deer hides	Apr. 12	W. J. Sturdy
43 Geo. H. Huson	Robert Soaper	Breach of Game Laws	Nov. 1	H. O. Boorse
44 Daniel Blea	Chas. LaBrash	Killing and selling deer	Nov. 21	W. E. Spetz
		Having deer in possession	Aug. 29	J. E. Edgecombe
			1908	
45 Daniel Blea	John Bell	Violation of Game Law	Jan. 16	McArthur, C.
46 Weinott	R. Keppy	Violation of Game Law	Jan. 21	C. McArthur
47 Daniel Blea	J. J. Matthews	Illegal possession of deer skins	Mar. 4	J. H. Willmott
48 Game Warden	Chas. Robinson	Using venison in lumber camps	Oct. 22	G. E. Gibbon
49 Daniel Blea	Chas. Graham	Trapping beaver	Nov. 4	"
50 Daniel Blea	Bert Organ	Trapping beaver	Nov. 4	"
51 Geo. S. Kerr	Geo. Frazer	Shooting partridge out of season	Aug. 10	J. Farrer
52 "	Edward Sawyer	Killing deer out of season	" 12	"
53 "	Hammond Willings	Purchasing deer out of season	" 15	"
54 Daniel Blea	Geo. Dunker	Violation of Game Law	" 19	C. McArthur
55 D. G. Milne	Wm. Christie	Killing a partridge	Apr. 20	McConkey,
56 T. H. Bennetts	Cornelius Bice	Contravention of Game Law	Sept. 17	"
57 Daniel Blea	Wm. Miller	Killing deer in close season	Nov. 19	"
58 "	Fred Smealer	Breach of Game Law	" 21	H. O. Boorse
59 "	Harry Robb	Breach of Game Law	" 21	H. O. Boorse
60 "	Wm. Hood	Infraction of Game Act	Dec. 18	J. Farrer
61 John Wood	Joseph Bell	Hunting and killing deer without license	Jan. 6	"
62 John Wood	John Bell	Hunting and killing deer without license	" 6	"
63 Hy. Laughington	Chas. Hicken	Fishing without license	" 22	"
64 Hy. Laughington	Jas. Damason	Fishing without license	" 22	"
65 John Woods	Richard Taylor	Killing deer on Sunday	" 12	"
66 "	Thomas King	Killing deer unlawfully	" 16	"
67 "	Napoleon Lefroncir	Killing deer unlawfully	" 16	"
68 "	Wm. Hood	Unlawfully possessing beaver skins	" 16	"
69 Daniel Blea	Wm. J. Kent	Breach of Game Law	Mar. 8	H. O. Boorse
70 Daniel Blea	Davi d O. Gibbons	Breach of Game Law	Dec. 9	H. O. Boorse
71 W. Madigan	John McCall	Killing deer out of season	June 30	J. Farrer
72 W. Madigan	John Nambush	Killing deer out of season	July 8	"
73 John Woods	Wm. Elias	Infraction of Game Act	Oct. 14	"
			1910	
74 S. Light	Walter Vowels	Infraction of Game Act	Jan. 7	"
75 Daniel Blea	B. E. Green	Breach of Game Law	Dec. 3	H. O. Boorse

FOR THE PROVISIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PARRY SOUND

—OCTOBER 1920

	Amount of Penalty, Fine or Damages	When Paid or to be Paid to said Justice	To whom Fine paid over by said Justice	If not paid, why not, and Remarks, if any
1	40 00	Aug. 25	John Woods and Hp. White	
2	25 00	July 3	E. Tinsley, Chief Game Warden	
3	25 00	July 6	" "	
4	10 00	" 6	" "	
5	20 00	" 9	" "	
6	25 00	" 11	" "	
7	20 00	" 18	" "	
8	20 00	Sept. 10	Henry White	
9	20 00	Sept. 20	Hy. White	
10	30 00	Nov. 13	½ to Crown Atty. and ½ to Informant	
11	30 00	" 12	½ to Crown Atty. and ½ to Informant	
12	20 00	" 24	John Woods	
13	5 00	" 24	A. G. Cardwell	
14	20 00	" 30	Hy. White	
15	250 00	Sept. 30	Crown Attorney	
16	40 00	Nov. 7		Not paid, sent to Burk's Falls Gaol for 2 mos.
17	100 00	" 7		Not paid, sent to Burk's Falls Gaol for 2 mos.
18	50 00	" 6	Edwin Tinsley	
19	50 00	" 6	Edwin Tinsley	
20	20 00			
21	5 00	Dec. 5	Henry White	
22	20 00	" 8	Henry White	
23	20 00	" 17	John Woods	
24	20 00	Sept. 6	White and Woods	
25	20 00	" 6	" "	
26	20 00	" 6	" "	
27	20 00	" 6	" "	
28	20 00	" 6	" "	
29	20 00	" 6	" "	
30	20 00	" 6	" "	
31	20 00	" 6	" "	
32	20 00	14 days		Committed for 30 days in P. S. Gaol
33	20 00	Jan. 28	John Woods	
34	20 00	Feb. 11	" "	
35	20 00	Feb. 11	" "	
36	20 00	Jan. 28	" "	
37	20 00	Feb. 16	" "	
38	20 00	" 16	" "	
39	20 00	" 16	" "	
40	20 00	Mar. 17		
41	30 00	Apr. 12	John Russell	
42	20 00	2 months		Committed to Gaol for 3 mos.
43	45 00	Not paid		
44	20 00			
45	100 00	Jan. 17	Dist. Treasurer	
46	20 00	Jan. 21	Dist. Treasurer	
47	150 00	Apl. 4	\$75 to Crown atty.	
48	40 00	Nov. 1	Game Warden Tinsley	
49	40 00		Committed for 90 days to Burk's Falls Gaol.
50	40 00			Committed for 90 days to Burk's Falls Gaol.
51	1 00			
52	20 00	Aug. 12	Crown Attorney	
53	5 00	Aug. 15	Crown Attorney	
54	5 00	" 19	Clerk of the Peace	
55	5 00	Apr. 20	½ to Informant, ½ to Justice	
56	5 00	Sept. 17	½ to Informant, ½ to Crown Attorney	
57	25 00	Nov. 19	E. Tinsley, Game Warden	
58	5 00	Nov. 21	E. Tinsley, Game Warden	
59	5 00	Nov. 21	E. Tinsley, Game Warden	
60	95 00	Dec. 19	Treas. of Ontario	
61	100 00	Jan. 6	½ to J. Wood, ½ to Treas. of Ontario	
62	6 00	Jan. 6	½ to J. Wood, ½ to Treas. of Ontario	
63	5 00	Jan. 22	Treas. of Ontario	
64	5 00	Jan. 22	Treas. of Ontario	
65	20 00	Feb. 12	Treas. of Ontario	
66	20 00			Not paid
67	20 00			Not paid
68	40 00			Not paid, warrant issued
69	5 00	Dec. 9	E. Tinsley	
70	5 00	Dec. 9	E. Tinsley	
71	20 00	June 30	Treas. of Ontario, per E. Tinsley	
72	20 00	July 13	Treas. of Ontario, per E. Tinsley	
73	20 00	Oct. 23	½ to Jamieson, ½ to E. Tinsley	
74	20 00	Jan. 7	E. Tinsley	
75	40 00	Dec. 30	E. Tinsley	

RETURN OF CONVICTIONS MADE TO THE CLERK OF THE PEACE

AUGUST 1905—

Name of the Prosecutor	Name of the Defendant	Nature of the Charge	Date of Conviction	Name of Convicting Justice
76 Daniel Blea	Rollie Tinsler	Breach of Game Law	Dec. 30	H. O. Boorse
77 James Muir	Conrad Ross	Shooting a moose	Mar. 10	J. Edgecumbe
78 W. J. Connor	John Leclair	Having venison in close season	Apr. 5	J. Farrer
79 W. J. Connor	"	Having two partridge in possession	" 7	"
80 Thos. Brownell	"	Having skins in possession	" 14	"
81 Thos. Brownell	"	Poisoned bait	" 14	"
82 W. J. Connor	Sylvester Pawis	Fishing without license	" 30	"
83 "	Jos. Pomadgovan	"	" 30	"
84 "	Chas. Micheau	"	" 30	"
85 "	Peter Pomadgovan	"	" 30	"
86 W. J. Connor	Thos. Isaacs	Fishing without license	Apr. 30	J. Farrer
87 "	Geo. Stalker	Infraction Game and Fish Act	May 2	"
88 "	Norman McLean	"	" 2	"
89 "	Hugh Stalker	"	" 2	"
90 W. Madigan	James Pomadgovan	"	" 2	"
91 W. Madigan	Joseph Francis	"	" 2	"
92 W. J. Connor	John Breggs	"	" 2	"
93 "	Abraham Knonash	"	" 2	"
94 "	Jos. Eagle	"	" 2	"
95 "	Jos. Demasie	"	" 2	"
96 H. Laughington	Jos. Demasie	"	" 2	"
97 W. Madigan	Enos Carpenter	"	" 2	"
98 W. J. Connor	Joseph Harrison	"	" 2	"
99 W. Madigan	John Nanabush	"	" 2	"
100 W. J. Connor	Noah Khechigomah	"	" 2	"
101 W. Madigan	Frank Poghwash	"	" 2	"
102 "	Hy. Abetung	"	" 2	"
103 "	Adam Poghwash	"	" 7	"
104 W. J. Connor	Henrietta Oldfield	"	" 7	"
105 H. Laughington	Ira D. Hill	"	" 10	"
106 H. Laughington	Wm. M. Mosley	"	" 10	"
107 W. J. Connor	Harry Misheau	Fish without license	" 13	"
108 A. Greer	Eden Carpenter	Kill partridge	" 21	"
109 H. Laughington	Jno. K. Meredith	Infraction of Game Law	" 23	"
110 A. Greer	Wesley Jacobs	Having partridge in possession	" 26	"
111 "	Jno. Beyette	Having partridge in possession	" 26	"
112 "	James Francis	Kill partridge	" 26	"
113 H. Laughintgon	Jno. Woodard	Fish with Seine	" 27	"
114 "	W. D. King	Fish without license	" 27	"
115 "	Silas Ashenbiege	"	" 27	"
116 "	Allan Nanibush	"	" 27	"
117 "	James Nanibush	"	" 27	"
118 "	David Pawis	Fish with Seine	" 30	"
119 "	John Pawis	"	" 30	"
120 "	John Miller	"	" 30	"
121 "	Andrew Cormican	Fish without a license	June 6	"
122 Murdock Watts	Alex Secord	Breach of Game Law	June 27	A. McMillan
123 Murdock Watts	Dave Lamondin	Illegal fishing	July 6	"
124 C. Knight	James Weale	Breach of Game Law	Aug. 29	"
125 W. J. Connor	Hy. Tracey Balcom	Fish without license	Sept. 19	J. Farrer
126 C. Knight	Wm. J. Cox	Kill two partridge on Sunday	Oct. 17	"
127 C. Knight	Peter Totoryn	Kill two partridge on Sunday	Oct. 17	J. Farrer
128 W. J. Connor	Arthur Stewart	Kill two partridge on Sunday	" 17	"
129 W. J. Connor	Arthur Merrion	Non resident hunting without permit	" 25	"
130 C. Knight	Myron Merrion	Non resident hunting without permit	" 25	"
131 W. J. Connor	Sam Snake	Hunting deer out of season	" 27	"
132 "	Daniel Booterall	Hunting & killing deer out of season	Nov. 30	"
133 "	Jos. Ellis	Hunting without permit	Nov. 30	"
134 G. M. Parks	Andy Manning	Hunting Moose	1909	"
135 "	Tedt Manning	"	Aug. 21	J. Labraah
136 "	George Croswell	"	" 21	"
137 "	E. D. Stayer	"	" 21	"
138 Daniel Blea	Wm. S. J. Johnston	Shooting deer without permit	Nov. 26	H. Boorse
139 "	Luke Wilson	Breach of Game Laws	Aug. 8	"
140 "	John Beatty	Breach of Game Laws	Nov. 2	"
141 Hy. Forder	Ed. Taylor	Having in poss. furs out of season	Dec. 9	J. Farrer
142 "	Alonzo Daball	Having in poss. furs out of season	" 9	"
143 "	James Walker	Kill 16 mink and 12 muskrat out of season	" 16	"
144 W. J. Connor	Frank Cooper	Hunting deer out of season	1911	"
145 "	Frank Cooper	Expose poison	Jan. 25	"
146 "	Edward Stayner	Having deer in poss. out of season	" 25	"
147 "	E. R. Selby	Kill four partridge	" 25	"
148 "	Ross McKay	Kill deer out of season	Feb. 6	"
149 "	Frank Meek	Kill 2 partridge out of season	" 16	"
150 John Scheich	John Brown	Hunt and kill deer during prohibited season	Dec. 21	B. E. Green and M. Corkery

FOR THE PROVISIONAL JUDICAL DISTRICT OF PARRY SOUND
—OCTOBER 1920 (Continued)

Amount of Penalty, Fine or Damages	When Paid or to be Paid to said Justice	To Whom Fine Paid over by Said Justice	If not Paid, Why not, and Remarks, if any
76	20 00	Dec. 30	E. Tinsley
77	20 00	Mar. 10	\$10 to E. Tinsley and \$10 to Prosecutor
78	20 00		
79	10 00		
80	5 00		
81	5 00		
82	10 00	May 7	Sup't Tinsley
83	10 00	Apr. 30	"
84	10 00	" 30	"
85	10 00	" 30	"
86	10 00	Apr. 11	Supt. Tinsley
87	10 00		
88	10 00		
89	10 00	May 2	Sup't. Tinsley
90	10 00	" 2	"
91	10 00	" 2	"
92	10 00	" 2	"
93	10 00	" 2	"
94	10 00	" 2	"
95	10 00	" 2	"
96	10 00	" 2	"
97	10 00	" 2	"
98	10 00	" 4	"
99	10 00	" 9	"
100	10 00	" 7	"
101	10 00	" 7	"
102	10 00	" 7	"
103	10 00	" 7	"
104	10 00	" 10	"
105	10 00	" 10	"
106	10 00	" 13	"
107	5 00	" 26	"
108	15 00	" 26	"
109	10 00	" 26	"
110	5 00	" 27	½ to E. Tinsley, ½ to informant
111	5 00	" 27	½ " " ½ " "
112	5 00	" 27	½ " " ½ " "
113	10 00	" 27	Sup't. Tinsley
114	5 00	" 27	"
115	5 00	" 30	"
116	5 00	" 30	"
117	5 00	" 31	"
118	5 00	June 6	"
119	5 00	June 27	"
120	25 00	May 30	"
121	5 00	June 6	"
122	20 00	June 19	Game and Fishery Overseer
123	25 00	July 6	Game and Fishery Overseer
124	25 00	Aug. 29	Game and Fishery Overseer
125	5 00	Sept. 19	E. Tinsley
126	10 00	Oct. 17	E. Tinsley
127	10 00	Oct. 17	E. Tinsley
128	10 00	" 17	E. Tinsley
129	30 00	" 25	½ to Connor for informant, ½ to E. Tinsley
130	30 00	" 25	½ " " ½ "
131	20 00	" 28	½ " " ½ "
132	40 00	Nov. 30	½ " " ½ "
133	20 00	Nov. 30	E. Tinsley
134	20 00	Aug. 21	G. M. Parks
135	20 00	" 21	"
136	20 00	" 21	"
137	20 00	" 21	"
138	20 00	Dec. 15	E. Tinsley
139	40 00	Aug. 8	"
140	200 00	Nov. 2	"
141	75 00		
142	170 00		
143	140 00		
144	20 00	Jan. 26	E. Tinsley
145	5 00	" 26	"
146	20 00	" 26	"
147	20 00	" 26	"
148	20 00	Feb. 26	"
149	10 00	Feb. 20	"
150	20 00	Jan. 4	\$10 Provincial Treasurer, \$10 J. Scheich, Dep. Game Warden.

In default two months

Appealed

RETURN OF CONVICTIONS MADE TO THE CLERK OF THE PEACE

AUGUST 1906—

Name of the Prosecutor	Name of the Defendant	Nature of the Charge	Date of Conviction	Name of Convicting Justice
151 Daniel Blea	Daniel Snider	Hunting in Oct. contrary to Game Law	Nov. 17 1910	F. Fowke
152 Daniel Blea	Fred Kelsal	Violation of Game Law	Mar. 18	C. McArthur
153 W. J. Connor	Frank Dillon	Fish without license	" 8	J. Farrer
154 "	Peter Ramsay	Fish without license	" 8	"
155 "	Wm. Ramsay	Kill partridge Feb. 5	" 8	"
156 "	Wm. Ramsay	Kill partridge Feb. 12	" 8	"
157 "	Jno. Ramsay	Kill Partridge Feb. 5	" 9	"
158 "	Wm. C. Ferris	Kill deer out of season	" 17	"
151 Peter Ramsay	Jno. Miner	Kill partridge out of season	" 20	"
160 F. Dillon	Jno. Miner	Kill rabbit out of season	" 20	"
161 W. J. Connor	Chas. Oslen	Fish without license	Apr. 4	"
162 "	Chas. Oslen	Fish without license	" 4	"
163 "	Hy. Oldfield	Fish with net without license	" 7	"
164 "	S. F. Oldfield	Shipping fish illegally caught	" 21	"
165 "	Robt. Wardrobe	Fish with net Apr. 14	" 21	"
166 H. Minor	Lockwood Haight	Kill partridge out of season	May 8	"
167 W. J. Connor	Jno. Miner	Kill 2 partridge out of season	" 29	"
168 Murdock Watts	Chas. Salem	Breach of Game Law	Mar. 2	A. McMillan
169 "	Chas. Robertshaw	Illegal Fishing	Mar. 22	"
170 "	Theoplis Forget	"	Apr. 8	"
171 "	Herman Schueler	"	May 19	"
172 "	Joseph Lacroix	"	" 20	"
173 "	Archie Guerin	"	" 20	"
174 "	Cliff Guerin	"	" 20	"
175 "	Henry Michand	Breach of Fish Law	July 28	"
176 Jno. Armstrong	J. M. Ray	Violation of Game Law	July 13	"
177 Daniel Blea	John Noble	Killing game out of season	Oct. 11	J. Farrer
178 Murdock Watts	Cardona Bruns	Breach of Game Laws	" 2	A. McMillan
179 Murdock Watts	Cesari Zublina	" "	" 2	"
180 C. H. Knight	C. Alisander	" "	" 2	"
181 C. H. Knight	Guiseppa Coronella	" "	" 2	"
182 G. M. Parks	F. Windsor	Killing moose out of season	Sept. 6	G. Parks
183 G. M. Parks	E. Leclair	Killing moose out of season	Sept. 6 1912	"
184 Robt. Markle	Mervin Scarr	Dog running deer	Feb. 24	"
185 Hy. Reid	John Fraser	Illegal Fishing	Feb. 26	"
186 Murdock Watts	Michael Gereaus	Breach of Game Law	Apr. 1	A. McMillan
187 "	John Prisque	Having venison in possession	Apr. 1	"
188 "	John Prisque	Setting out poison	Mar. 23	"
189 R. J. Markle	Victor Harvie	Violation of Game Law	Mar. 7	C. McArthur
190 Murdock Watts	Xavier Boucher	Breach of Game Law	Aug. 16	A. McMillan
191 Daniel Blea	Raffle Ross	Violation of Game Law	Sept. 20	B. Green
192 "	Vieto Garzli	" "	Sept. 20	"
193 "	George Linklater	" "	Nov. 30	"
194 Jno McPhail	Jno. McPhail	Unlawfully killing moose	Oct. 31	R. McConkey
195 M. Watts	Leo La Voy	Breach of Game Law	Oct. 5	A. McMillan
196 H. W. Reid	James E. Eccles	Having deer in poss. in close season	Sept. 5	J. Farrer
197 "	James E. Eccles	Fishing without license	" 5	"
198 "	E. C. Conlyon	" "	" 5	"
199 "	Wm. Conborough	" "	" 5	"
200 "	R. S. Conlyon	" "	" 5 1913	"
201 Hy. Forder	S. A. Sine	Venison in poss. in close season	Feb. 19	"
202 Daniel Blea	E. Cox	Beaver skin in possession	Mar. 15	G. Parks
203 Hy. Forder	S. A. Sine	Kill fish with explosive	July 4	J. Farrer
204 Hy. Forder	Louis Anderson	Kill fish with explosive	July 4	J. Farrer
205 John Scheich	Gordon Force	Infraction of Ont. Game Law	Sept. 22	B. Green
206 M. Watts	Paul Guerin	Illegal hunting	Oct. 27	A. McMillan
207 "	Joe Lalande	"	" 27	"
208 "	Albert Hickley	"	" 27	"
209 Peter Antoine	Walter Hanson	"	Nov. 3	"
210 Peter Antoine	Pat Murphy	Illegal hunting	Nov. 3	A. McMillan
211 Peter Antoine	Harry Burns	Illegal hunting	" 8	A. McMillan
212 Daniel Blea	John Northcote	Having rat skins in possession in close season	" 17 1914	G. Parks
213 J. B. Geroux	Lawrence Ashton	Illegal fishing	Feb. 11	J. Farrer
214 H. W. Reid	Thos. Langladd	Fish without license	" 19	J. Farrer
215 Murdock Watts	Mrs. S. A. Wabb	Breach of Game Law	" 7	A. McMillan
216 "	Robert Wabb	" "	" 6	"
217 "	Chas. Thompson	" "	" 7	"
218 "	Isaac Thompson	" "	" 15	"
219 Daniel Blea	Henry Sawyer	Breach of G. & F. Act	Oct. 21	R. Carter
220 "	Wm. Russell	" "	" 21	"
221 "	J. H. Richards	" "	" 21	"
222 Murdock Watts	Fred Augustine	Illegal fishing	May 10	A. McMillan
223 H. W. Reid	Hubert Hodgins	Illegal nets in possession	July 25	J. Farrer
224 "	Hubert Hodgins	Illegal fishing	July 25	"
225 Murdock Watts	Andrew Cornie	Breach of Game Act	Oct. 31	A. McMillan

FOR THE PROVISIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PARRY SOUND

—OCTOBER 1920 (Continued)

Amount of Penalty, Fine or Damages	When Paid or to be Paid to said Justice	To whom Fine paid over by said Justice	If not paid, why not, and Remarks, if any
151	20 00	Nov. 17	E. Tinsley
152	15 00	Mar. 8	Department
153	5 00	" 8	1/2 to Connor for Informant, 1/2 to E. Tinsley
154	5 00	" 8	1/2 " " 1/2 "
155	5 00	" 8	1/2 " " 1/2 "
156	5 00	" 8	1/2 " " 1/2 "
157	5 90	" 9	1/2 " " 1/2 "
158	20 00	" 17	1/2 " " 1/2 "
159	5 00	" 20	E. Tinsley
160	5 00	" 20	"
161	5 00	Apr. 4	"
162	5 00	" 4	"
163	5 00	" 7	"
164	5 00	" 21	"
165	5 00	" 21	"
166	5 00	May 8	"
167	10 00	May 29	"
168	25 00	Mar. 2	Game & Fisheries Overseer
169	5 00	Mar. 22	" " "
170	5 00	Apr. 8	" " "
171	5 00	May 19	" " "
172	5 00	" 20	" " "
173	5 00	" 20	" " "
174	5 00	" 20	" " "
175	5 00	July 28	" " "
176	20 00	July 13	1/2 Province and 1/2 for informant
177	95 00	Oct. 11	E. Tinsley
178	30 00	" 2	Game & Fisheries Overseer
179	5 00	" 2	" " "
180	5 00	" 2	" " "
181	5 00	" 2	" " "
182	20 00	Sept. 6	G. M. Parks
183	20 00	Sept. 6	G. M. Parks
184	5 00	Feb. 24	1/2 to Markle for informant and 1/2 to E. Tinsley.
185	5 00	Feb. 26	E. Tinsley
186	5 00	Apr. 1	Game & Fisheries Overseer
187	25 00	Apr. 1	Game & Fisheries Overseer
188	5 00		
189	50 00	Mar. 7	1/2 to Informant and 1/2 to Province
190	5 00	Aug. 16	Game & Fisheries Overseer
191	20 00	Sept. 27	Supt. Game & Fisheries Dept.
192	20 00	Sept. 27	" " "
193	20 00	Nov. 30	" " "
194	50 00	Oct. 31	Forwarded to Dept.
195	20 00	Oct. 5	Game & Fisheries Overseer
196	20 00	Sept. 5	1/2 to Tinsley and 1/2 to Informant
197	5 00	" 5	E. Tinsley
198	5 00	" 5	"
199	5 00	" 5	"
200	5 00	" 5	E. Tinsley
201	50 00	Feb. 19	1/2 to Informant and 1/2 to Treas. of Ont.
202	40 00	Mar. 15	E. Tinsley
203	50 00	July 4	Paid to Clerk Division Court \$1.50
204	50 00	July 4	Paid to Clerk Division Court \$1.50
205	5 00	Sept. 22	Conviction quashed on appeal 60 days in P. S. Gaol
206	5 00	Oct. 27	Game & Fisheries Overseer
207	5 00	" 27	" " "
208	5 00	" 27	" " "
209	5 00	Nov. 3	" " "
210	5 00	Nov. 3	G. & F. Overseer
211	5 00	Nov. 8	G. & F. Overseer
212	50 00	" 24	Supt. Game & Fisheries
213	5 00	Feb. 14	E. Tinsley
214	5 00	" 19	E. Tinsley
215	180 00	" 7	G. & F. Overseer
216	10 00	" 6	"
217	40 00	" 7	"
218	110 00	" 15	Not paid
219	20 00	" 28	E. Tinsley
220	20 00	" 28	"
221	40 00	"	"
222	10 00	May 10	Game & Fish Overseer
223	15 00	July 25	1/2 to Jos. Wanmaker and 1/2 to Prov. Treas.
224	10 00	July 25	Prov. Treas.
225	10 00	Oct. 31	Game & Fisheries Overseer
226	10 00	" 31	" " "
			Remitted to Game & Fisheries Dept.
			Remitted to Game & Fisheries Dept.
			Case appealed
			Sent to Gaol 60 days

RETURN OF CONVICTIONS MADE TO THE CLERK OF THE PEACE
AUGUST 1906—

Name of the Prosecutor	Name of the Defendant	Nature of the Charge	Date of Conviction	Name of Convicting Justice
226 Murdock Watts	Benedict Cambianci	Breach of Game Act	Oct. 31	A McMillan
227 "	Sistino Primo	" "	" 31	"
228 "	Emilo De Justo	" "	" 31	"
229 "	Emilo Vissicuci	" "	" 31	"
230 "	Sustrisey Varisto	" "	" 31	"
231 "	Givonni DeMastee	" "	" 31	"
1915				
232 H. W. Reid	Harold Brunnell	Kill partridge unlawfully	Feb. 25	J. Farrer
233 R. A. Duff	Nat. Egland	Deer in possession	July 2	"
234 H. W. Reid	Joseph Farley	Killing deer out of season	Nov. 8	"
235 R. A. Duff	Norman Russell	Violation of Game Law	Aug. 24	"
1916				
236 H. W. Reid	Nat. Egland	Having venison in poss. out of season	July 15	"
237 "	John O'Hara	Kill deer out of season	July 15	"
238 "	Mervin Scarr	Infraction of Game Law	Feb. 15	"
239 W. J. White	John Watson	Hunting deer during close season	Sept. 28	G. Parks
240 "	Frank Martin	" " "	" 28	"
241 "	Andrew Watson	" " "	" 28	"
242 "	Herbert Chapman	" " "	" 28	"
243 H. Reid	Herbert Hodgins	Illegal Fishing	May 23	J. Knifton
244 H. Reid	Lorne Fraser	Having skins in possession	Nov. 28	G. Moore
1917				
245 C. H. Knight	Lewis Crosswell	Having deer skins in possession	Feb. 20	G. Moore
246 R. A. Duff	A. Ingleson	Violation of Game Act	Nov. 17	C. McArthur
247 Henry Harris	William Little	Exposing poisoned bait	Dec. 28	J. Fletcher
248 Henry Harris	David Little	Exposing poisoned bait	Dec. 28	J. Fletcher
249 Game Warden	Samuel Alren	Shoot ducks out of season	Apr. 16	W. Boler
250 Game Warden	Lawrence Latour	Shoot ducks out of season	Apr. 16	W. Boler
251 R. A. Duff	James Cook	Violation of Fishing Act	May 22	C. McArthur
252 J. Lamonday	Joseph Jacko	Fishing without license	Nov. 5	D. Udy
253 "	John Solomon	" "	" 5	"
254 "	George Beauvias	" "	" 5	"
1918				
255 W. R. Duff	Edward Cotter	Violation Game Law	Dec. 10	C. McArthur
256 "	Albert Knowles	" "	" 10	"
257 "	Charles Joy	" "	" 10	"
258 "	Ambrose Munnelly	" "	" 10	"
259 "	Wm. Ardell	" "	" 10	"
260 "	Jack Davis	" "	" 10	"
261 L. Lamonday	John Perault	Fishing net in poss. without license	Mar. 2	W. Boler
262 H. Reid	Louis Cantel	Having furs in possession	May 3	G. Moore
1919				
263 H. Reid	Mylo Dyett	Having beaver skin in possession	Feb. 8	G. Moore
264 D. Lamonday	Joseph Rivers	Laying poisoned baits	Mar. 22	W. Boler
265 D. Lamonday	Curtis Jorden	Shooting muskrat	Apr. 4	W. Boler
1920				
266 H. Reid	Thomas Milligan	Having beaver skins	May 13	G. Moore
267 H. Reid	Thomas Milligan	Trapping without a license	" 13	"
268 C. Knight	Henry Sararas	Having beaver and rat skins	" 18	"
269 P. Revill	David Caplan	Having muskrat skins	Mar. 17	"
270 P. Revill	J. Woodhutt	Having muskrat skins	Mar. 17	"
271 David Irwin	Fred Hansen	Killing partridge	Oct. 4	"

FOR THE PROVISIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PARRY SOUND
—OCTOBER 1920 (Concluded)

Amount of Penalty, Fine or Damages	When Paid or to be Paid to said Justice	To whom Fine paid over by said Justice	If not paid, why not, and Remarks, if any
226	10 00	Oct. 31	Game & Fisheries Overseer
227	10 00	" 31	" " "
228	10 00	" 31	" " "
229	10 00	" 31	" " "
230	10 00	" 31	" " "
231	10 00	" 31	" " "
232	5 00	Feb. 27	½ to Wilson Moyer and ½ to Prov. Treas.
233	20 00	July 2	Crown Attorney
234	20 00	Nov. 8	½ to Informant and ½ to Crown
235	30 00	Sept. 1	Warden Duff
236	40 00	Feb. 15	Crown Attorney
237	20 00		
238	Dismissed		
239	20 00	Nov. 2	Game & Fisheries Dept.
240	20 00	Sept. 28	Game & Fisheries Dept.
241	20 00		\$5 paid on account
242	20 00	Nov. 1	Game & Fisheries Dept.
243	10 00	May 23	½ to Crown moiety to informant
244			
245	20 00	Feb. 20	Dist. Treas. without costs
246	20 00		
247	25 00	Dec. 28	¼ to Harris and ¾ to Prov. Treas.
248	25 00	Dec. 28	¼ to Harris and ¾ to Prov. Treas.
249	5 00		Dist. Treas.
250	5 00		Dist. Treas.
251	5 00	May 22	R. A. Duff
252	5 00	Nov. 5	Dist. Treas.
253	5 00	" 5	"
254	5 00	" 5	"
255	10 00	Dec. 10	W. R. Duff
256	10 00	" 10	"
257	10 00	" 10	"
258	10 00	" 10	"
259	10 00	" 10	"
260	10 00	" 10	"
261	5 00	Feb. 26	Crown Attorney
262	50 00	May 3	Dist. Treas.
263		Feb. 8	Dist. Treas.
264	5 00		Crown Attorney
265	5 00		Crown Attorney
266	25 00	May 13	Dept. Game & Fisheries
267	25 00	May 13	Dept. Game & Fisheries
268	120 00		
269			
270			
271	100 00	Oct. 4	Prov. Treas.

Sent to Burwash for one month

Suspende d sentence

Not yet paid

Skins confiscated and accused to pay costs

Dismissed and skins confiscated
Dismissed and skins confiscated

BRUCE MINES, ONT., MARCH 4TH, 1920.

To K. S. STOVER, ESQ., M. P. P.

MEMBER FOR ALGOMA.

Whereas the high cost of living has so advanced in these days, and travelling expenses have so increased, that it is advisable not to incur any more of these expenses than is absolutely necessary,

And where owing to these increased expenses, it is now difficult to get Bailiffs and Division Court Clerks to act under the present Tariffs of fees under the Division Court Act,

And whereas it will be better for all parties concerned to have the jurisdiction of the Division Courts in this Province doubled to its present jurisdiction,

Therefore Be It Resolved on^o motion of Councillor Jeffery seconded by Councillor Clark that the Council of the Township of Plummer Additional approve of having the Division Courts Act so amended, that said Divisional Courts will have jurisdiction to try actions in double or treble the amounts at which said Courts now have jurisdiction to try actions.

Passed by said Council this 10th day of April A.D. 1920.

J. P. MCCREA,

Reeve.

THOS. HUMPHRIES,

Clerk.

Exhibit "A"

Re Fisheries.

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR HON. MR. RANEY.

Towards the close of the 1919 Session of the House Mr. Dewart received confidential letters from Port Arthur relating to certain Fishing Privileges at Nipigon upon which to obtain information in the Legislature. These he used in the Campaign and held for the recent Session. These letters were handed to Lieut. K. S. Stover, Member for Algoma, this year, on which to base questions before the Public Accounts Committee.

The purport of the letters was not mentioned by Mr. Stover at the Public Accounts Committee on the adjournment of one Session; but the letters were locked in Mr. Stover's desk in the House and the key left inserted in the desk.

At the next ensuing meeting of the committee Deputy Minister H. McDonald made a statement touching the subject of the letters, which Mr. Stover had in the meantime found were stolen from his desk. (The key had been taken away and has not been recovered.

The writer of the letters soon after learned that his letters were seen in the hands of a friend of Col. Little, of Port Arthur, one of the parties mentioned in the letters.

He was threatened with legal proceedings for what he had written. Mr. Dewart requests that the Attorney-General conduct such investigation into the matter and prosecution of all parties as the circumstances call for. The letters can be and should be recovered.

P. F. CRONIN,

Secretary.

July 6th, 1920.

MEMO FOR THE HON. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

E. A. Hewett of 1041 College St., City of Toronto, made the following statement to me this 12th day of July, 1920, at my office: I was present at different meetings of the Fish and Game Committee, and on the last day they met I was sitting between Mr. Stover, M.P.P. and Mr. Taylor, M.P.P., I was talking to them, and after they both left the room I saw a bunch of papers which I picked up from the table where I was sitting, I intended to give them to Stover or Taylor but did not see them. I kept the papers and looked at them to see who owned them, and on reading one of the letters I saw it referred to Mr. McDonald, Deputy Minister of Fish and Game, and one Rattray of his Department, from the letter I concluded a dirty job was being put up on them, and the next day I brought the letters to Mr. McDonald, and left them on his desk, and told him he could do what he liked with them. The letters were left on the table by Mr. Stover or Mr. Taylor.

JOS. E. ROGERS,
Superintendent.

Toronto, July 12th, 1920.

1041 COLLEGE ST. TORONTO, CANADA.
JULY 12, 1920.

JOSEPH ROGERS, ESQ.,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, CITY.

DEAR SIR:—

At the last meeting of Fish and Game Committee, I was sitting at end of table, between Mr. Taylor and Mr. Stover.

At the close of the meeting I noticed a packet of papers in front of me lying on the table.

I picked them up intending to give them to either Mr. Stover or Mr. Taylor. I did not see either of them that day. At the office here I opened them to see who they belonged to. It appeared to me somebody was going to knife the Deputy Minister of Fish and Game.

It looked to me like dirty business, and I told Mr. McDonald about it and gave him the papers.

Yours truly,
ALFRED HEWETT.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND FISHERIES

MEMORANDUM FOR J. E. ROGERS, ESQ.,
SUPERINTENDENT OF ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

In reply to your verbal request of Saturday last, in regard to certain letters that were in my possession, which contained very serious statements as to my action and interests in Government operations carried on by one, J. A. Little, I have to state that these letters were placed on my desk on May 3rd, 1920, by one Alfred Hewett of 1041 College Street, Toronto, and with the statement, "Do what you please with them." Having read them on the morning of May 4th, and being surprised at the seriousness of the contents, I at once attempted to get an appointment with Mr. H. H. Dewart by calling his secretary on the phone at the Parliament Buildings, and failing to secure this appointment, I tried the second time some two or three days later through the same source but this also failed. I was then requested to appear before the Public

Accounts Committee shortly after these papers came in my possession, and having knowledge of the malicious statements being circulated in these letters of January 12th, 1918, January 29th, 1919 and March, 1919, I made certain voluntary statements while under oath by denying having any interest, either directly or indirectly, with Mr. J. A. Little in connection with the Lake Nipigon fisheries. I explained my reason for making my voluntary statements to the Acting Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee on the following day. Shortly after this time Mr. Little appeared at my office and made a request to have the papers turned over to him, and I refused to do so. Within a day or two, Mr. Little again appeared and as he was an interested party, I read to him certain portions of the letters bearing on the Lake Nipigon fisheries, and he greatly resented the statements therein. During the course of our conversation, Mr. Little took the letters from my desk, to which I made protest and whereupon he promised to return them.

Aside from the documents specifically mentioned herein, I had in my possession from the same source the following letters: January 28th, 1919, F. A. Clements to H. H. Dewart, K.C., document from Reeve and Clerk of Bruce Mines to K. S. Stover, M.P.P., also circular and letter from the Canadian Fishermen's Association addressed to K. S. Stover, M.P.P., which I had under lock and key until this date, when I turned over same for your disposition. No one has seen or read these papers while in my possession, nor has any action been taken in regard thereto and were entirely forgotten as they contained no charges against my integrity.

I deem it to be my right at all times to defend any accusation against my reputation and would consider it only fair to have a full enquiry made in the interests of all concerned, including the Department.

D. McDONALD,

Deputy Minister of Game and Fisheries.

Toronto, July 12th, 1920.

“ B ”

This is Exhibit marked “ B ” referred to in the evidence of Joseph E. Rogers taken on oath before the Public Accounts Committee this 11th day of March, A.D., 1921.

JAMES W. CURRY,
Chairman.

Private.

PORT ARTHUR, JANUARY 12TH, 1918

MR. H. H. DEWART, M. P. P.

Toronto, Ont.

DEAR MR. DEWART:—

With reference to the reported policy of the Ontario Government on the Fishing industry in the Province, and the statement that the Fish Department will, in future, reserve twenty per cent of the catch for consumers in this Province, and fixing the prices to be paid to the Fishermen, there is room for serious criticism, so far as it effects the industry in this part of the Province.

In the first place, the policy is wrong in its inception, as the men who catch

the fish are not marketers of the product to the public. Only in rare cases are they in a position to box and ice and ship their catch to the dealers at outside points, and therefore depend upon selling their catch to local dealers and shippers. As a matter of fact, The A. Booth Fish Co., an American concern primarily, handle ninety per cent of the catch made in the waters of Lake Superior, both at Port Arthur and S. S. Marie, and even if twenty per cent of the catch is to be reserved for the Government, what facilities are to be provided for the handling and marketing to the public?

The course they intend to follow only accentuates the weak and incompetent policy followed by the Food Controller, who, instead of regulating the prices and distribution, has allowed the Booth Co., and other concerns to charge and distribute as they pleased, with the result that Trout & White-fish cost consumers here 15 to 16 cents per lb., which is 3 to 4 cents per lb. in excess of what they should be, and what applies locally affects the rest of the province in even greater ratio.

The great bulk of the catch, as you are aware, is marketed in the United States, at high prices, and the Canadian consumers are paying 20 to 25% more than they should have to pay for this necessary food product.

The Ontario Govt. granted rights to a local company, headed by Col. J. A. Little, a Tory stalwart, to fish Lake Nepigon, which had hitherto been a closed lake.

The granting of an exclusive concession was not fair to the Fishermen of the District, as the lake should have been thrown open to all genuine fishermen.

Since granting the concession to fish Lake Nepigon, the Department has entered into an arrangement with this local Company by which the latter carries on the fishing, and the Government does the handling, boxing, icing and marketing.

The Company have been paying the Fishermen engaged in the work four and three quarter (4-3/4) cents per lb. at their nets and carry them to the Government's docks and ice-houses on Lake Nepigon, where the Government Officials handle, box, ice and ship them to Port Arthur, Toronto and elsewhere in the Province. I understand that the prices in Toronto are fixed at 15 to 16 cts., per lb. retail for trout and whitefish.

This means that somebody is making a fine profit out of the business, and it appears to me that the profiteers are the local Company. It is stated that one of the Department's own Officials is interested in the Company, and such assertions do not surprise me. The official is Mr. Donald McDonald, Deputy Fish & Game Warden for Ontario.

The personnel of the local company are, Col. J. A. Little, Geo. H. Rapsey and Donald McDonald. Rapsey is also a Government Official, being Manager for the Government at Lake Nepigon. All of these officials are ardent Tories, and were probably necessary for Little to carry out his undertaking.

The concession granted to this Company ought to be looked into, and the subsequent action of the Department ought to be the subject of inquiry, in order to establish the relationship of one to the other. There is no doubt of such relations and the Department can be placed in a bad light, if this is followed up. I presume that the only way that such can be established is by taking the matter up in committee, or when the Estimates for the Department are brought down.

However, I have given you enough information to enable you to investigate further, with a view to getting at the crux of the matter.

I hope to be able, later on, to give you some valuable information re the

manipulation of timber concessions and timber berths in this district, and in which several Government Officials are deeply involved.

I will expect you to treat the information given as of a confidential nature, in the meantime.

Yours faithfully,

GEO. F. HARRIGAN.

PORT ARTHUR, JAN. 29TH, 1919.

Personal.

MR. H. H. DEWART, M. P. P.

Toronto, Ont.

DEAR MR. DEWART:—

I am in receipt of yours of 25th inst. with reference to Nepigon Fish Co. You need not hesitate about the safety of the ground in making an investigation into the personnel and operations of this company.

The Deputy Minister, D. McDonald, was a member of the company at its formation, as was G. H. Rapsey, Inspector for the Department. It was part of Col. J. A. Little's plan to have McDonald and Rapsey transferred to the service of the Department, so that matters might be manipulated the better for the company. McDonald and Rapsey may not appear on the Board of Directors now, nor on the annual statement submitted to the Government, but they are nevertheless part and parcel of the company. The Department covered up to the extent of allowing one, Thos. Craigie, a local Fisherman to operate on a limited extent, and also to allow a few Indians to fish on Lake Nepigon, but the Nepigon Co. handle the catch and receive financial returns from the Department through their Manager, E. H. McLeod, at Orient Bay, Lake Nepigon, on the C. N. Ry. East of Port Arthur. Craigie made a strong protest some months ago against the monopoly given to the Nepigon Fish Co., as he was promised a license to fish the lake before Little formed his Company. These facts are pretty well known here, and there is demand that a probe be made.

We cannot expect our Tory friends to take action, although some of them are anxious to see a clean up.

Hogarth is still over in London drawing down military pay, and is also associated with Little in the company, and in many other land and timber transactions by which the public domain is exploited. Therefore, no voice of protest is raised, and we must rely on you and your colleagues to take action towards exposing these deals.

Little is a political pirate, who is practically local Member, during Hogarth's absence, and is making hay while the sun is shining, and makes no bones about it.

I will keep you advised *re* this matter, and trust that you will press for information without stint at the forthcoming session.

Yours faithfully,

GEO. F. HARRIGAN.

P. S. I have advised W. H. Adams, Secy. O. R. Asscn. and Mr. Proudfoot as to certain timber transactions which involve Little and others here.

G. F. H.

PORT ARTHUR, MARCH / 19.

H. DEWART, ESQ., M. P. P.

Toronto, Ont.

DEAR SIR:—

As our Member, D. Hogarth, is overseas and our adjoining Member, Jarvis, is a strong supporter of the Govnt. (as I am my self if you will leave out the word Strong;) I take the liberty of writing you on a matter which if true, is in my mind; one of the most flagrant rascality we have run up against for some time.

And as you are in a position to ask for all papers and documents in connection therewith; it is easy for you to find out if the report is based on facts.

It is well known that some time since the Dept. gave to J. A. Little and Geo. Rapsey both of Port Arthur the right to fish Nipigon Lake. Some time after the Dept. decided to go into the fishing business for themselves, to assist in the distribution of fish to the consumers of Canada, and thereby took over and operated the industry on Lake Nipigon thereby stepping into the shoes of Little and Rapsey:

Rapsey is given a position in the Dept. and thereby made a Gov't official. That part is all right he is a capable and honest man and will make good; Little had to be settled with likewise and what looks *Fishy*; even if it is a fish business is the fact that he (Little,) reported last summer, that he received from the Department a commission of 3 cts. per lb. for all fish taken; and late in the season the Dept. issued a statement saying that there had been 3,000,000 (three million) lbs. of fish taken from Nipigon; therefore if the two statements are correct the amount paid to Little by my figuring is about \$90,000.00. When the Ont. Govt. went into the fish business it was understood it was with the idea of giving the people more and cheaper fish food and the first thing done was to clap on a handicap to a friend of 3 cts. per lb.

I may say, that I am fisherman and have no Interest in the matter, pro. or con.—other than a feeling that it is one of the worst frauds ever perpetrated on a community.

It is well known that Little and Rapsey spent only a small amount in plant which would be taken over by the Dept.

I am, yours truly,

RICH. VIGARS

34 College St.,
Port Arthur.

I do not wish to have my name used without first asking me.

G. V.

“ C ”

This is exhibit marked “ C ” referred to in the evidence of Joseph E. Rogers given on oath before the Public Accounts Committee this 11th day of March, A. D., 1921.

JAMES W. CURRY,

Chairman.

MONTREAL, APRIL 12TH, 1920.

KENNETH S. STOVER, ESQ., M. P. P. FOR ALGOMA,
Parliament Buildings., Toronto, Ont.

DEAR SIR:—

We respectfully beg to call your attention to the enclosed copy of a petition which was recently presented by the Ontario fishermen to the Minister in charge of the Department of Game & Fisheries, Hon. E. C. Biggs.

This petition along with several other representations made by our fishermen members appear to have been ignored by the Government, as we understand they intend continuing the Fish Sales Branch.

As a considerable number of the fishermen who signed the petition are located in your constituency, we are placing this matter before you for you to take whatever action you may see fit on behalf of these Ontario fishermen who are being, we consider, unjustly discriminated against.

Trusting to enlist your sympathy on their behalf, we remain,

Yours very truly,
CANADIAN FISHERIES ASSOCIATION.

F. W. WALLACE,
Secretary.

FWW / ADL

“ONTARIO GOVERNMENT FISHERIES SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED.”

COPY OF AN EDITORIAL IN “*THE CANADIAN FISHERMAN*” FOR JANUARY.

See the March issue for further action on behalf of Ontario Fishermen.

The action of the late Ontario Government in engaging itself in the catching and selling of the fish of Ontario waters in competition with the regularly established fishermen and dealers may be characterized as an unwarranted interference with the rights of numerous citizens which has neither parallel or precedent to justify it. As a war-time measure, the fishermen and others whom it mitigated against, accepted the Government's fishery activities just as the citizens as a whole have borne other war-time measures, but not without indignant protest at the manifest injustice of the scheme, and the fishermen and those engaged in the fish trade feel that the time has now come—fourteen months after the conclusion of hostilities—for the Government's exploitation of the commercial fisheries to be abandoned.

The Ontario lake fishermen of all the Canadian fishermen are bound down with numerous severe restrictions. In the first place they are licensed by the Provincial Government: in the prosecution of the fisheries they have to employ expensive gear in the way of gill-nets or pound-nets, fishing tugs and boats, and their fishing seasons are limited. The work is skilled labor and since the war, cost of such labor has risen as well as prices for gear and equipment, but it will be found that the price of the fish sold nowadays by the fisherman has not advanced to the percentage of advance in gear and labor. Yet with these facts against them the Ontario fishermen at this date have to market their fish in competition with their own Provincial Government who have the advantage of being able to command twenty per cent. of the Ontario fishermen's catch at any time to augment supplies: the advantage of setting a purchase price for such commandeered fish: the advantage of fishing in virgin waters such as Lake Nipigon where the Government maintains a fishery, and all the advantage which a Government has in competing with private individuals.

Even during the dark days of the war no other Province in Canada attempted such an exploitation of the fisheries nor was it tried in Great Britain. The principle of all enlightened nations has ever been to encourage the fishermen—not to handicap them by entering into competition against them. Just why the late Government should select the fisheries, of all other food commodities the least important and least utilized by the people, is difficult to comprehend especially when Canada produces ten times more fish than the country can consume and when excellent fish, cheap in price, cannot be sold in home markets through lack of demand.

The whole affair started on a piece of mistaken philanthropy, when in 1917, the necessity of the day was to save meats for export to the Allies. It was at that time stated by a few irresponsible and uninformed persons that the fish of Ontario waters were unprocurable as they were all being exported to the United States by the Ontario fishermen. It is admitted that the best market for Canadian freshwater fish is in the United States just as it offers the best market for our lobsters, halibut, smelts, and other sea fish and the United States markets for such fish has encouraged what little development there is in our fisheries as a whole, but to state that Ontario fish were unprocurable in the Ontario market had absolutely no foundation in fact and such a statement was not sufficient justification for the late Government's action.

It is not the high price (?) of fish which should demand the attention of the Provincial Government, but the high price of more indispensable commodities such as meats, eggs, flour, vegetables, etc. The late Government evidently felt that food problems in those particular lines were too difficult to tackle and turned to the fisheries as being an easier industry to exploit by reason of the fact that it is prosecuted by a few inoffensive individuals with no political organizations of any great power behind them, and the said individuals being under the heel of the Government by reason of the fishery license which is granted yearly. Withdrawal or cancellation of said license means the ruin of the fisherman holding same, and this places them in a position of apprehensive tenure and inability to strenuously oppose or criticise the actions of the Government from whom they receive the right to fish. In a country boasting the free institutions such as ours, the position of the Ontario fishermen to-day is at once degrading and entirely out of keeping with the freedom and nobility of profession which has ever been the characteristics of fishermen the world over.

Since 1917, the fishermen of Ontario have been laboring under the handicap of Government competition while other basic industries developing natural resources have been free to prosper unhampered and to take advantage of enhanced prices—a state of affairs which all fair-minded persons unhesitatingly condemn. And yet the need of the present is to encourage the development of natural resources; to speed up exports of Canadian products that we may adjust adverse trade balances and pay our debts. The Ontario Government's fish policy is an excellent damper upon such efforts as far as the Provincial fisheries are concerned.

Of what benefit has the Government fish policy been, to the people of Ontario? We would state emphatically that it has been productive of absolutely no real benefit whatever. Ontario citizens may received whitefish, trout, herring and other species a cent or two cheaper at times than if they had purchased the privately produced fish, but just what would this saving amount to in the aggregate? It is claimed by the late Government that the citizens of Ontario were saved

the sum of \$160,000 during 1919 by its Fish Sales Branch. On the basis of three million population this represents the insignificant sum of five cents per capita per annum—a truly ridiculous economic parable with which to justify a Government commercial operation. And still more ridiculous aspects are contained in the facts that privately produced fish could have been sold at certain seasons at lower prices than that set by the Government; and also, with the prosperity of the average individual during the past three years, what economic advantage has it been to the people of Ontario in saving them a few cents a year upon a commodity which is by no means popular or indispensable, at the expense of its fishermen citizens?

It is sincerely to be hoped that with the advent of a new Provincial Government composed largely of men who are producers and harvesters of the soil that the petition of a sister industry—harvesters of the lakes—will be considered with that sympathetic appreciation which should exist among men who gain a livelihood through skilled muscular effort and who are at the mercy of wind and weather, and the policy of exploiting the fisheries established by the late Government be discontinued and the industry allowed to pursue its own normal development in the hands of the men to whom it is a livelihood and who have ever been the backbone of the Empire's Maritime Supremacy.

COPY OF PETITION PRESENTED TO THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT
BY THE CANADIAN FISHERIES ASSOCIATION
ON BEHALF OF THE FISHERMEN OF ONTARIO

THE UNDERSIGNED FISHERMEN OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Respectfully petition the present Government to cease commercial fishing and dealing in fish, for the following reasons:—

(1) No justifiable economic or publicly beneficial reason now exists for continued Government operation of a Fish Sales Branch. As a War Measure, such Branch may have justified its existence, but with the conclusion of hostilities, Government operation of a Fish Sales Branch constitutes unfair competition with private fishermen and dealers

(2) The Government operation of a fishery in the virgin waters of Lake Nipigon, where fish cost very little to produce, and the marketing of such low cost fish in competition with fish produced at much higher cost by independent fishermen in the Great Lakes—said fishermen paying tolls and licenses to the Government for the privilege of fishing—creates a situation which is manifestly unfair.

(3) The consuming public of Ontario have really received no benefit from the Government Fish Sales policy. The alleged saving in the price of fish to the consumer, it will be found upon analysis, has amounted to nothing which justifies a continuation of the policy. Those who have benefited are the few persons privileged to fish Lake Nipigon; the middle-man, who distributes the fish, and the retailer, who, with few exceptions, charges several cents per pound more than the supposed Government fixed price to the consumer, or, who sells a few pounds to the Ontario consumer and ships large quantities to the United States market for higher prices.

(4) At the present time it has been found that the public are not taking advantage of low priced fish to reduce living costs—the demand is for the high priced and expensive varieties. The Fish Trade of Canada are in a position

to fill the market with excellent low priced fish but there is no demand for such. In view of this fact, which can be substantiated upon investigation, there can be no justification for the continuation of a Government Fish Sales Branch.

We, therefore, respectfully ask the present Government to discontinue their present Fish Sales Policy, and we feel confident that we will receive sympathetic consideration of our petition.

G. W. Peterson, South Bay	Frank Herman, Anderdon	Springs
Frank Lambert, Northport	Mack Roson, Windsor	Aaron Main, Cedar Springs
D. H. Fraser, Northport	William G. Goodchilds, Am-	S. Vansickle, Wheatley
William Robbins, Picton	hersburg.	D. Smith, Wheatley
Frank Hupp, Picton	Erwin Joyce, Deseronto	Milton Crewe, Wheatley
Fred Frost, Milford	Blake Sharp, Hay Bay	Floyd Hopper, Wheatley
James Frost, Milford	H. E. Putman, North Port	Harry Cobby, Wheatley
R. C. Richardson, Picton	J. Kennedy, Northport	John Cobby, Wheatley
Phillip Hudgin, South Bay	Frank Cousins, Belleville	M. Baldwin, Merlin
Fred Bangard, South Bay	Joe Waimark, Belleville	F. P. Baldwin, Merlin
L. R. Garrison, Cherry Valley	Frank Cronk, Northport	A. N. Baldwin, Merlin
J. J. Monck, Picton	F. W. Spencer, Hay Bay	Nicholas Baldwin, Merlin
J. W. Tuttle, Cherry Valley	Blake Sells, Hay Bay	L. H. Kennedy, Blenheim
W. C. Utters, Cherry Valley	John Anderson, Hay Bay	Ernest Hardy, Blenheim
Walter Tuttle, West Lake	Frank McDonald, Point Anne	C. B. Toll, Blenheim
Manson Baverstock, Cherry Valley	Manson McDonald, Point Anne	George Allan, Blind River
S. A. Dulmage, Cherry Valley	E. McHenry, Deseronto	A. M. Spears, Blind River
Frank Guess, South Bay	F. McHendry, Deseronto	Robert Gray, Blind River
F. E. Howell, Demorestville	Henry Julien, Wheatley	A. M. Rogue, Blind River
William James Watson, Cherry Valley	J. Moody, Wheatley	R. P. Scott, Blind River
G. D. Miller, Picton	E. Thompson, Wheatley	Geo. H. Christilaw, Blind River
Wm. G. Head, Picton	H. Bailey, Wheatley	R. J. Inkster, Blind River
Percy Thurston, Cressy	H. Cottingham, Wheatley	Fred Thurmption, Blind River
Frank Bygott, Adolphustown	Jas. Lamarshe, Wheatley	W. H. McGauley, Blind River
Geo. Hyderman, Picton	Will Chute, Wheatley	James Baxter, Blind River
Joseph Gemer, Picton	A. E. Crewe, Merlin, Kent Co.	S. G. F. Bundict, Blind River
Reuben Henderson, Picton	W. Philcox, Merlin, Kent Co.	Dan Campbell, Blind River
Arthur Bangard, South Bay	J. St. John, Merlin, Kent Co.	D. McDonald, Blind River
Chas. H. Herdgin, South Bay	J. Adams, Merlin, Kent Co.	J. B. Chernier, Blind River
Douglas Hart, Picton	J. E. Wilson, Merlin, Kent Co.	J. Binett, Blind River
Sidney C. Carson, Cressy	J. H. Wilson, Merlin, Kent Co.	Thom J——, Blind River
Phillip ———, Picton	D. L. Crewe, Merlin, Kent Co.	W. Brathwaite, Blind River
Robt. Cory, Cressy	F. C. Crewe, Merlin, Kent Co.	W. J. Keen, Jr., Blind River
John St. Pierre, Waupoos	J. A. Bunning, Cedar Springs	J. Lajoe, Blind River
Clayton Stiffik, Point Pi—	D. L. Goodison, Cedar Springs	W. White, Blind River
John Mitchell, Waupoos	A. Boyd, Cedar Springs	F. Sullivan, Blind River
Wilson Minak, Waupoos	S. E. Burk, Cedar Springs	P. Lessee, Blind River
Berard Burns, Waupoos	Norman Lamarsh, Cedar Springs	D. Sheehan, Blind River
Wm. A. Airhart, Adolphus-	Wm. Dawson, Blenheim	Edward Monk, Meldrum Bay
town	Gebina Ramsden, Cedar Springs	Clifford Langman, Meldrum Bay
Fred Gallagher, Adolphus-	Andrew Pardo, Cedar Springs	G. W. Bromley, Meldrum Bay
town	Roy Bowden, Cedar Springs	D. Murray, Meldrum Bay
Philip Mack, South Bay	Clinton Bowden, Cedar Springs	James Pelton, Meldrum Bay
Burgess S Jenkins, South Bay	Geo. Bowden, Cedar Springs	J. W. Granville, Meldrum Bay
Charles Sawyer, Malden Township	H. J. Birkford, Cedar Springs	Ed. Morrison, Meldrum Bay
Raymond Moore, Malden Township	E. Fagan, Cedar Springs	Charlie McDonald, Meldrum Bay
Fred Guarolin, Amherstburg	M. Shaw, Cedar Springs	Joseph Millman, Meldrum Bay
William Wilcox, Amherstburg	John Curtis, Cedar Springs	Frank Cockwill, Meldrum Bay
W. E. Dewey, North Malden	Reginald R. Keiver, Cedar Springs	Chas. Joyce, Meldrum Bay
Francis Dewey, North Malden	Willie Keiver, Cedar Springs	Dan Sullivan, Meldrum Bay
O C. Dewey, North Malden	Robert Goodison, Cedar	John Murray, Meldrum Bay
George Herrnan, Anderdon		

W. C. Steele, Meldrum Bay	Donald MacKenzie, Little Current	Marchal Louis, Deseronto
P. Sullivan, Meldrum Bay	William Vanzant, Little Current	Frank Lambert, North Port
S. P. Woods, Meldrum Bay	John Hasiie, Sheguindah	Robert Cousins, Dorland
Fred S. James, Meldrum Bay	John Mark Turner, Sheguindah	Russell Cousins, Dorland
A. M. Gareau, Meldrum Bay	Argill Hastie, Sheguindah	Fred Gallagher, Dorland
W. J. Kurr, Blind River	Wm. Love, Killarney	Wm. Gallagher, Dorland
J. Lajoie, Blind River	Louis Rogue, Killarney	Leonard Dufor, Dorland
Archie Baxter, Blind River	Charles Low, Killarney	Stephen Hart, Dorland
E. Lnouette, Blind River	Cecil Low, Killarney	Adam Parks, Dorland
David Rainville, Blind River	Wm. Low, Jr., Killarney	Wilford LaRue, Belleville
Jno. A. Hawkins, Blind River	Thomas Bateman, Killarney	Samuel LaRue, Belleville
Wm. D. F. King, Blind River	Alf. Rogue, Killarney	Wilford LaRue, Belleville
J. B. Faulkner, Blind River	John Solomon, Killarney	William LaRue, Belleville
J. A. Menard, Blind River	Patrick Egan, Killarney	Carl D. Kiser, Belleville
P. C. McCalie, Blind River	Geo. Beauvais, Killarney	David Peoples, Belleville
J. E. Trahan, Blind River	George J. Pitfield, Killarney	Gus. Hall, Belleville
J. C. McArthur, Blind River	Wm. Solomon, Killarney	Jack Kizer, Belleville
A. C. Lewis, Blind River	Joseph W. Solomon, Killarney	Wm. Connor, Belleville
J. A. Pyson, Blind River	Thomas Tyson, Killarney	B. Kiser, Belleville
Lorne Burke, Blind River	William Beaucage, Killarney	W. Weymark, Belleville
Geo. Boville, Blind River	Charles Low, Killarney	Geo. Weymark, Belleville
Fred Liplady, Blind River	Alex. Rogue, Killarney	Wesley Fox, Belleville
Eli Taylor, Blind River	Chas. Rogue, Killarney	Edward Little, Belleville
R. J. Timmermans, Blind River	Frank Rogue, Killarney	Frank MacDonald, Point Anne
A. G. Lizoth, Blind River	Louie Lamorandiere, Killarney	Geo. C. MacDonald, Point Anne
Keetch Bros., Blind River	Daniel Rogue, Killarney	J. MacDonald, Point Anne
F. D. Pepin, Blind River	Eddie Rogue, Killarney	James Kelly, Point Anne
Mr. Pepin, Blind River	Joe G. Solomon, Killarney	Manson MacDonald, Point Anne
O. H. Hewitt, Blind River	A. Purvis, Duck Island	Robert MacDonald, Point Anne
Will Hutt, Picton	Ken McDonald, Duck Island	Anne MacDonald, Point Anne
C. Furby, Cherry Valley	Angus McLeod, Duck Island	Clarence MacDonald, Point Anne
B. E. Dunham, Cherry Valley	Oscar Young, Gore Bay	Norman MacDonald, Point Anne
E. B. Scott, Woodrous	H. E. Purvis, Cockburn Island	A. C. Alyea, Rossmore
Geo. W. Bangard, South Bay	James Young, Gore Bay	Raymond Belwak, Rossmore
Edward Stark, South Bay	W. A. Young, Gore Bay	S. Alyea, Rossmore
Allan Jarvis, Milford, R.R. 2	J. Gareau, Duck Island	Charles Thompson, Rossmore
Robt. Cousins, Dorland	A. Currie, Gore Bay	Claude Thompson, Rossmore
V. Young, Picton	George A. Thorburn, Gore Bay	David Belnap, Rossmore
Leonard McGibbon Cherry Valley	R. R. Merrylus, Gore Bay	W. R. Belnap, Rossmore
Hugh McWilliam, Picton	John H. Merrylus, Gore Bay	C. Losee, Rossmore
E. Cooper, Picton	Gus Nelson, Gore Bay	C. Reddick, Rossmore
H. B. Huff, Picton	Frank McCracken, Duck Island	John R. Scott, Rossmore
Wilfred Lowe, Killarney	Peter Laurance, Cockburn Island	M. Belnap, Rossmore
A. J. Lowe, Killarney	Harry Ridgen, Duck Island	Ray Belnap, Rossmore
John Lowe, Killarney	Thos. G. Mewain, Deseronto	Frank Belnap, Rossmore
Reginald Lowe, Killarney	M. Bowen, Deseronto	Daniel Belnap, Rossmore
Stanley Pitfield, Killarney	Sam. Putman, Deseronto	Edward Belnap, Rossmore
Vincent Rogue, Killarney	Harold Sherman, Shermans Point	T. W. Belnap, Rossmore
C. Savard, Killarney	'Isalah Sherman, Shermans Point	L. MacDonald, Point Anne
Capt. Joe Rogue, Killarney	Geo. Davey, Napanee	Archie Goyer, Belleville
Michell Bernerd, Killarney	F. J. Cummings, Deseronto	Nap. Goyer, Belleville
Joseph Lamorandiere, Killarney	M. Keetch, Deseronto	Wesley Kizer, Belleville
N. Trotter, Little Current	W. A. Johns, Deseronto	Frank Cousins, Belleville
H. Roszel, Little Current	M. H. Martin, North Fedburg	Marchel Gerow, Belleville
Wm. Wardrop, Little Current	H. W. Gallagher, Dorland	Harry Gerow, Belleville
Louis Lapointe, Little Current	W. Cousins, Dorland	Wesley Gerow, Belleville
Tom Boyter, Little Current	F. H. Keetch, Napanee No. 3	John Peoples, Belleville
James J. Noble, Little Current	M. Kimmerly, Deseronto	E. N. Bartlett, Low Bush
Thos. J. Noble, Little Current	Norman Louis, Deseronto	Earl E. Bartlett, Low Bush
Robert Boyter, Little Current		Ray. A. Bartlett, Low Bush
Emerson Boyter, Little Current		Norman E. Bartlett, Low Bush
Thos. Smith, Little Current		Corey Bros., Port Credit
		P. G. J. Corey, Port Credit

- Henry R. Fowler, Port Credit
 Louis Joyce, Port Credit
 W. H. Johnston, Port Credit
 John King, Sr., Thessalon
 John Treadeau, Thessalon
 A. Treadeau, Thessalon
 Lawrence Lesage, Thessalon
 Paul Lesage, Thessalon
 B. Buck, Thessalon
 George King, Thessalon
 H. Bellerose, Thessalon
 James Basch, Thessalon
 Dan McKay, Thessalon
 Geo. Fleron, Thessalon
 Thomas LeClair, Thessalon
 J. T. Young, Manitowaning
 Wm. Chapman, Manitowaning
 Seth Chapman, Manitowaning
 H. Chapman, Manitowaning
 Donald White, Lake Ontario
 Robert Parks, Lake Ontario
 Fred E. Thorigal, Lake Ontario
 Robert Colver, Lake Ontario
 Wm. J. Thorigal, Lake Ontario
 Hugh Begg, Lake Ontario
 Thomas D. Smith, Lake Ontario
 Murray Willard, Lake Ontario
 S. R. Lewis, Lake Ontario
 R. Milligan, Lake Ontario
 Bert Smith, Lake Ontario
 Thomas Smith, Lake Ontario
 R. Smith, Lake Ontario
 V. Howard, Lake Ontario
 Nelson Instant, Lake Ontario
 John Brown, Lake Ontario
 S. J. W. Brown, Lake Ontario
 W. Geo. Brown, Lake Ontario
 F. G. Colver, Bath, Ont.
 W. J. White, Blind River
 F. Sullivan, Blind River
 George Longe, Southampton
 M. Macaulay, Southampton
 Wm. Baker, Southampton
 Alfred Diamand, Gordenville
 E. R. Chase, Gordenville
 A. J. Chase, Gordenville
 Henry Nelson, Gordenville
 A. Young, Gordenville
 George Shewman, Brighton
 M. Young, Gordenville
 Jas. Quackenbush, Carrying Place
 B. E. Shewman, Carrying Place
 L. J. Young, Carrying Place
 Ben Coover, Gordenville
 W. McReynolds, Balaclava
 H. M. Vail, Silcote
 L. G. McReynolds, Balaclava
 T. F. McReynolds, Balaclava
 R. Edmonstone, Balaclava
 S. I. Edmonstone, Balaclava
 R. W. Edmonstone, Balaclava
 J. A. Vail, Balaclava
 D. Vail, Balaclava
 W. F. Edmondstone, Balaclava
 John Lourie, Balaclava
 W. M. L. Moutton, Balaclava
 John Moutton, Balaclava
 James E. Moutton, Balaclava
 J. R. McReynolds, Owen Sound
 Joe Bellerose, Thessalon
 David King, Thessalon
 Thos. Bellerose, Thessalon
 Chas. King, Thessalon
 Stephen King, Thessalon
 Frank Lesage, Thessalon
 Henry Treadeau, Thessalon
 R. H. Thibault, Thessalon
 Wallace King, Thessalon
 Fred Perkins, Burlington
 F. Dorland, Bronte
 W. E. Gillian, Bronte
 John Hinton, Jr., Bronte
 A. E. Pickard, Bronte
 E. Hinton, Bronte
 John Belyea, Bronte
 E. Belyea, Bronte
 Leslie Pickard, Bronte
 E. Pickard, Bronte
 Brock McAulay, Southampton, Ont.
 Angus McLeod, Southampton
 Donald McLeod, Southampton
 M. McAulay, Southampton
 M. McIver, Southampton
 B. Webster, Southampton
 A. F. Bowman, Southampton
 Harry Longe, Southampton
 Matheson, Southampton
 W. B. McLean, Southampton
 A. Granville, Southampton
 Peter Longe, Southampton
 W. Jackson, Southampton
 Duncan McLeod, Southampton
 John McLeod, Southampton
 George McLeod, Southampton
 M. Matheson, Southampton
 Malin Matheson, Southampton
 F. McLennan, Southampton
 John Macaulay, Southampton
 Geo. S. Macaulay, Southampton
 James Henry, Southampton
 William Logie, Southampton
 Edward Longe, Southampton
 John Dobson, Southampton
 Joseph Granville, Southampton
 Wm. Longe, Southampton
 Wm. Douglas, Port Maitland
 Mait McKeown, Port Maitland
 A. J. Moss, Port Maitland
 Geo. Moss, Port Maitland
 George Dorrell, Port Maitland
 J. Mossip, Port Maitland
 Roy Moss, Port Maitland
 Geo. Jones, Port Maitland
 Geo. Grant, Port Maitland
 John Siddall, Port Maitland
 D. Jones, Port Maitland
 Wm. Ardney, Port Maitland
 Frank King, Thessalon
 Alfred P. Leclair, Thessalon
 Wm. Burch, Jr., Thessalon
 Edward King, Thessalon
 Harry Burch, Thessalon
 Wm. Libo, Thessalon
 Frank Libo, Thessalon
 L. Provencher, Thessalon
 E. D. Beneteou, Thessalon
 Joe Libo, Thessalon
 David Bellerose, Thessalon
 Richard Bellerose, Thessalon
 Ross Dorland, Bronte
 Chas. Osborne, Bronte
 R. V. Joyce, Bronte
 Robt. Joyce, Bronte
 H. A. Joyce, Bronte
 Sam Perkin, Burlington
 E. Belyea, Burlington
 Sam Joyce, Bronte
 B. Belyea, Bronte
 Fred Belyea, Bronte
 Clifford Carpenter, Bronte
 Wm. Joyce, Bronte
 E. Joyce, Bronte
 J. Dorland, Bronte
 Edward Martin, Port Maitland
 E. W. Martin, Port Maitland
 Henry Crosby, Port Maitland
 Colon King, Port Maitland
 Fred Britzler, Port Maitland
 Ed. Harris, Port Maitland
 Art Dougher, Port Maitland
 Chas. Crosby, Port Maitland
 J. Aiken, Port Maitland
 M. Jenkinson, Port Maitland
 E. Moyer, Port Maitland
 J. H. Jones, Port Maitland
 Walter Ray, Port Maitland
 Campbell Long, Wheatley
 Geo. D. Smith, Wheatley
 W. R. Crewe, Wheatley
 White and Dobbyn, Wheatley
 L. Dawson, Wheatley
 E. Omstead, Wheatley
 Omstead and Getty, Wheatley
 John J. Vizzard, Wheatley
 J. W. Liddle, Wheatley
 J. Fitzpatrick, Wheatley
 F. B. Hodson, Wheatley
 Earl Metcalfe, Wheatley
 D. Derbyshire, Wheatley
 S. Derbyshire, Wheatley
 D. Campbell and Sons, Wheatley
 M. Campbell, Wheatley
 H. Derbyshire and Son, Wheatley
 J. W. Bailey, Wheatley
 E. N. McLean, Wheatley

- E. McLean, Wheatley
 Hugh C. Campbell Wheatley
 Chas. Hyatt, Wheatley
 E. Pinch, Wheatley
 G. Ferman, Wheatley
 W. B. Clarke, Gordenville
 H. Young, Gordenville
 D. Jones, Gordenville
 Thos. Joyce, Bronte
 Watson Bray, Bronte
 John Joyce, Bronte
 John Pollock, Bronte
 J. P. Joyce, Bronte
 Freeman Bray, Bronte
 Warren Joyce, Bronte
 R. A. Joyce, Bronte
 J.S. McDonald, Oakville
 L. Sargant, Bronte
 J. H. Gillem, Oakville
 O. A. Joyce, Bronte
 A. N. McDonald, Bronte
 W. E. Thomas, Bronte
 J. Hinton, Bronte
 A. G. McDonald, Bronte
 W. L. MacDonald, Bronte
 H. Carpenter, Bronte
 Percy Carpenter, Bronte
 Wm. Carpenter, Bronte
 J. Bray, Bronte
 M. Dorland, Bronte
 M. R. Joyce, Bronte
 Ernest Thomas, Bronte
 John McKee, Port Maitland
 Wm. Thompson, Port Maitland
 John Percy Siddall, Port Maitland
 E. G. Moyer, Port Maitland
 C. Ross, Port Maitland
 George Little, Port Maitland
 Chas. Crumb, Port Maitland
 Frank Ross, Port Maitland
 Ben Crumb, Port Maitland
 James Hall, Port Maitland
 H. A. Thomas, Port Maitland
 J. H. Shibley, Bath, Ont.
 G. N. Willard, Stella, Ont.
 H. Willard, Stella
 John Morrow, Stella
 C. Laeril, Bath
 N. Instant, Emerald
 Alfred Willard, Stella
 J. Smith, Stella
 Thomas Smith, Stella
 Bert O. Smith, Stella
 William Baker, Stella
 Will Beaubien, Stella
 J. M. Beaubien, Stella
 Caleb Tugwell, Stella
 Arthur Tugwell, Stella
 Robert Rickey, Millhaven
 Amos Barrage, Bath
 Thomas Denee, Emerald
 John Denne, Emerald
 A. Lumly, Brighton
 Alfred Simple, Brighton
 George Cowell, Brighton
 Ross Cowell, Brighton
- Arthur Cooper, Gordenville
 Wm. Simple, Brighton
 Sherman Cooper, Gordenville
 Harry Quick, Brighton
 W. A. Quick, Brighton
 John Simple, Brighton
 H. L. Davern, Brighton
 W. Palmer, Brighton
 E. A. Cowell, Brighton
 A. E. M. Lovett, Willes Bay
 Ernest Bonter, Gordenville
 Fred Cooper, Gordenville
 J. Rupert Bonter, Gordenville
 W. T. Clark, Gordenville
 G. N. Clark, Gordenville
 W. C. Macdonald, Point Anne
 M. Macdonald, Point Anne
 Geo. Julien, Port Dalhousie
 Murphy and Sons, Port Dalhousie
 William Howe, Port Dalhousie
 Stephen Ahern, Port Dalhousie
 F. Scott, Port Dalhousie
 Jon Burnet, Port Dalhousie
 Wm. Hand, Port Dalhousie
 G. Hand, Port Dalhousie
 Joseph Hodgins, Port Dalhousie
 Geo. Elliott, Jr., Port Dalhousie
 Ray Hand, Port Dalhousie
 W. Hand, Port Dalhousie
 James Seburn, Port Dalhousie
 Chas. Seburn, Port Dalhousie
 James Doig, Port Dalhousie
 Alfred Wismer, Port Dalhousie
 Thos. E. Lewis, Port Dalhousie
 C. E. Thomas, Port Dalhousie
 John Bowater, St. Catherines
 H. H. Misner, Port Dover
 W. F. Kolbe and Co., Port Dover
 A. Hoover and Son, Nanticoke, Ont.
 John A. MacAulay, Port Dover
 Wm. Kolbe, Port Dover
 M. Thompson, Port Dover
 Alfred Schubert, Port Dover
 Roy J. Grabell, Port Dover
 J. O. Robinson, Port Dover
 R. Davison, Port Dover
 D. MacDonald, Port Dover
 Thos. H. Low, Port Dover
 Port Dover Fish Co., Port Dover
 P. C. Robinson, Port Dover
 C. W. Barwell, Port Dover
 J. J. Thompson, Port Dover
 Wm. H. Tuckett, Bath, Ont.
 John McGinnis, Collingwood
 Isaac Vankoughnet, Collingwood
 Frederic Clark, Collingwood
 J. Harrison, Collingwood
 Robert Bishop, Collingwood
- Herbert Burnside, Collingwood
 Oscar Burnside, Collingwood
 Ernie Bishop, Collingwood
 Ralph Clark, Collingwood
 Thos. Nicoll, Collingwood
 Hugh Stalker, Collingwood
 W. Chambers, Collingwood
 T. McFarlan, Collingwood
 Geo. Simmons, New Liskeard
 Joseph Green, New Liskeard
 Pete Simmons, New Liskeard
 Chas. B. Prue, Haileybury
 W. Levi, Haileybury
 J. P. Morgan, Haileybury
 W. J. McLean, Haileybury
 Thomas Montgomery, Haileybury
 R. P. Green, South Bay Mouth
 Robert Sisson, South Bay Mouth
 Wm. Gelston, South Bay Mouth
 A. M. Chisholm, South Bay Mouth
 E. W. Chisholm, South Bay Mouth
 Henry Burnett, South Bay Mouth
 V. C. Wilman, South Bay Mouth
 Robert Morrison, South Bay Mouth
 Robert Saunders, South Bay Mouth
 Isaac Hopkins, South Bay Mouth
 J. Ritchie, South Bay Mouth
 Wm. Ritchie, South Bay Mouth
 Fred Harding, South Bay Mouth
 Everett Sanders, South Bay Mouth
 James Macdonald, Point Anne
 R. Howard, Point Anne
 W. J. Howard, Point Anne
 E. R. Batman, Kincardine
 John McGaw, Sr., Kincardine
 Arthur Hall, Kincardine
 Thomas McGaw, Kincardine
 Wm. Hall, Kincardine
 O. Westel, Kincardine
 Thomas McGaw, Jr., Kincardine
 Dan Martyn, Kincardine
 John Smith, Kincardine
 Hugh Campbell, Port Whitby
 John Campbell, Port Whitby
 Edmund Golding, Port Whitby
 F. Golding, Port Whitby
 W. J. Stevens, Port Whitby
 J. P. Stephens, Port Whitby
 H. E. Ross, Bruce Mines
 John Grisewood, Bruce Mines
 Albert Thibault, Bruce Mines
 Wm. Pemberton, Bruce Mines

Angus McNeish, Bruce Mines	Harbour	wich West
John D. King, Bruce Mines	Wm. O'Brien, Pickering	Thos. A. Skinner, Sandwich
John J. King, Bruce Mines	Harbour	West
Alex. King, Bruce Mines	John O'Brien, Pickering	A. Robert, Malden Rd.
Ralph Clark, Jr., Collingwood	Harbour	A. Brunet, Sandwich West
M. L. Jackman, Collingwood	Robert Saunders, Kincardine	Ed. Manard, Sandwich West
C. S. Wright, Collingwood	Colin Graham, Kincardine	C. Meloche, Anderdon
Thomas Drew, Collingwood	John McGaw, Jr., Kincardine	R. Meloche, Anderdon
Steve Burnside, Collingwood	G. A. McGaw, Kincardine	Andrew Sutherland, Ross
Dave Malcolm, Collingwood	Wm. D. Bates, Ridgetown,	Port
R. G. Nicoll, Collingwood	Ont.	Steve Paulmart, Ross Port
S. Y. Chapman, Collingwood	W. P. Conway, Scudder, Ont.	J. J. Sutherland, Ross Port
Alex. Clark, Collingwood	Albert Downing, Morpeth,	J. Paulmert, Ross Port
Wm. Taggitt, Collingwood	Ont.	Fred Gerow, Ross Port
E. Vankonghnet, Collingwood	W. Campbell, Ridgetown,	George Gerow, Ross Port
L. McArthur, Collingwood	Ont.	Jim Gerow, Ross Port
J. A. Thompson, Collingwood	Angus Munn, Morpeth, Ont.	A. Bruley, Ross Port
R. H. Clark, Collingwood	331	Mrs. E. Bruley, Ross Port
Percy Lavers, Collingwood	Wm. Watson, Morpeth, Ont.	Albert Bruley, Ross Port
Louis Michano, Heron Bay	R.R. No. 4	Chas. Gerow, Ross Port
Henry Echern, Dongulac	John DeClute, Morpeth Ont.	F. F. Dampier, Ross Port
Robert Michano, Heron Bay	R, R. No.	Charles Dampier, Ross Port
Peter Moses, Heron Bay	James McAllister, Morpeth,	Oscar Anderson, Ross Port
Frank Bananash, Heron Bay	R.R. No. 1	E. Anderson, Ross Port
Joseph Bananash, Heron Bay	Percy Basrow, Morpeth, Ont.	John Bain, Ross Port
Joe Ernest Bananash, Heron	Daniel Bakey, Morpeth, Ont.	S. Thrower, Ross Port
Bay	Frank Rose, Morpeth, Ont.	A. B. Sutherland, Ross Port
Louis Moses, Heron Bay	Arthur Turnbull, Morpeth,	I. LeSarge, Ross Port
Antoine Moses, Heron Bay	Ont.	F. Solomon, Ross Port
Philip Bananash, Heron Bay	C. Shiffey, Morpeth, Ont.	W. Legault, Ross Port
Donald S. McInnes, Meaford	T. Hall, Morpeth, Ont.	A. McLeod, Ross Port
M. Pillgrem, Meaford	Geo. Smith, Morpeth, Ont.	P. Perron, Ross Port
Alex. Kennedy, Meaford	Thomas Moore, Malden Town-	Joe King, Ross Port
Harry Kennedy, Meaford	ship	Harry Bain, Ross Port
Edgar Kennedy, Meaford	Alex. Moore, Malden Town-	M. M. Sutherland, Ross Port
Wm. Pillgrem, Meaford	ship	Wm. Megg, Ross Port
E. Perks, Meaford	James Moore, Sr., Malden	Nipegon Bay Fish Co., Ross
Jack Perks, Meaford	Township	Port
W. H. Brown, Meaford	F. Dewey, Malden Township	Frank Nicoll, Port Caldwell
Wm. Hose, Meaford	H. Gignac, Anderdon	Fred Nicoll, Port Caldwell
F. Noon, Meaford	E. Rene, Parwich, West	J. F. Blondin, Port Caldwell
D. McInnes, Meaford	J. Rene, Sandwich West	E. A. Otis, Port Caldwell
Jack Kennedy, Meaford	A. Dufour, Sandwich West	Michel Goodchild, Heron Bay
Arch Kennedy, Meaford	Robert Dufour, Sandwich	Bert Johnson, Port Caldwell
Edward Hand, Grimsby	West	John Nicoll, Port Caldwell
James Hand, Grimsby	Albert Meloche, Fighting	Thomas Twance, Heron Bay
Philip Hand, Grimsby	Island	M. Waboosian, Heron Bay
Frank Hand, Grimsby	Alex. Meloche, Sandwich	Louison Desmonlin, Heron
Joseph Hand, Grimsby	West	Bay
John Hand, Grimsby	Thomas Dufour, Sandwich	A. Desmonlin, Heron Bay
C. W. Stephenson, Pickering	West	Peter Desmonlin, Heron Bay
Harbour	Jos. Meloche, Sandwich West	Alion Desmonlin, Heron Bay
Thos. G. Mansfield, Pickering	Francois Rocheleau, Sand-	Geo. Michano, Heron Bay

EXHIBITS "A," to "D."
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURER OF ONTARIO
OFFICE OF THE MINISTER

TORONTO, MAY 7TH, 1920.

DEAR SIRS:-- *re Timber Investigation.*

The Government will include in the Further Supplementary Estimates vote of \$10,000, to pay the Expenses of the Commission, I will send you a cheque for \$10,000 immediately after the Supply Bill has received the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor, which will possibly be in two or three weeks. In the meantime you can use this letter for the purpose of procuring an advance to enable you to pay the expenses.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.)

P. SMITH,
Provincial Treasurer.

MESSRS. HARDING & HANLEY,
ROYAL BANK BUILDING,
TORONTO, ONT.,

TIMBER INVESTIGATION

J. M. McEvoy.

Services (26 days @ \$70 per day)	\$1,820.00
(43 days @ \$40 per day)	1,720.00
	\$3,540.00

Disbursements	700.00
---------------------	--------

\$4,240.00

T. E. LAWLESS.

Services (May 31st)	\$1,400.00
(June 28th)	575.00
	\$1,975.00

Disbursements (May 31st)	107.60
(June 28th)	22.05
	\$ 129.65

2,104.65

FREDERICK MOWAT.

Services (Sept. 3rd)	3.00
----------------------------	------

ELLIOTT, IVEY & IVEY.

Fees (Sept. 2nd)	1.25
Disbursements (Sept. 2nd)	11.20
	12.45

JOHN SALE

Fees (Oct. 4th)	2.00
Disbursements (Sept. 30th)	20.20

		22.20
THEODORE ELLIS		
Witness, conduct money (Sept. 23rd)		110.16
L. E. BLISS		
Witness, conduct money (Sept. 23rd)		27.45
FRANK R. WESTON		
Witness, conduct money (Sept. 16th)		60.00
MR. JUSTICE RIDDELL		
On account of Fees (July 2nd)	\$2,000.00	
Disbursements (June 25)	7.00	
(Sept. 15th)	129.77	
(Oct. 23rd)	36.40	
	\$173.17	
		2,173.17
MR. JUSTICE LATCHFORD		
On account of Fees (July 2nd)	2,000.00	
Disbursements (July 25th)	45.30	
(Sept. 15th)	37.85	
	\$83.15	
		\$2,083.15
A. E. NASH		
Services (Sept. 11th)		192.00
UNITED TYPEWRITER Co., LTD.		
Rental (Sept. 2; Nov. 7 & 15)	31.00	
Services (May 28th)	20.95	
Repair (June 28th)45	
		52.40
NIGHT DIRECTORIES LTD.		
Services (Mar. 30; May 28; Aug. 28; Nov. 11)		23.90
STANLEY MEEKING		
Services (Sept. 20th)		125.00
MURPHY, FISHER & SHERWOOD		
Fees (Aug. 12th)	5.00	
Witness, Conduct money	20.00	
Disbursements95	
		25.95
D. G. BOYD		
Services (May 20th)		66.25
SAM DEVLIN		
Witness, conduct money (June 10th)		26.70
EMPLOYERS DETECTIVE AGENCY, LTD.		
Services (May 25th)		103.95
F. J. NIVEN		
Services (July 12th. Oct. 29th)		300.00
NEWSOME & GILBERT, LTD.		
Supplies (Oct. 11th) (May 7 & 25)		28.25

D. TIERNEY			
Witness, conduct money (July 3rd)			72.10
ALBERT TOWNSEND AUTO LIVERY & GARAGE			
Taxi service (June 1st)			6.50
ALEX. THOMPSON, SHERIFF			
Services (June 7-22; Oct. 9th)	45.00		
Disbursements (June 9-12)	4.00		49.00
<hr/>			
ARTHUR CLAVET, CONSTABLE			
Services (June 7-22)			20.00
W. R. STRETTON, CONSTABLE			
Services (Oct. 9th)			2.50
PRINCE ARTHUR HOTEL, PORT ARTHUR			
Disbursements (Bill of June 12th)	608.05		
Disbursements (Bill of Oct. 9th)	68.65		676.70
MISS E. M. HALTER			
Services (May 27th)			32.25
R. FRIAR			
Witness—disbursements (May 15th)	47.10		
Conduct money (4 days)	60.00		
			107.10
NICKEL RANGE HOTEL, SUDBURY.			
Disbursements (Bill of May 14th)			512.65
GRAND & TOY			
Supplies (Apr. 7th)			1.10
W. J. LETHBRIDGE			
Services (May 28th)	840.00		
Services (Aug. 21st)	60.00		
		900.00	
Disbursements (May 28; Aug. 21)	244.65		1,144.65
<hr/>			
D. SMITH			
Services (July 17; Aug. 28; Oct. 5)	570.00		
Disbursements (July 17; Aug. 8)	121.39		
			691.39
FRANK TUCKER			
Witness, conduct money (July 16th)	9.00		
Disbursements (July 10 & 13)	92.95		
			101.95
GEORGE FISHER			
Disbursements (May 15; Sept. 19; Oct. 9)			376.85
D. J. GILLON			
Services (Oct. 14th)			5.00
PETER WHITE, K. C.			
On account of Fees (Nov. 4th)			2,500.00
F. E. TITUS			
Fees (Nov. 5th)			200.00
McLAUGHLIN, FULTON, STINSON & ANDERSON			
Fees (Oct. 29th)	6.00		

Disbursements (Sept. 13th)	6.15	
		12.15
E. H. TELFER		
Disbursements (Oct. 7-15)		65.82
FRED SOHROEDER		
Service (a/c May 28th, 3 days)	18.00	
Disbursements (a/c May 28th)	44.10	
		62.10
A. D. MEEKING		
Services (Oct. 14th)		15.00
H. D. GILLARD		
Services (Oct. 14th)		10.50
C. H. S. COOKE		
Services (Oct. 29th)	285.00	
Disbursements (Sept. 29 to Oct. 15)	84.70	
		369.70
<hr/>		
V. D. HARBINSON		
Services (June 28; Sept. 11; Oct. 23)	4,560.00	
Services, L. G. Price, Asst. (June 28; Sept. 11)	1,395.00	
Disbursements (June 27; Sept. 11; Oct. 20)	1,297.50	
		7,252.50
W. A. BAKER, Sheriff		
Service (June 13th; Oct. 13th)		25.00
HOME BANK OF CANADA		
Interest (June 23)	59.44	
" (Aug. 31)	211.73	
		271.17
J. D. KINGSTON		
Services (3 days, Sept. 20 a/c)	15.00	
Disbursements (a/c Sept. 20th)	59.06	
		74.06
QUEEN'S HOTEL, Toronto.		
Disbursements (Bill of Oct. 2nd)		46.20
H. H. FLESHER		
Services (Nov. 6th)	10.00	
Disbursements (Nov. 6th)	46.10	
		56.10
JAMES FLESHER		
Services (Nov. 6th)	10.00	
Disbursements (Nov. 6th)	46.10	
		56.10
R. J. BYRES		
Services (Nov. 6th)	10.00	
Disbursements (Nov. 6th)	46.10	
		56.10
C. T. ROTHERA		
Services (Nov. 6th)	10.00	
Disbursements (Nov. 6th)	52.10	

		62.10
<hr/>		
J. O'DRISCOLL		
Services (Nov. 6th)	10.00	
Disbursements (Nov. 6th)	55.10	
		<hr/> 65.10
W. F. TRIVETT et al		
Services (May 20th)	13.00	
Disbursements (May 20th)	1.05	
		<hr/> 14.05
JNO. B. COOK et al		
Services (May 20th)	39.00	
Disbursements (May 20th)	2.50	
		<hr/> 41.50
A. H. O'NEIL		
Disbursements (May 19th)		6.05
MISS I. M. GEROW		
Services (March 9th to Nov. 6th) on a/c. . .		845.00
JOHN BRADY		
Witness.—conduct money (Sept. 1)	5.00	
disbursements (Sept. 1) return fare		
Maynooth to Toronto	12.30	
		<hr/> 17.30
NORMAN McCRIMMONS		
Witness.—conduct money (Sept. 2)	10.00	
disbursements (Sept. 2)	22.50	
		<hr/> 38.05
JOHN McINTOSH		
Witness.—conduct money (Sept. 2)	10.00	
disbursements (Sept. 2)	13.20	
		<hr/> 23.20
HOME BANK OF CANADA		
Stationery.—cheque book (Mar. 17)		4.25
R. T. HARDING		
On account of Fees as counsel (Aug. 7)		2,000.00
DR. JOHN CARRUTHERS		
Disbursements (May 4th a/c)		175.30
TRANSPORTATION—R. T Harding & Party		
Disbursements (May 4th to October 18th) ..		1,957.50
R. T. HARDING		
Disbursements (March 2nd to Nov. 7th) per		
voucher		1,005.88
W. J. HANLEY (Harding & Hanley)		
Disbursements (Aug. 20th to Sept. 7th)		292.80
REMINGTON TYPEWRITER Co.		
Services (May 27th)		12.00
THE AVENUE HOTEL, Fort William		
Disbursements (Bill of June 2nd, 1920)		46.65
LAUNDRY		
Disbursements (June 6; June 8; June 16;		
June 21)		4.00

PORT ARTHUR DAILY NEWS, LTD.		
Supplies (June 7th)		2.75
THE REX HOTEL, International Falls, Minn.		
Disbursements (Bill of June 18 ...\$383.17)		
(Bill of Oct. 13 ... 198.95)		
		582.12
<hr/>		
S. BROWN		
Disbursements (June 22nd)		2.00
CANADIAN EXPRESS Co.		
Disbursements July 19th	\$.90	
(Sept. 13th50)	
		1.40
CANADIAN NORTHERN EXPRESS Co.		
Disbursements (Aug. 10th)		1.71
DOMINION EXPRESS Co.		
Disbursements June 23rd	\$15.45	
July 19th60	
Aug. 18th60	
		16.65
PRINCE ARTHUR HOTEL, PORT ARTHUR		
Disbursements—Bill of June 23rd		298.20
RICE LEWIS & SON		
Supplies (July 18th)		1.57
BELL TELEPHONE Co.		
Disbursements—Bill of Sept. 7th60	
Bill of Oct. 1st.	4.35	4.95
THE QUEEN'S HOTEL, TORONTO.		
Disbursements—Bill of Sept. 13th		14.35
S. S. DAINARD		
Witness, conduct money (June 17th)		30.00
CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY Co's TELEGRAPH		
Services Sept 14th		1.96
		TOTAL
Forward		\$34,223.61
TELEGRAPH ACCOUNT		
Disbursements (Mar. 11 to Nov. 12)		116.20
SUNDRIES (PETTY CASH)		
Disbursements (Mar. 11 to Nov. 15)		611.66
		<hr/>
		\$34,951.47

EXHIBIT 3" C "
TIMBER INVESTIGATION
SECOND RETURNS

(a) D. B. ROCHESTER

Disbursements (Miscellaneous	6,654.33
Disbursements (Wages of Men & Expenses 19,611.05	

\$26,265.38

(b) S. A. MARKS		
Services (76 days @ \$15 per day)	1,140.00	
Disbursements (Miscellaneous	925.15	
(Wages of men & expenses ..	1,945.45	
	<hr/>	
	2,870.60	4,010.60
(c) H. A. C. MACHIN		
Oct. 9 Disbursements, return fare Kenora		
Port Arthur and expenses as witness, 1 day ..		35.00
(d) GEORGE FISHER		
Wages—48 days @ \$8 per day		384.00
(e) ALEX McCALLUM		
Wages—48 days @ \$8 per day		384.00
(f) BYRNES & BYRNES		
Fees May 26th, to Dec. 6th, incl.,	1,124.99	
Disbursements	217.46	
	<hr/>	
		1,342.45
(g) K. D. CAMPBELL		
Disbursements Mar. 12th, to 19th		94.15
(h) PROVINCIAL MOTORS LIVERY		
Service Nov. 1st		2.00
(i) CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY Co's TELEGRAPH		
Service A/c Dec. 7/20		3.41
(j) B. M. WYLIE		
Salary Feb. 13th to Sept. 10th,		
176 days @ \$5.50 per day	968.00	
Disbursements \.....	608.41	
		<hr/>
		1,576.41
		<hr/>
		\$34,097.40

THESSALON, ONT., 28TH JAN., 1919.

H. H. DEWART, ESQ., K. C.,
Toronto.

DEAR SIR:—

I have your letter of the 25th inst., and I think your suggestion a good one. I submitted the material to you because besides being a Liberal Member of the Legislature, you are a reliable lawyer and could be depended on putting the case across, if you feel justified in taking it up. Before sending it to Mr. Bowman use your judgment as to whether you think it of sufficient importance. What may appear locally as being a scandal may not appear so serious at a distance. I myself have taken part in celebrations and didn't feel that I owed any apology to any one, but this making fish of one and flesh of another, by heavily fining one set of individuals for doing what another set can do without apparently any fear, seem to me worth investigating.

If Mr. Bowman cares to take the matter up Judge Hewson of Gore Bay knows me personally.

There is also the question of opening up timber limits. The Mississauga Timber Reserve is back north from here a few townships along the southern boundary are being lumbered but they are about as far away as lumbermen can profitably take in their supplies.

The question of building a railroad has been taken up with the Government

who have promised to give it their serious consideration. Without a railroad it is very questionable whether any lumber concern could profitably operate any further back in this reserve. It is said that a great deal of the timber is deteriorating and should be taken out. It is said that the increase in price the Government would receive from the timber would soon pay for the railroad. This is something the Opposition should also know something about.

There are also the questions of reforestation and regulation of lumbering operations so that our timber resources may not become extinct.

There are thousands of acres of cut over limits fit for nothing but growing another set of timber and it is said that if there were proper regulations restraining lumbermen from taking the smaller trees a timber limit might be a permanent institution. Of course I am not presuming that you already are not acquainted with this, but am just suggesting something which is of vital importance to this part of the country.

Yours truly,
F. A. CLEMENT.

COPY

Mr. Harding, Exhibit 'D'
HARDING & HANLEY,
Barristers, etc.,
601-602 Royal Bank Building.

TORONTO, MARCH 7TH, 1921.

A. E. GRIGG, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Lands & Forests,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ont.

re Timber Investigation Account.

DEAR SIR:—

Your letter of the 4th March, enclosing a copy of a letter of the 3rd March from Mr. Brown, Provincial Auditor, and a copy of the list of particulars in reference to the accounts filed. You will understand that the details, that will be necessary for me to cover all these items, will cover considerable time. Miss Gerow, who has had charge of the account, will immediately endeavour to get all the particulars that will be necessary to satisfy the enquiry for each item.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) R. T. HARDING.

COPY

Witness.—Conduct money (Sept. 2) 10.00

TORONTO, MARCH 4TH, 1921.

Re Accounts.

DEAR SIR:—

As you are aware, there has been received from you at the Department to date, accounts amounting to \$69,044.82 in connection with the Timber Investigation.

These accounts have all been submitted to the Auditor for his consideration. Apparently there are a large number of items about which the Auditor would require further information, and vouchers, &c., before he will be in a position to accept them.

For your information I am enclosing herewith copy of a letter which I have received from the Auditor in this connection, together with his comments on the various items, which do not appear to meet the requirements of the Audit Office.

Yours truly,
Deputy Minister.

T. R. HARDING, ESQ.,
MESSRS. HARDING & HANLEY,
Royal Bank Bldg.,
City.

COPY

TORONTO, MARCH 3RD, 1921

DEAR SIR,—

I am returning to your Department for further information, accounts in connection with the returns made by Mr. R. T. Harding against his advance of \$50,000.00 re Crown Timber Investigation.

The details of the information required are set out in the attached memoranda.

I might draw your attention to have all accounts for legal services taxed by the Attorney General's Department, and also where any services, no matter of what nature, the covering dates, the rate of pay and the nature of service should be definitely shown.

Payments made to members of your staff for extra services should have been by direction of the Minister of Lands and Forests or by Order-in-Council.

Yours very truly,
G. M. BROWN,
Provincial Auditor.

ALBERT GRIGG, ESQ.,
Deputy Minister of Lands & Forests.

COPY

NO. 1.

- 1.—J. M. McEvoy,
Disbsts. \$700.00. No vouchers.
- 2.—T. E. LAWLESS,
Disbsts. 129.65. No vouchers or covering dates of services.
- 6.—T. ELLIS,
Disbsts. 110.16. No vouchers.
- 7.—L. E. BLISS,
Disbsts. 27.45. No vouchers.
- 8.—R. F. WESTON,
Disbsts. 60.00. No details or vouchers.
- 9.—HON. JUSTICE RIDDELL,
173.17. No details or vouchers.
\$2,000.00. advanced.
- 10.—HON. JUSTICE LATCHFORD,
83.15. No details or vouchers.
2,000.00. advanced.
- 11.—A. E. NASH,
192.00. Covering dates and rate and approval.
- 14.—S. D. MEEKING,
125.00. No covering dates. Extra services.

- 16.—D. G. BOYD.
66.25. Extra services.
- 19.—F. J. NIVEN.
300.00. No particulars. Extra services.
- 26.—PT. ARTHUR HOTEL.
676.70. Why the charge for laundry, tailor and tobacco? Also details of bill for Miss Gerow—
42.90.
- 29.—NICKLE RANGE HOTEL.
512.65. Why the charge for extra meals, drugs, &c., and payment to Mr. Hurdman, \$20.00.
- 31.—W. J. LETHBRIDGE.
1,144.65. No vouchers for hotel sundries, berths, etc., and covering dates for services.
- 32.—D. SMITH.
691.39. No vouchers for expenses.
- 33.—F. TUCKER.
101.95. No vouchers for hotel berths, etc., and conduct money.
- 36.—PETER WHITE.
2,500.00. No voucher, advance only. No measure of service given under direction of Deputy Attorney General.
- 37.—F. E. TITUS.
200.00. No measure of service given. Extra services.
- 40.—F. SCHROEDER.
62.10. No vouchers or details.
- 41.—S. MEEKING & H. GILLARD.
25.50. Covering dates not shown. Extra services.
- 42.—C. H. S COOKE.
369.70. No vouchers for hotel or pullman or details for meals, tips, etc.
- 42½.—HARBINSON & ALLAN.
7,252.50. No covering dates or rate shown. Why the charge for section to Kenora, and no voucher for pullman returning also covering dates for hotel at Fort Frances.
- 44.—HOME BANK.
271.17. Please explain this charge of interest.
- 45.—J. D. KINGSTON.
74.06. Vouchers for pullman and covering dates and nature of services.
- 46.—QUEENS HOTEL.
46.20. Why hotel expenses in Toronto?
- 47.—H. FLESHER.
56.10. No vouchers for pullmans, covering dates and nature of services.
- J. FLESHER.
56.10. No vouchers for pullmans, covering dates and nature of services.
- R. J. BYERS.
56.10. No vouchers for pullmans, covering dates and nature of services.

- C. T. ROTHERA
62.10. No vouchers for pullmans, covering dates and nature of services.
- J. O. DRISCOLL.
65.10. No vouchers for pullmans, covering dates and nature of services.
- 48.—W. F. TRIVETT.
14.05. Covering dates and rate. No vouchers. Extra service.
- J. B. COOK.
41.50. Covering dates and rate. No vouchers. Extra service.
- A. H. O'NEILL.
6.05. Covering dates and rate. No vouchers. Extra service.
- 49.—I. M. GEROW.
845.00. Covering dates and rate and nature of services.
- 50.—J. BRADY.
17.30. No particulars.
- 51.—N. MCCRIMMON.
32.50. No particulars.
- 52.—J. MINTOSH.
23.20. No particulars.
- 54.—R. T. HARDING.
2,000.00. No particulars.
- 55.—DR. J. CROTHERS.
175.30. No returns for advances, made for conduct money.
- 56.—R. T. HARDING AND PARTY.
1957.50. Vouchers missing for pullmans and boat fares and taxis.
- 57.—R. T. HARDING.
1,005.88. Vouchers for hotels and pullmans and other particulars.
- 58.—W. J. HANLEY.
272.80. No vouchers and no details of conduct money advanced.
- 61.—LAUNDRY.
4.00. Appears to be personal.
- 63.—REX HOTEL.
583.02. Itemized bill required.
- 68.—PRINCE ARTHUR HOTEL.
298.20. Re Messrs. Harding's, Smith's, Neild's and Harbinson's account why the charges for laundry, tailoring, etc., and dates for Mr. Harding appear to be duplicated.
- 71.—QUEEN'S HOTEL, TORONTO.
14.35. Why this charge for Mr. Harding.
- 72.—S. S. DAINARD.
30.00. No particulars.
- 74.—TELEGRAPH ACCOUNT.
116.29. No copies of telegrams attached.
- 75.—PETTY CASH ACCOUNT.
611.66. No means of checking.


Miscellaneous Expenses of D. B. ROCHESTER.

- May 6th, 8th, 1bth, 15th.. No vouchers for berths.
- May 15th No details of \$6.00 for expenses in Toronto.

May 21st	No details for the charge of eight tickets Ottawa to Fort Frances.
May 8th	No details for expenses of \$9.10 in Sudbury.
May 22 & 23rd	How is the amount of \$47.00 for meals arrived at?
May 27th	Meals \$29.90. How many and for whom?
May 27th	P. Stinson \$60.00. No details.
Aug. 30th	J. L. Stinson \$70.00. No details.
Sept. 21st	Mahon & Co. \$10.75. No voucher.
Sept. 29th	Laundry 95 cents. Personal.
Oct. 14th	H. C. McMahon & Co. \$54.75. Why the payment of \$5.00 and \$10.00 to Larose and Bryson?
Oct. 15th	Berths \$5.95. No vouchers.
Oct. 21st	Berths \$13.40. No vouchers.

Voucher No.

1, 2, 4, 5	On returns, covering dates should be shown for <i>all</i> services, and in J. O. Driscoll disbursements, there is no voucher for the charge for log rule \$3.65. C. F. Rothera's account, no voucher for berth. S. A. Marks account, how is the amount of \$4,010.60 arrived at?
6	BYRNES & BYRNES. Usual vouchers not attached, date of commencement of services not shown and account not taxed.
10	B. M. WYLIE. In his disbursements there are no vouchers, for the hotel charge of \$4.00, for conduct money paid or for stenographer; and why the charge for laundry and sundries in the hotel account and how is the amount \$608.41 arrived at? Why was he paid from Feb. 13th, to Mar. 9th, the date the commission was appointed.
1	J. MCGURIN. \$446.94. No voucher for berth and how is the amount for meals arrived at and covering dates for his services should be shown.
3	L. J. MULLIN. \$1,362.60. Covering dates and nature of services also vouchers for berths, hotel bills, etc., and particulars of advances of \$30.00 and \$518.16 and disbursements of \$32.00.
3 to 43, inclusive	Proper pay lists with covering dates and detailed expense accounts with vouchers.



Appendix No. 3

REPORT

of the

**Standing Committee on
Privileges and Elections,
1921**

REPORT

of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, 1921, including Minutes, Evidences and Exhibits.

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg leave to report that pursuant to the Order of this House dated 8th day of March, 1921, they have investigated certain charges made by H. P. Ashplant, Andrew Hicks, David James Taylor and R. W. E. Burnaby and their report in reference to the said charges as follows:

Mr. J. M. Ferguson, K.C., of Toronto was appointed Counsel for the Committee.

1. As to what are known as the **Ashplant Charges:**

The Committee finds the statement attributed to Mr. Ashplant in the votes and proceedings of the House, dated 8th of March, 1921, were made by him as therein set out. The Committee bases its finding on the evidence of Mayor Little of London and on the evidence of the following Aldermen of the City of London, namely, Alderman Harley, Alderman Drake, Alderman W. A. Wilson, Alderman Brighton, A. C. Carty, London Correspondent of *The Toronto Globe*, H. H. Penny, Reporter for the *London Advertiser*.

Mr. Ashplant denied that he intended to convey the impression that any Member of the Legislature could or might be bribed and stated to the Committee that if his language was capable of that interpretation he desired to withdraw the same and to apologize and express sorrow for having made the statement.

Your Committee accepted the withdrawal and the statement of regret and sorrow from Mr. Ashplant and recommends that no further proceeding be taken with respect to that matter.

2. As to what are known as the **Hicks charges:**

Andrew A. Hicks, Member of the Legislature, admitted on oath to the Committee that he had made the statement attributed to him set out in the votes and proceedings of the House dated 8th of March, 1921. He stated that his statement was based on a conversation which he had had with Mr. M. C. Fox, Member of the Legislature for the Riding of South Essex, in which, according to the recollection of Mr. Hicks, Mr. Fox had stated to him that he could have had \$20,000 if he, Mr. Fox, had switched his attitude upon a certain Measure known as the Beaches Protection Amendment Act, which came before the Legislature in the Session of 1920.

Mr. Fox gave evidence before the Committee. His position was that he had not been offered any bribe in connection with the Act in question and that Mr. Hicks must have misunderstood him. He testified that he had told Mr. Hicks that in connection with litigation between the Township of Pelee and certain individuals who were engaged in the sand sucking business off Pelee Island, the Township had been offered \$50,000 to drop the action which the Township had taken to restrain the taking of sand and gravel from the bed of Lake Erie

in the vicinity of the Island and that it was this \$50,000 offer to the Township to which he had made reference in his conversation with Mr. Hicks. Mr. Hicks stated to the Committee that it was quite possible that he had misunderstood what Mr. Fox had said to him, or that he did not get Mr. Fox's real meaning. Mr. Hicks stated that he knew of no other facts upon which he based his remarks made in the speech at the Picnic at London, June 9th, 1920, and referred to in the Votes and Proceedings of this House under date of 8th of March, 1921. The Committee is satisfied after hearing all the evidence, that the whole incident was the result of an honest misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Hicks of words used by Mr. Fox in the course of a casual conversation.

3 As to what are known as the **Taylor Charges**:

The particulars of these charges are set out in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of March 8th, 1920. Mr. D. J. Taylor, a Member of this House for the Riding of North Grey gave evidence before this Committee that shortly after he was elected Member of the Legislature, a man whom he did not know, but who, he said, came from Owen Sound approached him at his home in Wiarton and told him in effect that if he, Taylor, would use his influence with the Government to procure a position on The Workmen's Compensation Board for one George Menzies of Owen Sound, he, Taylor, would be paid \$1,000.00. It was upon the strength of this occurrence that Mr. Taylor made the statements set out in the Votes and Proceedings of the House above referred to, at a public meeting on the 11th of June, 1920. Mr. Taylor produced and filed as an Exhibit before the Committee, a letter signed by one William Willcocks, dated at Detroit, Michigan, March 22nd, 1921, in which the writer of the letter admitted that he was the man who had approached him at his home in Wiarton and made to him the offer of \$1,000.00. The envelope containing the letter in question bore the Detroit post mark and if the statement in the letter is true, Willcocks had removed from Owen Sound and was then residing in Detroit outside the jurisdiction of Ontario Courts.

Mr. Taylor did not make any effort to have the man Menzies appointed, nor has he been appointed to any office in the gift of the Government.

Your Committee finds, as a fact, upon the evidence submitted to it that the offer referred to by Mr. Taylor was actually made to him and that it was upon the strength of this offer that he made the speech referred to in the Press of the 11th of June, 1920.

4. As to what are known as the **Burnaby charges**:

This is the matter relating to the statement by Mr. Burnaby at Kettleby reported in the Press under date of June 23rd, 1920. Mr. Burnaby stated to the Committee that a man, whose name he refused to give, called on him and offered to give him \$1,000.00 a year, as set out in the statement attributed to Mr. Burnaby in the votes and proceedings of the House dated the 8th of March, 1921. Mr. Burnaby stated that he refused to give the name of the man who had made this proposition to him, because he feared that he might be subjected to an action for slander and that as he and the man who made the statement were the only ones present at the time it was made, he might not be able to successfully defend himself in any action that might be brought against him. It was pointed out by the Chairman to Mr. Burnaby that any evidence he might give before the Committee was privileged and that no action could be brought against him by reason of any statement made by him in connection with the giving of any such

evidence. Notwithstanding this Mr. Burnaby still refused to give the name of the individual. The Chairman ruled that he must give it, but upon a vote of the Committee the ruling of the Chair was not sustained. Mr. Burnaby also took the position that this Committee had no jurisdiction to investigate the matters set out in the statement referred to this Committee, contending that it did not in any way reflect upon any member of the Legislature. The Committee, upon advice of its Counsel, ruled that it had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter. Mr. Burnaby, thereupon, in the public interest, stated that he would waive the objection which he had taken and would give evidence. Mr. Burnaby stated that the part of his statement reading as follows: "But I want to tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God I am not in the Government," was intended to mean that accusations of bribery had been going on for years, and not that bribery had been going on for years. He stated that he knew of no instance where a Member of the Legislature had ever been bribed or offered a bribe. Mr. Burnaby stated that the day before he made his speech in which the statement was made, he had mentioned to the Attorney General that he might refer to his own bribery case the following day. Following the appearance of the report of Mr. Burnaby's speech in the Press, the Premier wrote to Mr. Burnaby asking for an explanation of the charge made. Mr. Burnaby then endeavoured to get in touch with the Premier by telephone, but did not succeed. He did speak to the Attorney-General by telephone and then gave the Attorney-General the initials and the first and last letters of the surname of the man who had offered him the bribe, in order that if he were an applicant for the position the Government would know that he was the man who had attempted to give the bribe. The initials given by Mr. Burnaby are J. S. F y. It appeared from the statement made by the Premier that this man was not among the list of applicants. Mr. Burnaby said that he had known the man for several years, and that he resides in Toronto, but he refused to tell his occupation.

The Committee was unable to follow the matter up, however, because of the fact that the name was not given, but, upon the evidence which was available to the Committee, we find as a fact that the offer of the bribe was made to Mr. Burnaby substantially as Mr. Burnaby relates it.

The Attorney General stated that Mr. Burnaby had given him the information in the course of a private conversation and that he did not feel it his duty to follow the matter up and demand that the man be prosecuted, more particularly when Mr. Burnaby declined to give the name of the man who had offered him the bribe. Mr. Burnaby has persistently refused to give the name of the person who offered the bribe to the Attorney General or to any other person and still refuses to give it for the reasons hereinbefore set out.

The Committee finds that the statement made by Mr. Burnaby, that he had been approached, is true, but the Committee is, upon the evidence, unable to make any recommendation in the matter.

5. The next matter referred to this Committee is what is known as the **Swayze-MacBride matter.**

The Committee was of opinion that inasmuch as this charge was to the effect that Mr. MacBride was insincere as a Member of the Special Committee which investigated the strike of the Hydro Employees at Chippawa, this Committee was unable to enter into the question as no definite charge had been made against Mr. MacBride, and no action was taken by the Committee.

6. The next matter referred to the Committee was a complaint made by Mr. R. R. Hall, M.P.P. in regard to an article appearing in *The Toronto Telegram*, dated March 31st, 1921. The Committee was advised by its Counsel that inasmuch as the charge contained in the *Telegram* was made not against Mr. Hall in his capacity as Member of the Legislature, that this Committee had no jurisdiction to entertain the charge.

The Committee therefore took no action in this matter.

Dated at Toronto this 29th April, 1921.

R. L. BRACKIN,

Chairman, Privileges and Elections Committee.

MINUTES AND PROCEEDINGS

The Committee met at 11.30 a.m. on Tuesday April 19th, in the Private Bills Committee Room, the following members being present:—

Messrs. Hon. E. C. Drury; R. L. Brackin; J. B. Cunningham; J. W. Curry; H. H. Dewart; J. W. Freeborn; F. H. Greenlaw; Hon. Mr. Henry; J. Joynt; J. G. Lethbridge; A. C. Lewis; Hon. Mr. Raney; C. F. Swayze; J. C. Tolmie; T. Tooms; J. M. Webster.

Moved by Mr. Webster, seconded by Mr. Lethbridge that Mr. Brackin of West Kent, be Chairman. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that this Committee authorize the Chairman to engage the service of a stenographer, to take the proceedings in shorthand and transcribe the same. Carried.

The Chairman read to the Committee the resolutions of the House contained in the Votes and Proceedings of March the 8th, March the 30th, and April the 1st, 1921, with regard to the matters which have been referred to the Committee for investigation. It was decided on motion of Mr. Curry, seconded by Hon. Mr. Raney, that Mr. J. M. Ferguson, K.C., Barrister, of Toronto, be retained by the Committee to act as Counsel in the matters which had been referred to the Committee; Mr. Ferguson to report to the Committee at the next meeting with a report as to the nature of the charges referred to the Committee and as to the witnesses who should be summoned to attend before the Committee.

Moved by Mr. Curry, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that when the Committee adjourns, it adjourn until Wednesday, April 20th at 2.30 p.m. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Curry that the Committee do now adjourn. Carried.

The committee held its second meeting at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, April 20th the following members being present:—

Messrs. Brackin, Cridland, Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Hay, Heenan, Henry, Hicks, Joynt, Lennox, Lethbridge, MacBride, Mathieu, Racine, Sewell, Tolmie, Tooms, Webster, Widdifield.

Mr. Brackin took the chair and introduced Mr. J. M. Ferguson, K.C., who had been appointed Counsel for investigation to the Committee.

Mr. Ferguson then dealt with the charges which had been referred to the Committee for investigation.

(1) Ashplant Charges.

Mr. Ferguson recommended that the following witnesses be subpoenaed:

A. C. Carty, *Globe* correspondent, London; H. B. Ashplant, London, Mayor S. Little, London; Alderman John Bridge, London; Mr. Marshall Graydon.

(2) Hicks Charges.

Mr. Ferguson recommended that Mr. Hicks be requested to appear before the Committee to give his explanation of this charge before any other witnesses were called.

(3) Taylor Charges.

Mr. Ferguson suggested that Mr. Taylor be requested also to appear before the Committee and give his explanation.

(4) Burnaby Charges.

(5) Swayze-MacBride Charges.**(6) Charge against Mr. Hall.**

Mr. Ferguson recommended that these last three charges be held over pending further information and the disposal of the first three charges.

Mr. Widdifield moved, seconded by Mr. Cridland, that the Swayze charge be not further considered.

Mr. Dewart moved, seconded by Mr. Curry, an amendment to the effect that the Burnaby, Swayze and Hall charges be held over.

The amendment was carried and the motion was lost.

Moved by Mr. Curry, seconded by Mr. Hay, that the Clerk should telegraph Mr. A. C. Carty, *Globe* correspondent, London, to appear before the Committee at its next meeting (1.30 P.M., Thursday, 21st April) with reference to the Ashplant and Hicks charges and that Mr. Hicks and Mr. Taylor should also be requested to appear before the Committee. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Dewart, seconded by Mr. Curry, that when it adjourns it adjourns until Thursday, April 21st, at 1.30 P.M. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Curry that the Committee do now adjourn. Carried.

The third meeting of this Committee was held at 1.30 P.M. on Thursday, April 21, 1921, in the Private Bills Committee Room. The following members were present:—

Messrs. Brackin, Cridland, Cunningham, Curry, Freeborn, Hay, Hicks, Lennox, MacBride, Racine, Raney, Ross (Kingston), Sewell, Sinclair, Swayze, Tolmie, Tooms, Webster, Widdifield.

Hicks Charges.

Mr. J. M. Ferguson, counsel for the Committee suggested that the charge of Mr. Andrew Hicks referred to the Committee by a motion in the Assembly on the 8th of March, be first considered.

Mr. Hicks was called as witness by the chairman and duly sworn.

Mr. Ferguson asked Mr. Hicks to tell the circumstances under which he made the charge in question and the foundation upon which he based his charge. Mr. Hicks told his story and submitted a copy of a written statement with which he had furnished the Attorney-General shortly after making the said charge.

This statement was submitted as Exhibit 1.

Mr. Hicks also offered to read a statement written by Mr. Fox to the Attorney-General and after some discussion it was decided to admit this statement subject to verification and Mr. Hicks having read the statement, the same was admitted as Exhibit 2.

Mr. Lennox and Mr. Ferguson examined the witness who then left the stand.

It was moved by Mr. Lennox and seconded by Mr. W. E. Sinclair "That the reporter who interviewed Mr. Hicks, M.P.P. at his farm subsequent to the picnic and the maker of the statement in question be summoned to appear before this Committee and give evidence at th next sitting." Carried.

Moved by Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Calder "That Mr. Fox be summoned to appear before the next meeting of Privileges and Elections Committee and give evidence regarding Mr. Hick's statement." Carried.

Ashplant Charges.

The chairman then called Mr. A. C. Carty, *Globe* correspondent at London,

as witness to give evidence with regard to the charges of Mr. H. B. Ashplant referred to the Committee for investigation by the Assembly on 8th March.

Mr. Carty being called was duly sworn.

Mr. Ferguson read the resolution of the House with regard to the Ashplant charge to the witness.

Mr. Carty then told his story of the meeting of the City Council at which the charge was made and submitted copies of the two reports with which he furnished the *Globe*.

The first report appeared in the *Globe* on March 8th, (admitted as Exhibit 3) and the second report on March 9th, (admitted as Exhibit 4).

Moved by Mr. Curry, seconded by Hon. Mr. Ross "That Herbert H. Penny, reporter London *Advertiser*, be called as a witness before the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the Ashplant charge." Carried.

Mr. Penny, being called, was duly sworn.

The chairman then read to the Committee the report of the City Council meeting on March 7th, furnished by the witness to the London *Advertiser* and the same was admitted as Exhibit 5.

Mr. Penny submitted his report and answered the question of Mr. Ferguson in regard thereto.

Moved by Mr. McCrea, seconded by Mr. Calder that the following witnesses be subpoenaed to attend before the Privileges and Elections Committee at its next meeting to give evidence on certain reported charge of Mr. Ashplant affecting members of the Legislature:

Messrs. H. B. Ashplant, Mayor Little, Frank E. Harley, John Bridge, J. C. Wilson, G. B. Drake, W. H. Wilson, Wm. Boss, B. F. Brighton, A. H. W. Graydon. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Hay, seconded by Mr. Lennox "That when the Committee adjourns it adjourns until Tuesday, April 26, at 1.30 P.M." Carried.

The fourth meeting of this Committee was held at 1.30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26th in the Public Accounts Committee Room.

The following members were present:

Messrs. Brackin, Calder, Cridland, Cunningham, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Hay, Hicks, Johnston (Lanark South), Lethbridge, Mathieu, Racine, Sewell, Sinclair, Swayze, Tolmie, Tooms, Widdifield.

Ashplant Charges

When the meeting opened it was announced that the following witnesses had presented themselves for examination, in what is known as the Ashplant Charges. H. B. Ashplant, Mayor S. Little, Ald. F. E. Harley, Ald. G. B. Drake, Ald. W. A. Wilson, Ald. B. F. Brighton, all of the city of London.

Mr. Ashplant was called as a witness and duly sworn. He was examined by the counsel to the Committee, Mr. Ferguson, and Mr. Ashplant denied that he intended to convey an impression that any member of the legislature could or might be bribed, and stated to the Committee that if his language was capable of that impression, he wished to withdraw the same, and to apologize and express sorrow for having made the statement. Following the examination of Mr. Ashplant, Mayor Little and Aids. Harley, Brighton, Drake and Wilson were severally called as witnesses, duly sworn and affirmed the reported statements of Mr. Ashplant in the Toronto "*Globe*," and the London "*Advertiser*" as being

substantially the statements which Mr. Ashplant had made in London at the Council meeting on the 7th of March. The Committee accepted the withdrawal and the statement of regret and sorrow offered by Mr. Ashplant, and recommended that no further proceedings be taken with respect to the matter.

Taylor Charges

The Committee then considered what is known as the Taylor Charges referred to it for investigation upon motion in the Assembly on the 8th of March, 1921.

Mr. Daniel James Taylor, member of the Assembly for North Grey, was called as a witness and duly sworn.

Mr. Taylor told the Committee that shortly after he was elected a member of the legislature a man whom he did not know, but who, he said, came from Owen Sound, approached him at his home in Wiarton and told him that if he, Taylor, would use his influence with the Government to procure a position on the Workmen's Compensation Board for one, George Menzies of Owen Sound, he, Taylor, would be paid one thousand dollars. It was on the strength of this occurrence that Mr. Taylor made the statements set out in the votes and proceedings of the House above referred to on the 11th day of June, 1920. Mr. Taylor produced a letter, signed by one William Willcocks, dated at Detroit, Michigan, March 22nd, 1921, in which the writer of the letter admitted that he was the man who had approached him at his home in Wiarton and made to him the offer of one thousand dollars. The letter was admitted as Exhibit 6.

Mr. Taylor did not make any offer to have the man Menzies appointed, nor has he been appointed to any office in the gift of Government.

Charge against Mr. Hall.

The Committee then dealt with the complaint made by Mr. R. R. Hall, M.P.P. in the Assembly in regard to an article appearing in the Toronto "*Telegram*," dated March 31, 1921, which complaint was referred to the Committee for investigation upon a motion of the Assembly on the 1st of April, 1921.

On the motion of Mr. Webster, seconded by Mr. Cridland, it was resolved that in as much as the charge contained in the "*Telegram*" was made not against Mr. Hall in his capacity as member of the Legislature, this Committee has no jurisdiction to entertain the charge and, therefore, that the matter be not further proceeded with.

Swayze Charges.

Mr. Ferguson then brought up what is known as the Swayze Charges. On the motion of Mr. Tolmie, seconded by Mr. Hicks, it was resolved that in as much as this charge was to the effect that Mr. McBride was insincere as a member of the special committee which investigated the strike of the Hydro employees, at Chippawa, this Committee was unable to enter into the question, as no definite charge had been made against Mr. McBride, and that no further action be taken by the Committee.

The Committee instructed the clerk to subpoena Mr. R. W. E. Burnaby to appear before the Committee at its next meeting.

Moved by Mr. Hay, seconded by Mr. Curry that when the committee adjourn, it adjourn until Friday April 29th at 1.30 p.m. Carried.

The fifth meeting of this Committee was held in the Private Bills Committee Room on Friday April 29th, at 1.30 p.m.

The following members were present:

Messrs. Brackin, Calder Cridland, Cunningham, Curry, Drury, Doherty, Fox, Freeborn, Hay, Lennox, Hogarth, Racine, Tolmie.

The Chairman announcing that all matters referred to the Committee for investigation had been disposed of, and with the exception of what is known as the Burnaby charge and that Mr. R. W. E. Burnaby was present to-day.

Burnaby Charges.

Mr. W. E. Burnaby being called, was duly sworn. At the outset Mr. Burnaby raised the question of want of jurisdiction of the Committee to call him for examination in as much as he did not make his statement as a member of the Legislature and in as much as his statement in no way reflected upon the conduct of any member of the Legislature. Mr. Ferguson, as counsel to the Committee, stated that, in his opinion, the Committee had jurisdiction. However, Mr. Burnaby agreed to waive any want of jurisdiction of the Committee and to proceed with the examination. The statement made by Mr. Burnaby and referred to the Committee for investigation in the votes and proceedings in the House on the 8th of March was made by him at Kettleby and reported in the press on the 23rd day of June, 1920. Mr. Burnaby stated to the Committee that a man, whose name he refused to give, called on him and offered to give him \$1,000 a year if he would use his influence to secure for him the appointment as purchasing agent to the Government on being asked to give to the Committee the name of the man who had attempted to bribe him Mr. Burnaby refused. He stated that he feared he might be subjected to an action for slander and that as he and the man who made the statement were the only ones present at the time it was made he might be unable to successfully defend himself in any action that might be brought against him. Although the chairman pointed out that any evidence Mr. Burnaby might give to the Committee was privileged, Mr. Burnaby still refused to give the name of the individual. The chairman ruled that he must give the name but upon a vote of the Committee the ruling of the chair was not sustained by a vote of 9 to 12. The following members voted in favor of sustaining the ruling of the chair: Messrs. Drury, Brackin, Calder, Dewart, Hay, Lennox, Racine, Tolmie, Webster. The following members voted against the ruling of the chair: Cridland, Cunningham, Curry, Doherty, Fox, Freeborn, Lethbridge, Oke, Sewell, Taylor, Tooms, Widdifield.

File of correspondence admitted as Exhibit 7.

Following the examination of Mr. Burnaby it was moved by Mr. Lennox and seconded by Mr. Racine that the Attorney-General be called to give evidence with respect to this matter. The motion carried by a vote of 15 to 7 the yeas and nays being as follows: yeas, Messrs. Brackin, Calder, Cunningham, Curry, Hay, Joynt, Lennox, Racine, Raney, Sewell, Sinclair, Tolmie, Tooms, Webster, Widdifield. Nays, Messrs. Cridland, Fox, Freeborn, Hicks, Lethbridge, Oke, Taylor; nays, Cridland, Fox, Freeborn, Hicks, Lethbridge, Oke, Taylor.

Upon the conclusion of the examination of the Attorney-General the chairman named the following sub-committee to consider the evidence which had been produced before the Committee and to report the findings of the Committee to the House:

Messrs. Brackin, Lennox, Tolmie, Webster, Freeborn.

On motion of Mr. Calder, seconded by Mr. Lennox, the meeting then adjourned. Carried.

EVIDENCE.

APRIL 19TH, 1921.

The Committee was called to meet at 11.30 a.m., April 19, 1921, in the Private Bills Committee Room, the following members being present,—Messrs. Brackin, Cunningham, Curry, Dewart, Freeborn, Greenlaw, Henry, Joynte, Lennox, Lethbridge, Lewis, Raney, Swayze, Tolmie, Tooms, Webster, Drury.

Moved by Mr. Webster, seconded by Mr. Lethbridge that Mr. R. L. Brackin, of West Kent, be Chairman. Carried.

Mr. Brackin having taken the chair:—The first business, gentlemen, before the Committee, I am told, is to bring a motion before the Committee to deal with the question of engaging a stenographer for the Committee. Will someone make a motion with respect to that? I see, according to the last meeting of the Committee, which was in 1913, that the first business was a motion by Mr. McGarry, seconded by Mr. Mills, that the Committee authorize the Chairman to engage the services of a stenographer to take the proceedings in shorthand and transcribe the same.

MR. DEWART: I move that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LEWIS: I second it.

The motion, being put, was carried.

MR. BRACKIN: Where is the resolution of the House with regard to this matter? There are several resolutions here. I see that the matter referred to the Committee at that time was a statement made by Mr. William Proudfoot that had been referred to the Committee to enquire into and report, and the Chairman read the statement of Mr. Proudfoot containing the charges that had been made. Is it the desire of the Committee that I shall read the proceedings in the House on the matters referred to the Committee? They are rather long.

Some members.—Take them as read.

MR. BRACKIN: I will give you the substance of them. The first was; “Resolved, That whereas it has been made to appear to the House that at a public meeting of the Council of the City of London, held on the 7th March, one H. B. Ashplant publicly asserted that the City Gas Company of London, Ontario, could and might bribe Members of this House to induce such Members to vote in favor of a certain Private Bill presented to this House on behalf of the said City Gas Company. Be it therefore resolved that the said H. B. Ashplant be ordered to appear before the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections at such time as the Chairman thereof may direct, to be examined for such further action as the House may direct upon report of the Committee.”

The next was that in regard to a statement made by one Andrew Hicks as reported in the press. “That whereas one Andrew Hicks, of Centralia, Ontario, and a member of the Legislative Assembly, representing the riding of South Huron, did make a statement on or about the 9th day of June, 1920, as reported in the press as follows:—

London, Ont., June 9th.—‘The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling.’ Such was the startling statement made by Andrew Hicks, U. F. O. Whip, in an address to the East Middlesex U. F. O. picnic here this afternoon. ‘But thank God,’ he added, ‘not one of the U. F. O. members succumbed to the effort of bribery.’”

And the next was in respect to certain statements made by David James Taylor, Warton. “And whereas one David James Taylor, of Warton, and a

member of the Legislative Assembly for the riding of North Grey, did make a statement on or about the 11th day of June, as reported in the press, as follows:—

“The principle of the \$2,500 indemnity for the Members is all wrong, but I did favour a bonus for the present Session. The hotel bill alone was about \$4 a day, and in the Session each Member would spend about \$700. ‘And if you don’t believe me, just try it,’ said Mr. Taylor. ‘If the Member was a farmer he had to hire someone to run his farm, while if he was a labourer he lost his job. If the public want honest service they should pay their representatives a fair amount. Every dollar I get the public will know about it,’ said Mr. Taylor, telling of an offer of \$1,000 he had received—and refused—for his influence in a certain measure, and three weeks after his election. ‘And if the past Government had not been in the habit of taking money on the side, how was it that the man should come to me?’ queried Mr. Taylor.”

And the next was in regard to a statement credited to Mr. J. W. E. Burnaby, of North York. “And whereas one J. W. E. Burnaby, of North York, President of the U. F. O. Co-operative Association, did make a statement on or about the 23rd day of June, 1920, as reported in the press, as follows:—

Kettleby, June 23.—Mr. Burnaby declared that a direct attempt had been made to bribe him; cited the offer made, and said he was ready at any time to back up his statement:—

‘I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the press lately,’ the U. F. O. President said, ‘but I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job.’”

And whereas all these statements are serious reflections on the independence and honour of the Legislature; and whereas the dignity and honour of the House and the safety of the public interests demand that these allegations be fully and thoroughly investigated and proper punishment be meted out to anyone who may be found guilty of any of the acts alleged; be it therefore resolved that in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government to refer the allegations and charges to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. DEWART: Who moved the first motion? Are they all contained in one motion?

MR. BRACKIN: It is just simply a motion, Resolved, that whereas, and so on.

MR. DEWART: Was not there a motion moved by somebody and seconded by somebody.

MR. BRACKIN: The motion with regard to these particular matters was moved by Hon. Mr. Ferguson, if you will remember, with regard to the Hicks and Taylor matters, and the other stuff was added on another motion and I think Mr. Homuth brought up the first matter. That matter was the Ashplant matter, which Mr. Homuth had referred to in the House, and was moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Dewart. But Mr. Ferguson moved the amendment, seconded by Mr. Henry, to add these other things. He moved that it be amended, then the motion as amended was submitted to the House and was carried unanimously.

MR. CURRY: The amendment was carried?

MR. BRACKIN: The motion before the House was with regard to one matter, the Ashplant matter. Mr. Ferguson moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Henry, and the motion as amended was carried.

Then another motion is that there be referred to the Committee a statement in the press which was read to the House by Mr. Hall:—

On the motion of Mr. Hall seconded by Mr. Dewart:

“Resolved,” That whereas it has been made to appear to the House by the statement made this day to this House, by Richard Reece Hall, and by an article appearing on page 27 of the *Toronto Telegram* newspaper of date of Marsh 31st, referring to the Parry Sound Development Plant, that the said statement and the matters therein contained be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the said Committee be instructed to inquire into and report thereon, with power to send for and examine all necessary persons and papers in or concerning the premises. And that the said Committee be empowered to sit for such purpose.”

And then the other is the statement of Mr. Swayze:—

“Mr. Swayze, the Member for Niagara Falls, having stated while addressing the House, that a member of the Chippawa Commission of 1920, was insincere as a member thereof, Mr. MacBride, rising in his place, demanded that Mr. Swayze should state specifically the name of such Member, and thereupon Mr. Swayze stated that Mr. MacBride was the member of the said Committee he referred to.

“Mr MacBride then moved,

“That the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation and report.

“And the question being submitted to the House was carried, and it was,

“Ordered, That the matter in question do stand referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for enquiry and report.”

MR. DEWART: That was at the instance of the member for South Brant. What is Mr. Hall complaining about?

MR. HOMUTH: Certain statements set forth in a newspaper.

MR. BRACKIN: As I recollect the statement in the *Telegram* was statement of fact. It was about him having sold gravel from his gravel pit to the town when he was Mayor.

PREMIER DRURY: I think there were several statements.

MR. BRACKIN: I see at the last meeting of the Committee that dealt with certain charges made by Mr. Proudfoot it was decided to allow Mr. Proudfoot to be represented by counsel and that his counsel be allowed to examine all papers. Does the Committee desire to do anything with regard to that feature of the matter with regard to anyone being represented by counsel.

Honourable Member: I think the committee ought to have counsel to prepare the case, to have the documents submitted. But these are not cases like where a man puts his political life in the balance.

PREMIER DRURY: I myself think they have to do with the dignity and integrity of the House. I think it is quite proper that there should be counsel in that case.

MR. DEWART: Why not have counsel appointed by the committee to represent the House?

MR. CURRY: The position of course in connection with a matter of this

kind, you take for instance the first charge we have, that of Ashplant, we are not interested at all in appointing counsel as no member of the House is interested in appointing counsel in regard to that charge.

HON. MR. RANEY: What charge is that?

MR. CURRY: The Ashplant charge.

MR. BRACKIN: He said that the Gas. Co., could and might bribe members of the Legislature to put the bill through.

MR. CURRY: I feel quite satisfied that there are sufficient counsel among the members of the House without appointing a counsel. With regard to the other matter there are certain of the members of the House who are charged, now if the House desires to appoint counsel for their assistance it might very well be that that would be so, I can quite understand.

HON. MR. RANEY: Take the matter of Mr. Hicks, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hall. They might require to have counsel to bring out matters fairly before this Committee as to what actually did take place, and so far as I am concerned I would be prepared to move that counsel be appointed to represent these members in the charges that have been brought before us.

MR. DEWART: One of the difficulties of course in these cases is that there is nobody to formulate the charges and lay the evidence before the Committee.

MR. BRACKIN: And decide what is going to be called.

MR. DEWART: Unless you appoint somebody to do so it is going to be difficult. In the other case—the last sitting of the Committee was in 1913 on the Proudfoot charges, this involved a number of documents that had appeared before the Public Accounts and also a number of other papers. And when Mr. Proudfoot undertook the responsibility of laying the charges it was at first contended that Mr. F. B. Johnston be engaged as counsel. When he could not act I took the matter up with W. J. Elliot and we appointed counsel on the other side, so both sides were represented. But there was a distinct issue between certain persons. These seem to be entirely different.

MR. CURRY: This seems to be a case where it might very well be necessary to have counsel to see if there is anything to bring before us.

HON. MEMBER: That counsel should represent the Committee.

MR. CURRY: And I would move that Mr. J. M. Ferguson be appointed as counsel to represent the Committee.

MR. BRACKIN: Mr. John M. Ferguson.

MR. CURRY: He is a young counsel and I think an excellent counsel, one who would not spare any labour.

HON. MR. RANEY: I second Mr. Curry's motion.

MR. CURRY: To enquire into—

HON. MR. HENRY: I move, Mr. Chairman, the Committee do the investigating.

MR. CURRY: To enquire into and prepare the evidence.

MR. BRACKIN: To prepare the evidence and decide what witnesses can give the Committee the most information, and all that sort of thing. That is Mr. Henry's idea.

MR. CURRY: To represent this Committee and enquire into the charges as to the necessary evidence to be produced and to prepare the case.

HON. MR. RANEY: If you just name him as counsel for the Committee.

MR. BRACKIN (Chairman) put the motion. "That Mr. Ferguson shall act as counsel to the Committee in connection with these matters which have been

referred to the "Committee." Carried.

MR. DEWART: He will have the assistance, I take it, of somebody in the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. BRACKIN: I see, gentlemen, a motion at the last meeting of the Committee with regard to enquiring into and the production of certain documents and papers. I suppose we could hardly deal with that until the case is prepared and we know what is going to be needed.

HON. MR. HENRY: The counsel will know what to ask for.

MR. BRACKIN: We need a motion with regard to that.

MR. DEWART: You would force production after the Committee orders it?

MR. LEWIS: How soon will we know whether Mr. Ferguson can act?

MR. BRACKIN: We will communicate with him at once. Will you deal with the matter I referred to, the production of documents, or will you leave that to a later Session, until Mr. Ferguson indicates what he wants produced?

MR. DEWART: It has been suggested that every one of these charges is based upon a statement in the public press. If this is so, why should not the editors of these papers in which these articles appeared be summoned now so that you can get that far anyway?

HON. MR. RANEY: Suppose the Committee instruct the Chairman to issue processes by way of subpoena to any witnesses whom counsel you have selected thinks desirable should be brought before the Committee.

PREMIER DRURY: It is desirable to facilitate the matter as much as possible.

MR. DEWART: The House is always in Session and the House can order the attendance of witnesses as much as the Committee can.

MR. CURRY: Suppose this Committee adjourn until 2.30 Thursday. That is the day after to-morrow.

MR. BRACKIN: That gas committee will be going on Thursday.

MR. CURRY: Say 2.30 to-morrow.

MR. BRACKIN: Would you expect me to have witnesses here then?

HON. MEMBER: No. We would expect you to tell us what he desires to be ordered and produced.

PREMIER DRURY: Probably as to the witnesses to be summoned.

MR. BRACKIN: Certainly I will report on that.

MR. BRACKIN: Somebody will move adjournment until to-morrow at 2.30?

Moved by Mr. Curry, seconded by Mr. Raney, that this Committee adjourns to stand adjourned until tomorrow (Wednesday, April 20th, 1921) at 2.30.

Carried.

April 20th, 1921.

The Committee met at 2.30 p.m., Wednesday, April 20, 1921, with Mr. Brackin in the chair.

MR. BRACKIN: Gentlemen, at the last meeting the matters that were referred to the Committee were read, and it was decided on motion of Mr. Curry that Mr. J. M. Ferguson of Toronto be retained by the Committee to act as counsel, Mr. Ferguson to report on the nature of the charges and the names of witnesses to be summoned to the Committee. I took the matter up with Mr. Ferguson, put him in possession of copies of the records of the House, showing the matters that had been referred to the Committee, and Mr. Ferguson is here. Now it was the thought, I suppose, to-day, that we could not have any time to

take evidence, and it was the thought that counsel should look into these matters, make such enquiries as he might see fit, so that he could come before the Committee and tell us—lay sufficient of a programme before us so that we could determine to-day what we would take up at our next meeting, and, having decided what we would take up, then we would have some idea as to the witnesses who should be called in connection with that particular matter, in order that the Committee might pass the necessary resolutions with regard to the summoning of witnesses. Mr. Ferguson is here. I suggest we now have him make his report to the Committee on these matters that were referred to. Is that agreeable?

HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as you know there are several matters that were referred to this Committee to investigate, and I have, with the limited time at my disposal, looked into them to the extent I was able. And I intend to refer to them in the order in which they appeared in the copies that were handed to me. Now the only thing, I think, that can be done, as the Chairman said, is to determine, if possible, what witnesses will be necessary or it would be necessary to call for the purpose of commencing the investigation. It may be that other witnesses will be needed at a later period, but at all events certain ones now ought to be called.

I deal first with the Ashplant charges, and just so that you will know what they are about I will take the liberty of reading a line or two to point them out. This is an extract from the minutes and proceedings of the House of the 8th of March last.

(Mr. Ferguson reads extract already set out on pages 2 and 3 of the verbatim report.)

MR. DEWART: Is the paper named in which the paragraph appeared?

MR. FERGUSON: No. It is not. But I find it is in *The Globe*, and I have seen the Editor of *The Globe* and I have got the name of the correspondent who sent down the report, so that he will be one of the witnesses. His name is Mr. E. W. Carty, of London. And, of course, Mr. H. B. Ashplant will have to be subpoenaed. One of the Aldermen also, Mr. John Bridge, I understand, is familiar with the matter, and will be able to give information with regard to it. I thought, too, the solicitor for the Gas Company, ought to be subpoenaed. Mr. Marshall Graydon, he was at the meeting. As far as I know at present that ought to be sufficient in connection with this charge. If it turns out that there is serious conflict as to whether these charges were made, or as to the nature of the charges, then we will have to call probably other members of the City Council of London. But I think to commence with that that would quite sufficient. And, therefore, so far as that charge is concerned, I have nothing further to recommend with regard to that.

MR. DEWART: Did this appear in the London papers?

MR. FERGUSON: I do not know. I have not been able to find that out. The way it happened, as I understand it, is this; the local correspondent of *The Globe* in London was at this meeting and it was he who took down this account and forwarded it to *The Globe* for publication. It was a special dispatch to *The Globe*. I do not know anything about the London papers having it.

MR. DEWART: Probably the Chairman will know with reference to that?

MR. BRACKIN: It was a *Globe* article. Mr. Homuth read it, and I am

not sure. I do not know. It was incorporated in the resolution, but I know it was from *The Globe*.

MR. FERGUSON: I have not been able to get a copy of *The Globe*, but I am getting one. I will have it, I hope, when the matter comes up.

Now that is the only really definite charge that we have and where it is possible to form some idea of the witnesses that may be required. The other charges are more or less indefinite and the information will have to come from the men who made the charges. For instance, the next charge is, "That whereas one Andrew Hicks, etc." (Mr. Ferguson reads in full the House resolution already incorporated in verbatim report.)

Now, so far as that charge is concerned, the only suggestion that I have to make is that Mr. Hicks can tell his own story and can tell the foundation upon which these charges were made, if they were made. And, I think we should first hear from Mr. Hicks before subpoenaing any witnesses with regard to that case. There is no information that will enable us to say who ought to be subpoenaed.

MR. DEWART: Did that appear in a newspaper too?

MR. FERGUSON: It appeared in *The Globe*, too.

MR. DEWART: Can we ascertain who the correspondent was?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I do not know his name yet, but I am getting it.

MR. DEWART: Probably he should be here too.

MR. FERGUSON: I think it is the same man.

MR. HAY: We might be in a condition in which it would not be necessary to summon witnesses. That is exactly the condition in so far as this charge is concerned. If we have admissions in regard to it, it won't be necessary to call anybody else. But the Ashplant matter is on a different plane.

MR. FERGUSON: Now with regard to the Taylor charge:—

(Mr. Ferguson reads extract already set out on pages 2 and 3 of verbatim report.)

That is the charge in so far as Mr. Taylor is concerned. Now that appeared, that is from *The Mail and Empire*, I think.

MR. DEWART: Where is it published?

MR. FERGUSON: Well, perhaps the evidence will disclose that.

MR. BRACKIN: We may have to get that evidence.

MR. FERGUSON: Then the next one is Mr. Burnaby's charge.

MR. DEWART: Is there any particulars as to how that appeared, or as to the reporter?

MR. FERGUSON: No. I have no record of that. I have not been able to find out about that.

MR. DEWART: Do you suggest, Mr. Ferguson, that somebody should be summoned from the *Mail and Empire* staff who would tell us who the reporter was?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, unless the *Mail and Empire* will give us the name of the correspondent as *The Globe* did. I saw the Editor of *The Globe* and he gave me the name. Perhaps the *Mail* will do the same. But this matter came to me so late that I was not able to find that out, but I thought, Mr. Dewart, in proceeding with these matters it would be well perhaps first to find out whether they are disputed or not.

MR. BRACKIN: Yes, if the Member, of course, says, 'Yes, I said that.'

MR. FERGUSON: If he says that there is no need of calling the reporter.

MR. CURRY: He has stated in the House he did not say it.

MR. FERGUSON: Of course I do not know as to that.

MR. CURRY: That is my recollection of it.

MR. FERGUSON: I am not familiar with that. I do not know.

Now the next matter relates to the charge made by Mr. Burnaby, and this is the report in connection with that; "And whereas Mr. R. W. E. Burnaby, etc." (Mr. Ferguson reads extract already set forth pages 2 and 3 of the verbatim report.)

HONOURABLE MEMBER: What paper does that appear in.

MR. FERGUSON: I can tell you in a minute.

MR. CURRY: I think it appeared in *The Globe*.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I think that is the one that appeared in *The Globe*. I have the dates on which these articles appeared in *The Globe*, but I have not the exact references. I think *The Globe* had that.

MR. LENNOX: Have we any evidence on that?

MR. FERGUSON: None whatever. My suggestion is the same as with the others. Mr. Burnaby should be called to say whether he admits the statement or if he says it is untrue, and if he says it is untrue it will be time enough to bring the newspapers. I do not know what his attitude would be with regard to that.

Now these are the statements more or less of a specific character. And there are a couple of others here, one made by Mr. Swayze referred at the request of Mr. MacBride. This is the record taken from the Proceedings of the House on the 30th of March last:—"Mr. Swayze having stated," etc. (Mr. Ferguson reads extract already set out in verbatim report.)

Now I do not know what evidence, if any, there is with regard to this. I spoke to one of the parties interested and he said he will let me know whether he wants any witnesses subpoenaed or not. I was not able to see the other gentleman who is interested yesterday, because I was not able to get him when I came up to the Buildings in the afternoon. However, I suggest that that can stand, if you so agree, until the next meeting of this Committee, when perhaps I will have some more definite report in regard to it, if this is satisfactory.

MR. MACBRIDE: I would like to have the information upon which Mr. Swayze made the statement, specifically, on his responsibility as a member of the House, and the Speaker so ruled. Now I presume I am the gentleman he was unable to see yesterday because I was not in the House. I can be seen at any time, and I think that when a member makes a statement of that kind, first at the convention in Welland, and then brought out by me on the floor of the House, and the Speaker rules he makes it on his responsibility as a member of the House, and should bring his witnesses before this Committee at once in order that I may know and be in a position to defend myself on what basis he makes these assertions. I am prepared to bring witnesses and I think the person making the accusation should bring witnesses.

MR. HAY: Would I be in order in asking, assuming we finally will be able to prove the accusations that have been published, are we following the right lines, and are we going to accomplish anything by proving this. They are not so tremendously serious.

MR. BRACKIN: So far as this is concerned isn't this the situation? Isn't it after all, even so far as witnesses are concerned, a matter of opinion. Suppose you called several witnesses who said, we were of the opinion and are of the

opinion that a certain honourable member of the Committee or Commission was insincere, I think that was the word used if I am not mistaken. Suppose you asked them and they said, "Well, that is our opinion."

MR. DEWART: There is very little time to-day and I understand the object of Mr. Ferguson's report is to see what we can get ahead with. If this stands other things can be proceeded with.

MR. WIDDIFIELD: This matter has been referred to this committee by the House and I am trying to move that this case be not considered by this committee. I cannot see that there is anything to warrant the consideration of this committee, or taking up the time of this committee. That is my motion that it be not considered.

MR. MACBRIDE: Which case?

MR. WIDDIFIELD: The last one mentioned.

MR. BRACKIN: The matter referring to the statement made by Mr. Swayze in regard to the member for Brantford.

MR. HAY: My query had to do with all the cases. I want to know whether Mr. Ferguson as solicitor advises we go on and follow it to a conclusion, and if we are getting any place even if we do prove that.

MR. FERGUSON: Some of these charges are quite serious, and I should think that it is up to the honourable members of the House to show to the public that there is nothing in these charges. I understand that is the object of it. And if they are investigated and then shown that there is nothing behind them, or if the charges are withdrawn, then the end has been accomplished.

MR. BRACKIN: But with regard to the Swayze matter, Mr. Ferguson, assuming for the sake of argument that you are going to call witnesses, is it possible to get any evidence except that of people who say, "Well, that is our opinion. We think he was insincere." Does that get us anything?

MR. DEWART: Surely, Mr. Ferguson has said he has not so far been able to report on that case. Therefore I think he should have time to report. And I would move an amendment to the motion of Mr. Widdifield. That at such time as this committee meets to take under consideration the Ashplant matter, the Hicks, Taylor matters—I think this will be enough for one sitting, because these are the ones with regard to which certain witnesses have been suggested, and I therefore move an amendment that at such time as this committee pleases to meet such witnesses as Mr. Ferguson suggested on the Ashplant, Hicks and Taylor cases be summoned to appear.

MR. MACBRIDE: I asked, of course, Mr. Ferguson to amend his information. I am quite willing he be given time. But to me it is a very serious matter. Mr. Swayze made charges on his responsibility as a member of the House, from his seat in the House. Now this is a serious matter from my view point. I am a public man in the Province of Ontario and I want to be able to defend myself. Now so far as getting evidence is concerned I can bring you most authentic evidence to prove my efforts were sincere. And I want an opportunity of doing that. And I first want my accuser to bring evidence if he has any. If he has not I have plenty.

MR. FERGUSON: Of course so far as I am concerned I am bound by the instructions I get. I take it so far as this committee is concerned, it is bound by instructions from the House. Therefore, this committee in my judgment, would have no power whatever to amend or interfere in any way with the matter that is referred to it. That would be my idea of it at all events. The committee

may be of a different view, but so far as I am concerned I cannot make the change.

MR. LENNOX: In view of what Mr. Ferguson says, is Mr. Widdifield's motion in order?

MR. BRACKIN: Well, Mr. Widdifield's motion never was seconded.

MR. CRIDLAND: I take pleasure in seconding his motion.

MR. MACBRIDE: It is out of order.

MR. TOLMIE: It seems to me that the only fair thing we can do to the committee and to everybody concerned is that the Swayze part should stand over until our counsel has time to consider the thing and bring in his suggestions.

MR. BRACKIN: That is Mr. Dewart's amendment. There is a motion and an amendment. The motion is, That this committee do not take any action in the way of investigating what are known as the Swayze charges. The amendment by Mr. Dewart is that the committee proceed to call witnesses in the Ashplant, Hicks and Taylor matters, and that we do not take up the Swayze matter until a later meeting, when Mr. Ferguson will have time to make a report to the committee on the same. I will put the amendment.

MR. LENNOX: I am not interested in Mr. Swayze or Mr. MacBride or anybody else, but it seems to me that the motion is entirely out of order. Certain charges have been made in the House and then sent her for the purpose of being investigated. Now every investigation would be closed off if this is not stopped. Let us take the case of Mr. Hicks, and I have nothing against Mr. Hicks. I do not know whether he said it or whether he did not. But all Mr. Hicks will have to do if he does not want to be met by this committee is to bring his friends here and move the committee does not deal with it.

Now as I understand it, the charges were sent here for a specific purpose and that specific purpose will not be carried out unless the witnesses, the evidence, is exhausted, unless witnesses are produced before this committee. And it seems to me that it is out of order for any member of the committee to get up and say, notwithstanding the direction made by the House we are not going to deal with it because we think there is nothing in it, although we do not know anything about the evidence, we do not know what is going to be produced, and we do not care how it affects Mr. MacBride. We have come to the conclusion without knowing what evidence counsel will be able to obtain, and knowing only what we have seen in the press, that it should not go on further. I am merely pointing this out, and not taking sides with Mr. MacBride or Mr. Swayze or anybody else. But I have never seen this done before in any committee, especially in this Committee where direction was given that certain things should be done.

MR. MACBRIDE: As one of the interested parties I want to ask your pardon for speaking again. Accusations were first made against me at the Welland convention. Again—I made it my business—they were made on the floor of the House.

MR. DEWART: This committee has no power to sit during a session of the House without leave of the House, and therefore I ask that the previous resolutions be dealt with by the committee. It is a question of whether we get some business ready for the next meeting or not. Unless we get leave from the House we have no right to sit now.

MR. MACBRIDE: I am quite willing to defer the matter, but I want to insist as a public man, demanding an opportunity to vindicate myself, that this committee deal with the matter the House has referred to them.

MR. HAY: I cannot see that this committee has any choice in the matter

the House has referred to it.

MR. WIDDIFIELD: As I understand it, it was just simply referred to this committee, and nothing was said about investigation. If we assume that it is our privilege we can do it today as well as any other time.

MR. BRACKIN: I am putting the amendment by Mr. Dewart; That consideration of the Burnaby and Swayze matters be laid over until a subsequent meeting, when Mr. Ferguson will have an opportunity to make a report to the committee thereon.

MR. MACBRIDE: I move an amendment to the amendment; That we proceed with the various investigations ordered, in the order in which Mr. Ferguson recommends to this Committee.

MR. BRACKIN: Well, as I understand it, he has recommended the Ashplant matter.

MR. DEWART: That is what I suggested—the order in which Mr. Ferguson recommends.

MR. LENNOX: If you rule, that is all there is to do.

MR. BRACKIN: Those in favor of the amendment by Mr. Dewart?

MR. MACBRIDE: Will you put the amendment to the amendment that we proceed with the various cases referred to this committee in the order Mr. Ferguson recommends.

MR. JOYNT: It seems to me we are all out of order. The House is in session and I think we should adjourn and meet again at the call of the Chairman.

MR. BRACKIN: Let me put the amendment. Mr. Ferguson has recommended the order in which they should be dealt with, Ashplant, Hicks and Taylor matters. Now Mr. Dewart's motion is that the Burnaby and Swayze matter be left to a subsequent meeting.

MR. LENNOX: Mr. Dewart did not refer to the Burnaby matter at all.

MR. DEWART: My suggestion was that we proceed with the first three matters Mr. Ferguson has suggested at the meeting.

Mr. Dewart's amendment being put, the Chairman declared it carried.

MR. BRACKIN: I have got the list of those witnesses. Will somebody please move as to the witnesses to be summoned.

MR. FERGUSON: There is one other charge here. Pardon me if I did not deal with it yet—the Hall matter.

MR. BRACKIN: We will leave it over.

MR. DEWART: I move that the witnesses named by Mr. Ferguson be summoned here.

MR. BRACKIN: When?

HON. MEMBER: Friday?

MR. CURRY: No, Friday we have the Public Accounts.

HON. MEMBER: No, Thursday is Public Accounts.

MR. CURRY: Friday. Wednesday and Friday. Then I understand tomorrow is Private Bills.

MR. DEWART: Well, Private Bills will not interfere. I move they be summoned to appear here tomorrow at 10.30.

MR. WEBSTER: I second it.

MR. BRACKIN: You could not get them here tomorrow.

MR. FERGUSON: I do not see how you can proceed satisfactorily tomorrow morning at 10.30. Tomorrow afternoon?

MR. DEWART: Say 1.30 tomorrow.

HON. MEMBER: Can we get the witnesses here?

MR. DEWART: Well, we will have somebody here, surely.

On instructions being given for the summoning of the following witnesses the committee adjourned—E. W. McCarty, H. B. Ashplant, Mayor E. S. Little, Ald. John Bridge, Marshall Graydon, all of London; and Andrew Hicks, M. P. P., David Taylor, M. P. P., and an unnamed Mail and Empire correspondent.

APRIL 21ST, 1921.

The standing committee on Privileges and Elections met in the Private Bills Committee room on Thursday April 21, the chairman, Mr. R. L. Brackin presiding.

The Committee being called to order the chairman said: Now gentlemen there are three matters proposed to be taken up. We have the Ashplant charge, the statement by Mr. Hicks and the statement by Mr. Taylor. Mr. McCrae is not here and Mr. McCrae is interested to some extent in the Ashplant charge because there was a statement made with regard to him being ready to take stock to divide up among the members of the Committee to promote the bill. I suggest that we go on with the others first. There is only one witness on the London matter. After we met yesterday I saw Mr. Lennox and Mr. Dewart and others who agreed that if we brought down four or five of these gentlemen from London we couldn't hope to dispose of them between 1.30 and 3 o'clock when the House would meet, and so it was decided that we would call the man who wrote the report in the *Globe* of Ashplant's remarks, get him here and get them verified, first as to whether or not the report is correct, and then we can call other witnesses at a subsequent sitting. I suggest that we take up first the statement said to have been made by Mr. Hicks. Is that agreeable to the members of the Committee? Carried.

Mr. Ferguson, counsel for the Committee thereupon read the following:

"That whereas one Andrew Hicks of Centralia, Ontario, and a member of the Legislative Assembly, representing the riding of South Huron did make a statement on or about the 9th day of June 1920 as reported in the *Press* as follows:

London, Ont., June 9th—"The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling," was the startling statement made by Andrew Hicks, U.F.O. whip, in an address to the East Middlesex U.F.O. picnic here this afternoon. "But, thank God," he added, "Not one of the U.F.O. members succumbed to the effort of bribery."

MR. FERGUSON: That is the charge as far as Mr. Hicks is concerned. I would ask that Mr. Hicks be called.

Andrew Hicks called and sworn;

Q.—Mr. Hicks, you have heard the charge that has been read here of the statement credited to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you mind telling the Committee what you said on that occasion?

A.—Gentlemen, regarding the statement it can be made contradictory, but to facilitate matters and to save unnecessary delay on the part of the committee I will say here and now that the statement as read by Mr. Ferguson is correct. I will say I made the statement in order to facilitate matters and to avoid the

necessity for calling witnesses of any kind. I will say the statement as read is correct. The situation, and the reason for my making the statement is this, very briefly; When the matter of the Beach Protection Act was up in the House last Session strong representations were made by American interests against the passing of the Beach Protection Act. The member who was directly concerned in the matter was Mr. Fox. He asked me if I would lend my assistance in the passing of the bill and I said I would. No doubt many of the members recall the strenuous opposition put up by these American interests to the passing of the Beach Protection Act. Up to that point that is all I have to say, that I did lend my influence and helped toward the passing of the bill on the special request of Mr. Fox. Immediately after the committee had passed the bill, as we were filing out of the Private Bills Committee room, I by chance met Mr. Fox right outside the door. He was pleased to have the bill passed and said it meant a great deal to him and to his constituents to have the bill passed. Now the whole thing hinges just here and I will produce statements to this effect. The statement I understood from Mr. Fox was this, that "if I switched enough to defeat this bill I could have had \$20,000, had I changed and caused the defeat of this bill, the Beach Protection Act. That is the ground for the making of my statement, and when that statement appeared in the press and caused so much concern.

MR. HAY: Let us get clear here; do you mean if you had switched or if Mr. Fox had switched?

MR. HICKS: All I wanted was to pass the bill, Mr. Fox was for the bill.

MR. LENNOX: If who had switched?

A.—It was the member for Essex who wanted the bill passed because it affected the people in his constituency. The statement I say is this; Mr. Fox was pleased the bill was passed and he said had I switched

Q.—Who, you or Mr. Fox?

A.—Had Mr. Fox went and gone against the bill, he could have had that. That is how I got Mr. Fox's statement, coming out of the Committee room. After it appeared in the paper I had a communication by long distance telephone with the Attorney General and he suggested that I come down and meet him in Toronto and have a discussion in regard to the matter. I came down as per appointment. I cannot give you the date but it was a few days afterward. There was a controversy in the papers and the Attorney General thought it would be better for me to say what the history of it was. That was in the course of a week or ten days afterward . . . it is not material. On that visit I did not see Mr. Fox and Mr. Fox didn't see me. I did not see in that time any Government member outside of possibly Mr. Freeborn who was at the picnic. There was no controversy in the matter, no arrangement or anything of the kind. When I got up to the Parliament Buildings here it was I believe in the afternoon and Mr. Fox had already been up seeing the Attorney General and had stated his case and placed his case in writing, in a statement. Now with the permission of the chair I will read Mr. Fox's statement. I read it when I arrived in Toronto.

MR. BRACKIN: I don't, think, as far as Mr. Fox is concerned it would be proper to put in this unless it is the original statement.

WITNESS: It is a copy of the original statement.

MR. BRACKIN: I don't think we should let that go in at this juncture, since the original is available.

MR. SINCLAIR: And Mr. Fox is available.

MR. BRACKIN: If Mr. Fox were here to say this is a copy it would be all right.

I think we ought to defer that until we can get Mr. Fox here.

MR. HICKS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I am not allowed to read this I cannot see that I can go any further to clear up this misunderstanding.

MR. BRACKIN: You will get it out all right.

MR. FERGUSON: Strictly speaking it is not admissable as evidence. There is no doubt about that . . . Then Mr. Hicks, that completes your statement, that you want to make?

A.—That completes my statement to this point. After reading Mr. Fox's letter I made a statement to the Attorney General and I have a copy of that in my hand.

MR. BRACKIN: You desire to put in the statement you made then?

MR. LENNOX: I think we should have it.

MR. BRACKIN: Go ahead then.

MR. HICKS: (reads)

JUNE 23, 1920.

HON. W. E. RANEY, ATTORNEY GENERAL,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO.

DEAR SIR:—

I have read the letter written to you by Mr. M. C. Fox M.P.P. dated the 22nd inst. which you showed me today. The statement that I made at London with reference to moneys being available to members of the Legislature to corruptly influence their votes on matters before the House at the last Session was based entirely upon a remark made to me by Mr. Fox. Apart from that statement I have no information whatever as to any approaches having been made to any member of the Legislature to corruptly influence his action in respect to any legislature before the House. No money was ever offered to me, and as far as I know, no money was offered to any other member of the House, and no improper proposal ever made in that connection either directly or indirectly.

I, of course, accept Mr. Fox's statement without reservation. Apparently the whole matter was based on a misunderstanding on my part of his remark."

MR. FERGUSON: Is that the only thing upon which your statement was based?

A.—The only thing.

Q.—That is the only piece of legislation affected by it?

A.—Yes, my understanding was that the people making the approaches were American interests. What their names were I never learned.

Q.—You never learned the names of these American interests?

A.—No.

MR. HAY: How did you arrive at that understanding—by the one statement from Mr. Fox?

A.—Yes, by the one statement by Mr. Fox.

MR. FERGUSON: To make the matter perfectly clear, your statement reported here is based on that one statement. You believed that and made the statement accordingly?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You know nothing about the facts except what was related by Mr. Fox?

A.—No.

Q.—You have no other reason for basing such a statement upon?

A.—No sir.

MR. BRACKIN: Would any member of the Committee like to ask any

question?

MR. SINCLAIR: Did you ask Mr. Fox anything further about it at that time?

A.—There was no conversation between Mr. Fox and I regarding the matter at all. I based my statement upon the remark I mentioned here and I didn't meet Mr. Fox until the day he made the statement. He left before I arrived.

Q.—At the time Mr. Fox made the statement was the House in Session?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then during the remainder of the Session was there any further discussion?

A.—No.

MR. LENNOX: When you say that the statement made by you was based on a misunderstanding what do you mean by that?

A.—Mr. Fox's statement would clear that up, it gives what he says he mentioned when he mentioned it to me.

Q.—He did say to you what you have told us?

A.—That is what I say.

Q.—Did you make the statement which appeared in the papers and which you to-day admit you said based entirely on what you have just told us?

A.—Oh yes.

Q.—Now let me read it to you and see what justification you had for making that statement.

MR. HAY: (interrupting) I was wondering if in view of the written statement by Mr. Hicks it would not be better, the two being collateral, if we were to have the statement in writing by Mr. Fox.

MR. LENNOX: I think that is a good suggestion.

MR. BRACKIN: What is the date of the copy you have, someone could go to the Attorney-General's office and ask them for the original, I think?

A.—June 22.

MR. FERGUSON: I would suggest that it go in subject to verification.

MR. CURRY: If this is a matter only affecting Mr. Hicks and if he is satisfied to let that go in as a copy he has a right to have it go in. It cannot go as evidence against anyone else except him, and I do not see any reason why it should not go in.

MR. BRACKIN: Except that it is produced as a copy of the original when the original is available.

MR. CURRY: But he is the one interested and he says it is a copy.

MR. BRACKIN: But Mr. Fox is another honourable member who is also interested, if something is put in as a copy of what he said, that he has never seen.

MR. CURRY: It cannot go in as against Mr. Fox.

MR. FERGUSON: I would suggest that you do it subject to verification.

WITNESS: (Reads) "Kingsville, June 22nd, 1920." This is addressed to Mr. Raney and is signed by Mr. Fox.

"Dear Sir:

"In answer to your inquiry with reference to statements that have appeared in the press connecting my name with the alleged offers of money in the matter of the amendment of the Beach Protection Act of last Session, I desire to say that no one ever approached me either directly or indirectly with any offer of

money or other corrupt proposal in connection with this legislation. Not only so but no one has ever approached me since I have been a member of the Legislature with any offer of money or corrupt proposal in connection with any matter whatsoever.

"I think I can understand how Mr. Hicks received the impression which he appears to have. There was, before the last Session of the Legislature litigation pending between the township of Pelee Island and the Sandusky Company which has been engaged in removing sand under the waters adjoining Pelee Island, the township claiming that the operations of the sand company were causing the erosion of the shores of the island. The company offered to pay the township \$50,000 in settlement of that action and this offer was refused by the Township Council. I recall mentioning to Mr. Hicks the fact that the company had offered \$50,000 to settle the matter. I had no thought that he would understand that I meant by that statement that any money had been offered to members of the Legislature, or that there had been anything improper in the proposal."

MR. FERGUSON: Was it \$50,000 you read?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And \$20,000 was the amount you mentioned?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that is all you know about it?

A.—Yes.

MR. LENNOX: You say that it was \$20,000 that Mr. Fox mentioned to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that was mentioned immediately after the Bill had been disposed of?

A.—It was passed in Committee.

Q.—And you took it for granted from what he said that if he had opposed the Bill it would have been worth \$20,000 to him?

A.—Certainly I did.

Q.—That you say is the only occasion on which you had any reason to believe a member of the Legislature had been approached?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—That being the case how do you explain this statement you to-day admit you made. "The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling?" Upon what do you base that statement?

A.—On the statement I have just made. The wording of that should have been "a piece of legislation," instead of "pieces."

Q.—Do you think, as Whip of the Government that you were justified in making such a public statement on the statement that Mr. Fox made to you?

A.—I certainly did.

Q.—That "the offerings of money to the representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling?"

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—That being the case can you suggest, or have you any reason to believe that there were representatives of the people that were offered money?

A.—Only on this occasion.

Q.—That was one representative. Are you correct in saying that offerings of money to representatives of the people were appalling?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—What other representatives was money offered to?

A.—Well, if you want it in the plural, I possibly overheard the statement of Mr. Taylor.

Q.—You overheard the statement of Mr. Taylor at that time?

A.—I cannot give you anything as to that.

Q.—You cannot say as to that?

A.—No.

MR. BRACKIN: See if he understands that. Mr. Lennox means, at the time you made the speech at the time this statement was made, had you then heard of what Mr. Taylor had claimed?

A.—I would not be definite on that. Mr. Taylor's statement I think followed the statement that appeared credited to me, a few days after.

MR. LENNOX: Then whether rightly or wrongly the conclusion you arrived at from what Mr. Fox told you was that he had been offered the sum of \$20,000 to switch?

A.—Yes sir.

Q.—Now, having been told that and believing it to be true what action did you take or did you do anything as far as the Government was concerned?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Did you make any report to any member of the Government after you were told this?

A.—No sir.

Q.—Did you report what you had been told and what your belief was to any member of the Legislature?

A.—No sir. I don't think I did. I don't think so.

Q.—Then will you kindly explain, and as a member of the Legislature and as Whip of the Government, believing that a member of the party to which you belong had been offered \$20,000 as a bribe, why did you not report it and take some steps to ascertain whether it was true or not?

A.—Well sir, I never concluded—it never occurred to me, as it does now, what a serious thing it might mean. I did not think then there was any serious consequences connected unless there was an acceptance.

Q.—Now when you made your speech at London on the 9th of June you were aware then that it had not been accepted?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—You knew then that it was not a serious matter because it hadn't been accepted?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then in view of that why did you use the words "The offerings of money to representatives of the people . . . were appalling," if you didn't consider it serious?

A.—I meant the size of the amounts.

Q.—The amount offered?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And when you made that statement to the public you believed it to be true?

A.—I certainly did.

Q.—Now subsequent to that there appeared in the press a correction made by you. Did you give any statement to the press subsequent to the date of

making that statement at the picnic?

A.—Not that I have any recollection of.

Q.—Do you recall a statement appearing in the press by way of an explanation by you that the reporters must have misunderstood you, that it was a windy day and that your voice must not have been carried with accuracy?

A.—You are referring to the London picnic in June?

Q.—Yes.

A.—I was interviewed over the long distance phone several times by reporters from the city, in fact one reporter came out to the farm.

Q.—Did you as a matter of fact when you were interviewed over the phone or in person deny that the report that had appeared in the papers was not what was said at the picnic?

A.—I would say I never enlarged upon it until I got my ground, until I got my bearings.

Q.—What do you mean by that?

A.—That I did not entertain any reporters as to giving them any further matter.

Q.—Did you deny having made the statement to any reporters?

A.—I would not say definitely, on that. It was a matter of controversy with men at the picnic whether I did or did not make it.

Q.—I don't want to be unfair, I want to get all the truth. Subsequently there appeared an explanation by you in the press in which you deny having made the statement. Did you say that?

A.—I don't recall it.

Q.—Do you recall having seen or was it ever brought to your attention, a report that you denied having made the statement and that the reporters on account of the wind must have misunderstood you?

A.—I might have made that statement.

Q.—And if you did make that statement, it of course, would be incorrect in view of what you have said to-day?

A.—If I could see the statement I would have a better idea.

MR. BRACKIN: Any statement of that kind was not before the House.

MR. FERGUSON: It was not brought to my attention.

MR. LENNOX: Then of course you made no public statement such as you have made here to-day, that it was a misunderstanding between you and Mr. Fox. You have made no previous public statement?

A.—Regarding the misunderstanding?

Q.—Yes?

A.—Not that I recollect.

Q.—And as I understand it, although you and Mr. Fox sat in the House here for some weeks after the report of the Committee you never even discussed the matter with him?

A.—I don't think so.

Q.—Though you thought he had been approached with an offer of \$20,000, you as Whip of the party didn't think it your duty to investigate and ascertain whether that was true or untrue. Is that right?

A.—I say, no.

MR. FERGUSON: Just one question. Apparently there is a misunderstanding between you and Mr. Fox as to what was said on that occasion. Was there

anybody else present when Mr. Fox made this statement to you?

A.—As I recollect it was a matter of walking along the corridor beside one another. We weren't in a group or standing and discussing the matter at all. It was just casually referred to when we were walking along.

Q.—You don't remember the name of any person who might have overheard what Mr. Fox said to you?

A.—I cannot say who was there, several people were walking along.

MR. MACBRIDE: After this statement appeared in the press you paid a visit to the office of the Attorney-General?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What occurred, what was the object of your visit to the Attorney-General and what occurred?

MR. BRACKIN: That was brought out before the Committee. If the Member had been here he would have heard that question answered. He explained how he happened to come down to Toronto.

MR. MACBRIDE: All I am trying to show is this, Mr. Hicks made a statement that he did not realize the seriousness of the statement. What I want to find out is, was he then advised as to the seriousness of the statement?

MR. HICKS: I don't think I was advised of it. After talking the matter over, after seeing what Mr. Fox's statement was I accepted his statement without reservation, knowing him as I know him. I believe he was sincere. I believed that statement was sincere when I read it, I have every confidence in Mr. Fox.

MR. SINCLAIR: You didn't see Mr. Fox at that time?

A.—No, I didn't see him in the city at that time.

MR. BRACKIN: There is one thing I would like to ask you. You have told us what Mr. Fox said to you, or what you understood him to say, that he could have had \$20,000 to switch his vote on that particular Bill. Has Mr. Fox at any time since that ever said to you he didn't say that.

A.—No, we have never conversed on that matter.

MR. BRACKIN: Of course the copy of the letter of his doesn't deal specifically with that. He doesn't say "I never said it."

A.—We never had any conversation on that.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Fox will be called to explain in his evidence.

MR. BRACKIN: I do not see anything in Mr. Fox's statement that he denied he told Mr. Hicks such a thing.

MR. FERGUSON: No.

MR. FERGUSON: That is all the evidence we have on the Hicks case to-day. I would suggest that the only other witness we could call on that point is Mr. Fox, and that he be called at the next sitting.

MR. LENNOX: I would suggest that the reporter who interviewed Mr. Hicks be called.

MR. FERGUSON: He is here to-day. What ever the Committee thinks, only the reason I did not intend to call the reporter is that Mr. Hicks comes and says, "This is perfectly true. I made that statement."

MR. LENNOX: Yes, but that may be for a purpose—of making it not necessary to call the reporter.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, it is for the Committee to say.

MR. BRACKIN: Will some Member make a motion with regard to the summoning of whatever witnesses you want. You say, Mr. Lennox, that you

want the reporter who interviewed Mr. Hicks.

MR. FERGUSON. There was a reporter at the picnic who sent the dispatch. That reporter is here.

HON. MEMBER: We do not need him because Mr. Hicks admits it.

MR. CURRY: Well, is that material, as to what he said afterwards.

MR. LENNOX: We do not know until we hear his evidence. We do not know what took place subsequent.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no dispute about the statement. Mr. Hicks says, "I made that statement."

MR. LENNOX: I suppose the public would like to know when Mr. Hicks was interviewed whether he told the reporter he made the statement. I think it is a matter of very great importance.

HON. MEMBER: Well, in the light of what it is that is referred to this Committee—suppose that two months afterwards he denied he made that statement. Is that material, except the thing we have to particularly inquire into is this particular statement that was made, and whether it was made, and whether there was any justification for it.

MR. LENNOX: I do not want to get into a controversy on the subject, but what I think my right is and what I shall insist upon, subject to the Committee, is that the witness be called, and as the question is put to him you may rule as to whether he may answer, as to whether it is relative. I think surely we have the right to have him here to be examined.

MR. FERGUSON: What paper did he represent?

MR. CURRY: I have not any doubt about it, if a member of the Committee asks to have a witness called, and makes a statement that that witness can give evidence that is material, why he should have him called. But this Committee ought not to be asked to summon witnesses here to give evidence that is not material, if there is any doubt about that.

MR. SINCLAIR: What we want is the fullest of information.

MR. LENNOX: We must take it for granted you know what the witness is going to say.

MR. CURRY: No, I do not.

MR. LENNOX: Well, you must take it for granted I know.

MR. MCBRIDE: I do not suppose any of us know very much about this affair, and until such time as the witness is called how are we going to know whether he has material evidence to give or not. We are all groping for facts.

MR. FERGUSON: If controversy should arise between Mr. Hicks and Mr. Fox, then it would be important what Mr. Hicks said to the reporter.

MR. LENNOX: I think everything is important, everything ought to be disclosed that took place arising out of the statements made by Mr. Hicks at that picnic.

HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well you move a motion, or maybe you will be in a position to move before the Committee rises. I understand you gentlemen know the name.

MR. LENNOX: No. I only saw the paper. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not taking an interest in Mr. Hicks. Only I think this matter should be gone into.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you can get his name, or get the paper?

MR. FERGUSON: I may be able to find that out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as I understand it, Mr. Lennox moves that the reporter for the newspaper that interviewed Mr. Hicks ought to be summoned, when his name can be ascertained. That is agreeable, gentlemen?

The motion being put, the Chairman declared it carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now then with regard to the other witnesses.

HON. MEMBER: It seems to me the fact that Mr. Hicks admitted that possibly he misunderstood Mr. Fox. If Mr. Fox comes before this Committee and tells us his story, and it is proved to be a misunderstanding, what more need to go any further. That is all there is to it.

MR. LENNOX: A very simple way of getting away from it.

MR. CURRY: Just in answer to Mr. Lennox and Mr. MacBride. I have in my mind what is brought to my attention regularly at Public Accounts, in which we use a form: "I hereby certify the evidence to be obtained by blank by the Public Accounts is in my opinion material and important."

MR. LENNOX: Well, I have not the slightest hesitation in signing that.

MR. CURRY: Exactly. You do not need to sign that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is that out of the way.

MR. CURRY: Now then there has to be a motion made by a member of the Committee and the Committee must order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now then, with regard—is it the desire that Mr. Fox shall be here at the next meeting? If both Mr. Hicks and Mr. Fox appear before this Committee and say there was nothing in the story, that they did not understand the seriousness of it, I am quite satisfied. I have no desire to prolong things, but I think the slate should be wiped clean, and any man whose honour is in question should be exonerated. If he makes the same statement, I fancy the only honourable course to my mind is to have him state so here.

MR. TOOMS: I think the Member has done that in his evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major Tolmie moves, seconded by Mr. Calder, that Mr. Fox be requested to appear at the next meeting of the Committee. You will have to put that in writing.

The motion being put, the Chairman declared it carried.

MR. HAY: Is Mr. Hicks here? I think it might clear up the minds of the Committee by asking one question.

(Mr. Hicks, recalled.)

MR. HAY: Did you gather that with the defeat or the carrying of this Bill to which he referred, and in connection with which you had in mind the \$20,000, that it would be offered to him personally or would it be offered for distribution?

A.—I thought personally.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why, if he thought it was going to be distributed he would take more interest.

MR. CURRY: He didn't think you were going to get any of it.

MR. LENNOX: There was a little Scotch in him.

MR. HAY: The only thing in mind is whether the money was for distribution to those who assisted in carrying the Bill or whether Mr. Fox dominated the Committee.

MR. JOYNT: I am satisfied in my own mind that the whole matter was one of misunderstanding. Mr. Hicks certainly understood Mr. Fox to say this, and it was some months afterwards, perhaps a couple of months afterwards—I can easily understand this thing grew in his own mind and was simply a

misunderstanding .

MR. FERGUSON: That is all of that case. I have a reporter here from London, and I want him to get through to-day .

THE CHAIRMAN: That is in the Ashplant matter.

Arthur C. Carty was called, sworn and examined as follows:—

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Carty, I understand that you are the local representative of *The Toronto Globe* at London?

A.—I am.

Q.—And in that capacity you sent a dispatch, I believe to *The Toronto Globe*, relating to something that transpired at a meeting of the City Council at London on the 7th of March last?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I will read you the charge that was made here so as to bring to your attention what the matter in dispute is;

(Mr. Ferguson reads the charge embodied in the House Proceedings already incorporated in verbatim report, pages 2 and 3.)

Q.—Now were you the reporter who sent the account of that meeting to *The Toronto Globe*?

A.—I was, yes.

Q.—And I believe the report sent in by you appears in a copy of *The Globe*, dated March 8, 1921?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—You might just see if that is the report you refer to?

A.—Yes, that is my story of the meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read the thing over to the Committee, Mr. Carty, because we have not it all in our minds.

A.—The matter under discussion was the question of raising the City Gas Company rates by authority of the Legislature from 90 cents to \$1.25 per thousand feet. The basis of the agreement as suggested, or as put before the Council by Alderman Cameron Wilson had just been set forth in all the details and Mr. Ashplant asked permission to address the Council as one of the deputations who appeared in protest. I said:—(reads, from *Globe*, March 8.)

“Mr Ashplant raised objection to this agreement, and declared that the Company would find it possible to set aside sums of money to influence the vote of members of the Legislature against the interests of the citizens.

“Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the Company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through,” he commenced when Mayor Little interjected a protest, declaring that he would not sit to hear the honour of the Provincial Legislators impugned. Mr. Ashplant rejoined that he had not said that this would be done, but only that it could be done, and, he added, “it is the most natural thing in the world if the Company should do it.”

Now that is the only part of the article that is relevant.

Q.—Is that a correct account of what took place at the meeting?

A.—That is a correct account.

Q.—Now I think the Committee would like just to hear the circumstances a little more elaborately than you have given them.

A.—Well, this agreement provided among other things that the capital stock of the Company should be limited to \$400,000 and the dividend of ten per cent. should be allowed on that . That is, that rates should be fixed that would provide

for a return of ten per cent. on \$400,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let us start in the other way. There was a Bill before the Legislature on behalf of the City Gas Company of London.

A.—Yes.

Q.—It was in reference to the passing of this Bill in the Legislature that this meeting was held?

A.—Yes, I understand the Private Bills Committee had sent it to the Council for them to give an opinion as to the action that should be taken. Mr. Ashplant argued that if the city approved a rate devised to pay a 10 per cent. return, capitalized say at 6 per cent., would actually mean a much higher capitalization for the Company than \$400,000. He gave various other illustrations. Then he developed the point further contending that the Company had less than \$400,000 actually invested in the property. He said, I think, that the Company had only an investment of about \$260,000 in the plant, and that the remainder represented earnings of the Company of past years, that were put in as reinvestment of the earnings of the Company. He objected that these earnings that were so reinvested really belonged to the people, that it had come from the people and had been charged to the people in excess of the service in the payment of service of previous years. And he said that if the Gas Company was permitted to charge the rate that this larger amount of \$400,000 necessitated, that they were actually being given, I think he said, \$140,000 or \$144,000 of a bonus stock. That was the phrase, "bonus stock." That is, he said that stock would be issued against these excess earnings so reinvested. Then he went on to argue this would give the Company a fund.

He went on to make the point that this \$140,000, that would be given by the people to the Company, they would simply issue stock against it and would have a fund available that cost them nothing, which they might use to further the interests of the Bill. He dealt with that point a moment and then he came to this point. I quote. (Reads from *The Globe* of March 8, 1921.)

"Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the Company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through," he commenced, when Mayor Little interjected a protest, declaring that he would not sit to hear the honour of the Provincial Legislators impugned. Mr. Ashplant rejoined that he had not said that this would be done, but only that it could be done, and, he added. "it is the most natural thing in the world if the Company should do it."

I am not just certain on that point. I think instead of members of the Legislature, I think he confined himself to members of the Private Bills Committee.

MR. BRACKIN: I hope so.

WITNESS: At that moment Mayor Little, who had been in the chair—Council was in the Committee of the Whole and Mayor Little was sitting in the seat of the Chairman—he drew his chair back quickly and said he would not hear such stuff as that, and honourable members of the Legislature's honour impugned. And he abruptly left the meeting and went to the ante-room. Several of the Aldermen shouted, "No, no," and there were several interruptions. At that point Mr. Ashplant went on, and his rejoinder was that he had not said this would be done, but could be done, and he had said it might be done. I am not quoting directly, but that phrase, "The most natural thing in the world," was from his speech. So what he said was, that he had not said this would be done,

but that Companies seeking public privileges of one sort or another very frequently resort to that sort of thing, and then he said, "It would be the most natural thing in the world." I think that covers the whole thing.

Q.—The Mayor, you say, left in protest?

A.—Yes, and subsequently in an interview—

Q.—(Interrupting Witness) Was there any pretest from the other members?

A.—Yes, Alderman Wilson, who had brought forward the agreement.

Q.—Who was the Chairman?

A.—Mr. Ashton. Mr. Little is the Mayor. (Reads from *The Globe*, Marsh 8, 1921.) "Alderman J. C. Wilson, Chairman of the Committee which negotiated the agreement, hotly condemned Mr. Ashplant's address as the worst distortion of facts he had ever heard. "Ponzi had nothing on you, Mr. Ashplant," he declared. "Your whole address has been purely and simply destructive without one suggestion of a possibly better arrangement."

MR. CURRY: The Meredith you speak of, is he the City Solicitor?

A.—I made no reference to Meredith.

HON. MEMBER: Mayor Little got up he said.

Q.—Would you mind telling us who were present in case we want to know the names?

A.—There was Alderman Harley, John Bridge, Ald. Brighton, Ald. Boss—I believe that practically all the Aldermen were there with the exception of Alderman Waters, who was ill. On the following day—and I propose using this paper for reference—I interviewed—

Q.—(Interrupting) I want you to tell about the subsequent interview with Mr. Ashplant?

A.—At the time I wrote this thing, this article was written within thirty minutes after the incident occurred, I went to the telegraph office with the story.

Q.—Do you take shorthand?

A.—No. I do not use shorthand. It was a brief incident, only three or four sentences.

Q.—Did you make notes?

A.—Oh yes, I make notes, absolutely.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Carty has not his notes. They were destroyed.

MR. CARTY: Immediately after having written this thing, within thirty minutes after the incident, I threw my notes aside at the telegraph office. Of course I did not anticipate there was going to be any denial. The following day I found that the office had been cleaned up and the notes had gone. And then when it was denied, I called up each member of the City Council. I got Mayor Little, Alderman Harley, Alderman J. C. Wilson, Chairman of the Committee, Alderman John Bridge, Alderman Drake, Alderman W. A. Wilson, Alderman W. Boss, Alderman Brighton, and Alderman Ashton.

I interviewed each of them. What I said was this. I read the item in *The Globe* to which denial had been given. I said, "This is my story of what occurred at the Council." I asked him to listen very carefully, and then tell me what he thought about it. Each man gave me his statement of whether in his judgment I had made a correct report of the meeting. Then, with this statement I got from each of the Aldermen, before sending them to Toronto, I read them back and had each man approve, each of the persons interviewed, before it was sent out. So these are all verified interviews before publication. They

are all, with the exception of Mr. Ashton, all confirmed.

(Witness reads interviews appearing in *The Globe* of March 9, 1921.)

“Mayor Little said to-night: ‘I most certainly think that the statements made by Mr. Ashplant warrant a rebuke from the Legislature. Because I felt his statements should not go unchallenged I protested and left the meeting. The same sort of loose talk has been allowed recently at several meetings conducted by these people, notably at the meeting concerning unemployment a week ago, when E. A. Pocock alleged that we had closed our industries and that I had taken up a collection to defray my election expenses. When Ashplant started the same thing before the City Council last night, I protested, and if I had been in the Chair I would not have allowed him to speak another minute.

“He said that the agreement proposed with the Gas Company would give the Company \$144,000 of bonus stock which had come from the consumers. He said there was nothing to prevent the Company using it to secure this Legislation. When he said that the Company might well give \$15,000 to Mr. McCrea, I at once left the meeting and did not hear the finish of his statement.”

MR. MCCREA: Please state the amount I was supposed to have received?
A.—\$15,000.

Q.—Was it in stock?

A.—He did not say Mr. McCrea was to receive it. Suppose that he should.
(Reads from *The Globe* of March 9, 1921.)

“Alderman J. C. Wilson (Chairman of the Special Committee which negotiated the agreement with the Gas Company) said:—‘Absolutely the statement made by Mr. Ashplant in his remarks, that the Gas Company might use stock to influence the members of the Private Bills Committee, was unwarranted and insulting, and the action of the Mayor in protesting and leaving the Council Chamber was justified. Mr. Ashplant’s remarks were insulting, not only to the members of the Private Bills Committee, but to the members of the Council, and that is what I replied in condemnation. I believe the Legislature should take what action is in their power to make Mr. Ashplant apologize and withdraw.’”

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Carty, I do not think you need read any more. Did you have an interview with Mr. Ashplant?

A.—Well, these interviews are all to the same purpose with the other Aldermen. They were published in *The Globe* of March 9, 1921.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have not got that *Globe*.

WITNESS: The report was in on the 8th, and the 9th was the follow up. In addition to interviewing the members of the City Council, I called up Mr. Ashplant and I told him just as I did the others. I went to read the story. He said he had not seen *The Globe* report of this meeting. I read it to him as I did the others. Now here is the interview that Mr. Ashplant gave to me:—

(Witness reads from *The Globe* of March 9, 1921.)

“I said that the Bill proposed involved giving the City Gas Company \$144,000 of bonus stock, free, and that any Company having such facilities would find it possible, if they chose to look upon it as a matter of investment, to pay out commissions or fees to insure getting the measure through. I was arguing that if the Company felt like doing it, it could give its solicitor a good commission or fee, in a perfectly honest, legitimate and straightforward way, to see that the Bill would go through. I meant that it could give such money to Mr. Graydon—”

WITNESS: “Mr. Graydon” That is the Company Solicitor in London.

(Reads)

“—or any other solicitor, and then it occurred to me that Mr. Graydon did not speak for his client in the Legislature, and that Mr. McCrea had spoken for the Company, and I brought in the name of Mr. McCrea in a purely incidental way to show that he was not intended—”

WITNESS: Now at this point in the interview I asked him repeatedly to tell me the exact sentence in which Mr. McCrea's name was used. But I could not get it. I asked him this absolutely dispassionately, for his version of the story, and told him I was using exactly his story.

(Reads)—

“—I meant that such companies could give sums of money to three or four solicitors as is generally done for propaganda purposes. Such companies, when they do that sort of thing, don't know and don't care very often, just how the money is spent, providing they get what they want.” Mr. Ashplant was asked how such propaganda usually works out in practice. “Those agents,” he explained, “mingle with the members of the Legislature and in private conversation they put forward their arguments and data, and influence the members without the members being aware of it—”

WITNESS: And then I raised another point. I said; What did Mayor Little take offence at when he protested and left the Council Chamber.

(Reads)—

—“The Mayor gets mad at me on general principles,” he answered. “I suppose that he took offense at my statement that the company could influence the members of the Legislature on its behalf by such legitimate propaganda.”

WITNESS: Now I believe Mr. Ashplant also denied this last interview. I believe he has since. He did not deny it, but said he would not be responsible for anything not over his own signature.

Q.—Ashplant is not a member of the Council, is he?

A.—No. He is an ex-alderman.

Q.—He was merely one of a deputation.

A.—Yes.

Q.—What business is he in?

A.—An accountant, I believe.

Q.—Now are you an experienced reporter?

A.—Yes. I have been a reporter continuously since 1907.

MR. FERGUSON: That is all I have to ask.

MEMBER: Who did you say was with Mr. Ashplant at the meeting?

A.—Mr. Thompson was with Mr. Ashplant. He asked permission to speak, but the council refused permission to hear him speak by some division.

Q.—Is Mr. Ashplant a member of any political organization up there?

A.—I am not just certain, although he ran against Mayor Little in the last two campaigns as a Labor representative.

Q.—He is an outstanding Labor representative, is he?

A.—Yes, he is.

Q.—Who was he representing when he went to the City Council?

A.—There are several Labor organizations there, with the Independent Labor Party. Then, for political purposes, they merged the activities of the general Labor organization in what is known as the Labor Representation Committee.

Q.—Did he appear in a representative capacity?

A.—Yes. The Labor representation has what they call the High Cost of Living Committee, and I believe he and Mr. Thompson are members of that committee and they appeared under that committee.

MR. MCCREA: Has he such a reputation in the community that when he makes statements such as you have said he did make people are likely to believe him?

A.—Well, Mr. Ashplant would probably be believed by his own friends.

Q.—Well what is his general reputation when he makes a statement of that kind?

A.—I do not think that is a fair question.

Q.—Is he in the habit of making irresponsible statements?

A.—He is in the habit of making statements.

THE CHAIRMAN: Responsible or otherwise. Now I do not think that is fair to Mr. Carty. He lives in London. He is a newspaper correspondent. I do not think he should be asked to pass an opinion.

WITNESS: I am absolutely dispassionate in this thing and I was when I reported this thing. I did not care what he said. I was simply there to record it.

MR. CURRY: Do you know his reputation for veracity in the district where he resides?

A.—No. I do not know.

MR. CURRY: Well, then, of course you cannot say what his reputation is. You cannot say anything.

WITNESS: It would only be my judgement of what the community thought.

MR. CURRY: You do not know what his reputation is.

A.—He would have various reputations.

Q.—But you do not know what his reputation for veracity is in London?

A.—No. I do not know what his reputation for veracity is.

MR. MCCREA: May I ask this further question. If this man is given to making irresponsible statements, making statements on different occasions as you suggested, why is it the newspapers who are supposed to present reliable news to the community are so keen on reporting them?

A.—That would infer first that I know Mr. Ashplant is in the habit of making irresponsible statements, and also that I know the newspapers are in the habit of reporting them. I do not know that Mr. Ashplant is always reported when he makes speeches. But when he makes speeches that create public interest of course he gets them published.

Q.—Newspaper notoriety?

A.—Just newspaper interest.

MR. TOLMIE: Isn't it a fact that he is an outstanding man in London?

A.—Oh, yes, his name is known to everybody.

Q.—Well known?

A.—Oh, yes, he ran for mayor twice.

Q.—One of the leaders of his party?

A.—Yes, he stands very high with his party..

MR. FERGUSON: There is one question I want to ask. Is there a split in the Labor Party in London, two divisions, and he is connected with one of these divisions?

A.—Well, I have heard that but I did not know it is a fact.

Q.—Do you know just which one he is reputed to be the leader of?

A.—Well, I don't know. I do not know just what that would be. But I

know this, that in the last campaign some rather harsh things were said about him by the present political faction, he was called Red and Bolshevik and so on.

Q.—Well, he is prominent in one wing of the Labor Party.

A.—Oh yes, he is prominent in all the wings to the extent that he had the nomination for two years.

MR. FERGUSON: There is another witness here I propose to call. He is a reporter of the *London Advertiser*, who happens to be in Toronto to report this meeting. He was present when Mr. Ashplant made these statements, and I would like his evidence to be taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. Call him.

Herbert H. Penny, on being sworn, was examined as follows:—

MR. FERGUSON: You are a reporter for the *London Advertiser*?

A.—I am.

Q.—And were you at the council meeting at London when the charges were made by Mr. Ashplant?

A.—Yes, on the 7th of March last.

Q.—And did you hear the evidence given by Mr. Carty?

A.—Yes.

MR. CURRY: I will move that this man be called as a witness in this case. Will you second it, General Ross?

GENERAL ROSS: Sure.

MR. CURRY: In order to have it go through with the auditor.

The motion being put, the Chairman declared it carried.

Q.—Now you heard the evidence given by Mr. Carty as to what took place at the meeting, as to what Mr. Ashplant said, do you agree or disagree with Mr. Carty's account of what he said?

A.—I think it was fair, yes.

Q.—You think Mr. Carty's account was a fair account?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You did write a report of the same meeting for your own paper, did you not?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And is this a report that appeared in the *London Advertiser* of that same meeting?

A.—Yes, that was the report in the morning paper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps members of the Committee might want to hear it. Mr. Penny's report in *The Advertiser*, which is here, with regard to the statement, the speech of Mr. Ashplant, is as follows:—

(Reads)—

“H. B. Ashplant opposed the basis of settlement. The intention of the Legislature was that the consumers and not the city council should be consulted, and this had not been done, he contended. The 10 per cent return on \$400,000 was equal to 6 per cent. on half a million. He gently inquired what was to prevent Charles McCrea, the sponsor of the gas bill, and other members of the private bills committee of the Legislature being given shares in the company to insure the possibility.”

WITNESS: There is a mistake there—“passing of the bill.”

Q.—You remember, Mr. Penny, there, the reference to “possibility.” Is there anything wrong with the report there as to the printing of it?

A.—Yes. It should be “to insure the possibility of the passing of the bill.”

The sense is not quite clear.

Q.—And what you intended it to read?

A.—“To insure the possibility of the bill going through the Legislature.”

Q.—Were you present all the time during this council meeting,

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you heard all that was said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The reporters have a seat close to the members of the council?

A.—Yes. We have a seat practically adjoining the council.

Q.—How far away would you and Mr. Carty be sitting from Mr. Ashplant when he was making the speech?

A.—About 20 or 25 feet.

Q.—And you heard distinctly?

A.—Yes.

Q.—No danger of your misunderstanding what he said?

A.—Not as far as hearing goes.

Q.—And you have said before that Mr. Carty's report of the meeting substantially agrees with your own?

A.—His report as given here today, yes.

MR. FERGUSON: That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions gentlemen.

MR. HEENAN: I would like to ask if he and the other reporter compared notes before submitting it to the paper.

THE CHAIRMAN: The member would like to know whether you and the other reporter compared your notes before you wrote your respective articles for your papers.

A.—No, we did not. I think Mr. Carty left some time before I did.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has to get his stuff on the wire, and you simply go to the office and write yours

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It appears according to the evidence given here that Mayor Little, and Alderman Harley, Alderman J. C. Wilson, Chairman of the Committee, Alderman John Bridge, Alderman Drake, Alderman W. A. Wilson, Alderman W. Boss, Alderman Brighton and Ashton were present at the time the statement in question was made. Is it the desire of the Committee that any of these other witnesses shall be brought here along, of course, with Mr. Ashplant?

MR. HAY: Has Mr. Ashplant anybody here representing him?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it should be intimated to Mr. Ashplant that he will be entitled to be represented by counsel before the committee. Mr. Foster will advise him when he notifies him.

MR. MCCREA: I would like to move that these men and Mr. Ashplant be brought here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you put it in writing?

MR. MCCREA: What was the date of that meeting?

THE CHAIRMAN: March 7th, 1921.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the Committee that we shall proceed any further today with the taking of evidence in any of these matters.

HON. MEMBER: I do not think we can, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the suggestion was that Mr. Hicks and Mr. Taylor would be here, and so far as the London matter was concerned it was not intended

we should attempt to hear all the evidence. The first thing was to ascertain whether or not the report of what Mr. Ashplant was supposed to have said was correct. Should the newspapermen have come forward and said that report is not correct there would be nothing to investigate. Having got that out of the way, if they said it is correct, that is what he said, then, of course, we have got to give Mr. Ashplant and any witnesses he may want to call, or any other person, opportunity to come before the Committee. But manifestly that cannot be done until the next Session. Mr. Taylor was also requested to come to-day to give evidence in connection with the statement of his which was referred to this committee. Now does the committee desire to go on and hear Mr. Taylor now, or do you think we will have time.

MR. CURRY: We will not have time. We have only got five minutes. We could hear him Saturday all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I find it is eight minutes to three. It will probably not take Mr. Taylor very long.

MR. CURRY: Oh, it will take him some time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, all right, I am perfectly agreeable.

MR. SINCLAIR: Could not you get a forenoon some day next week?

MR. CURRY: On Tuesday there is a Municipal Committee, and there are important bills. How about Monday? Monday, nobody is here. Then on Wednesday there is Public Accounts. Thursday, Private Bills, and I think they are cleaning up Private Bills and that there are a number of important bills.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure, gentlemen of the Committee; until when is it this committee shall adjourn?

HON. MEMBER: 1.30 Tuesday.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable? And then if there is nothing important on in the House we can get leave of the House to sit here until 4.30. When the Committee adjourn today it will stand adjourned until 1.30 on Tuesday afternoon.

HON. MEMBER: What about bringing Mr. Burnaby on that day?

MR. FERGUSON: Oh, there will be enough on this next day. And the necessary resolutions have been put through as to the witnesses to be here.

HON. MEMBER: Clean Mr. Taylor up.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have him first on Tuesday.

The Committee then adjourned until 1.30 o'clock on the afternoon of Tuesday, April 26, 1921.

APRIL 26TH, 1921.

The Committee met at 1.30 p.m. on Tuesday April 26th and was called to order by Chairman R. L. Brackin.

M. C. Fox, M.P.P., being called and sworn, gave evidence as follows:—

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Fox, we have been investigating the charge made by Mr. Andrew Hicks which appeared in the press and which reads as follows: Mr. Hicks is said to have made these statements at a picnic;—

(Reads)

“The offerings of money to representatives of the people to pass certain pieces of legislation during the last Session of the Legislature were appalling,” was the startling statement made by Andrew Hicks, U.F.O. Whip, in an address to the East Middlesex U.F.O. picnic here this afternoon. “But, thank God,” he added, “not one of the U.F.O. members succumbed to the effort of bribery.”

Now Mr. Hicks says that that correctly reports what he stated on that occasion, and he stated that this statement was made by him by reason of a conversation he had with you. Now was there any conversation between you and him upon which this statement might be based?

MR. FOX: Yes. I think there was.

Q.—You might relate to the Committee what it was.

A.—Well, it was in connection with a bill I was getting through the House here, and in explaining to Mr. Hicks and several other members whom I do not just remember at the present time the objects of this bill, I said these people, the sand sucker people, had offered the Township of Pelee Island \$50,000 to settle the case out of court.

Q.—Well, there was some litigation between the Township and this company?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, I suppose, between some ratepayers and the company.

A.—No, as a township.

MR. FERGUSON: The Township was suing for damage done?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was anything else said by Mr. Hicks to you on this matter?

A.—I don't remember anything else.

Q.—Mr. Hicks refers to \$20,000 in his evidence as being the sum that might have been obtained. Was that amount mentioned by you?

A.—No. It was not.

Q.—Was anything more mentioned about that \$50,000 that is referred to?

A.—No.

Q.—So, I take it, this \$50,000 that was offered to the Township to settle was a perfectly legitimate offer, was it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The same as anyone engaged in litigation might offer to another party for the purpose of settling a law suit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And so far as your understanding was concerned, there was no suggestion of any improper methods?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—There was no suggestion of bribery of any of the members of the Legislature?

A.—Not that I know of.

Q.—Nor any member of committee?

A.—No.

Q.—So that if Mr. Hicks understood you to say such a thing you at all events did not intend to convey that impression?

A.—No, I did not intend to convey that impression at all.

MR. FERGUSON: I would think that is all I have to ask.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any member of the Committee desire to ask a question of Mr. Fox?

MR. FERGUSON: There was no other conversation at any time between you and Mr. Hicks, nothing relating to bribery or improper giving of money to members of the House?

A.—Nothing that I am aware of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any more witnesses in the Hicks matter?

MR. FERGUSON: The only other witness that might possibly be called is the reporter Mr. Lennox desired to call. I got in touch with *The Toronto Daily Star* and I find that Mr. Hicks was interviewed at his farm by a reporter of that paper, and his name is A. P. Gow. Personally I do not see the need of calling this witness because of the fact that Mr. Hicks says he was correctly reported, that is the charge that is before the committee as was made by Mr. Hicks, or said to have been made. It is for the committee to say whether this reporter who subsequently interviewed Mr. Hicks is a material witness or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee desire to hear any further evidence at this point?

HON. MEMBER: If Mr. Lennox asked for this witness he may want to know something at the other sittings of the committee and there will be no harm in leaving it. There may be nothing to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire that the matter be left open to see whether Mr. Lennox desires to have this witness called in another sitting?

Carried.

MR. FERGUSON: I think that the next matter we have to take up is the Ashplant matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashplant is here and some Aldermen of the City of London. I think Mr. Ashplant ought to be called.

Ex-Ald. H. B. Ashplant called and sworn.

Examined by Mr. Ferguson.

MR. ASHPLANT: Before you proceed I would like to say that I am here in response to a summons and I would like to ask what status I have in this Committee. Is this a trial court or an investigation?

MR. BRACKIN: Merely an investigation of a matter referred to the Committee by the House. You are entitled to be represented by counsel if you desire. Do you desire to have counsel? It is simply an investigation and the Committee has a right to put you on oath and have you examined by counsel for the Committee.

MR. ASHPLANT: I would like first, to register a protest against the summons I have received. Then as I understand from your definition of my position I am not here as a defendant at this stage of the Committee, then. My reasons for making that reference is that I have received a summons in these terms, I am asked to appear here in the matter of certain charges made by H. P. Ashplant of the City of London, and if I have already been tried and it is assumed and admitted by this Committee that these are charges that I have made—

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee is simply here for the purpose of investigating certain statements which you are alleged to have made in public at a meeting of the London City Council to the effect that the City Gas Company could and might bribe members of the Private Bills Committee or of the Legislature to put through a certain Bill in which the Company was interested. The duty of the Committee is to investigate first, whether or not that statement or a statement similar to that was made by you and then, secondly, if it was made, the Committee will investigate as to whether or not there were any grounds for the making of such a statement. I think that is as far as the duty of the Committee goes. It is not to try anyone, simply to investigate and put in a report to the House of the evidence taken.

MR. ASHPLANT: Then that is quite satisfactory to me. The next point I would like defined is this; do I correctly interpret your statement that inquiry is to be made as to whether or not I made the statement that certain members of the Legislature could and might be bribed—that that is the charge?

MR. BRACKIN: Where is the reference to the Committee, the record from the House . . . This is an extract from the proceedings in the House:

“Resolved, That whereas it has been made to appear to the House that at a public meeting of the Council of the City of London, Ontario, held on the 7th of March, one H. B. Ashplant publicly asserts that the City Gas Company of London, Ontario, could and might bribe members of this House to induce such members to vote in favor of a certain Private Bill presented to this House on behalf of the said City Gas Company. Be it therefore resolved that the said H. B. Ashplant be ordered to appear before the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections at such a time as the Chairman thereof may direct, to be examined for such further action as the House may direct upon the report of the Committee.” That is the reference in the notes of the House to your case.

MR. ASHPLANT: Then I am perfectly satisfied if that is the understanding because now I have a fairly clear idea of what the position is as the Committee views it, and I now understand that the Committee has been led to believe that I publicly stated in these terms as specified that the members of the Private Bills Committee and of the House could and might be bribed.

MR. BRACKIN: The statement as reported in *The Globe* and as sworn to by the *Globe* reporter the other day was that you stated that the City Gas Company of London could and might bribe members of the Legislature to act favorably upon the Gas Company's Bill. That in brief is the substance of the statement. There is considerable more in it but that is the substance of it.

MR. ASHPLANT: That is the essence of it?

MR. BRACKIN: Yes.

Mr. Ashplant here took the stand and was examined by Mr. Ferguson.

Q.—You live in London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you lived there some time?

A.—Thirty years.

Q.—You were at the meeting of the City Council in London on March 7th last?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the occasion for your being there?

A.—I was delegated to attend that meeting in the same way in which I had previously attended the Private Bills Committee, to follow up the whole matter of the City Gas Company's action for higher rates.

Q.—May I ask by whom you were delegated?

A.—By the High Cost of Living Committee.

Q.—That is a Committee in London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And as a delegate from that Committee you attended this meeting?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And do you remember who were present at that meeting?

A.—Ten members of the Council and his Worship the Mayor.

Q.—And were there some reporters present?

A.—Three, to my knowledge.

Q.—Mr. Carty was there?

A.—I did not see Mr. Carty.

Q.—You know Mr. Carty?

A.—I know Mr. Carty and I know a gentleman who passes by the name of Mr. Carty.

Q.—The same man?

A.—No sir, two different men.

Q.—Do you know Mr. Penny?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was the other reporter?

A.—Mr. Brigg.

Q.—And you asked for permission to address the Council?

A.—There was Committee of the Whole in session prepared to listen to either side that desired to present the position.

Q.—Just to clear the matter up—the Gas Company were trying to get through the House a Private Bill, I understand?

A.—That had been settled. At this meeting of Council this was not the issue.

Q.—Then what were you talking about?

A.—The feature of the discussion in Committee of the Whole was the possible Bill not yet decided on.

Q.—There was a Bill that was contemplated?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—It was in regard to the contemplated Bill that you addressed the Council?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That contemplated Bill had what object in view?

A.—To increase the capitalized value without any investment on the part of the shareholders.

Q.—The idea was to increase the capitalization to \$400,000?

A.—Without any investment on the part of the shareholders. The proposition was to raise the dividend rate from six to ten per cent. and following that it would be necessary to provide more revenue.

Q.—And you opposed that?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And because you were opposed to that you attended this meeting to express your view?

A.—On behalf of those I represented.

Q.—Now Mr. Carty who gave evidence here and sent the dispatch to the *Globe* swore that he was at that meeting. I am going to read you what he stated concerning your speech and ask you if it is the fact: “Mr. Ashplant raised objection to this agreement and declared that the Company would find it possible to set aside sums of money to influence the vote of members of the Legislature against the interests of the citizens.” Is that true so far?

A.—That is not what I said. That is a summarization by the reporter. That may be a correct summary on the part of the reporter.

Q.—We are not suggesting that this is a verbatim report. It that a correct summary of that part of the speech?

A.—Will you read that again?

Q.—This is from the *Globe* of March 8,—I will go back to the beginning of the item. “Ex-Ald. H. B. Ashplant appearing as a representative of the Labour Committee opposing relief for the City Gas Company created a stormy time in the City Council to-night by asserting that the Company could and might bribe members of the Legislature to get its Private Bill enacted.”

A.—There was no stormy time created. That is an indication of certain features of this report.

Q.—There was no stormy time?

A.—No.

Q.—I understand that the Mayor left his seat in the Council as a protest against your remarks?

A.—I am not sure, but if he left his seat it was not a stormy departure.

Q.—But at all events the Mayor did leave his seat? If the Mayor says that he left his seat out of protest you would not be prepared to contradict that?

A.—Oh, I would examine him on that.

Q.—If he says that would you be prepared to contradict that?

A.—I would say I would be doubtful about that.

Q.—Up to that point, have you made the only objection you want to make regarding the statement in the *Globe*? I will read it again. “Ex-Ald. Ashplant appearing as a representative of the Labour Committee opposing relief for the City Gas Company created a stormy time in the City Council to-night by asserting that the Company could and might bribe members of the Provincial Legislature to get its Private Bill enacted.”

A.—I would say that it is entirely incorrect in three ways—that one paragraph.

Q.—You might give the three points in which it is incorrect.

A.—It is incorrect in the description of the character of the scene. It was not a stormy scene. The next objection, a serious objection, is regarding my asserting anything. I asserted nothing.

Q.—Did you state nothing?

A.—I made no statement that I am aware of. I made an indirect remark, or as Mr. Penny puts it a “gentle inquiry.”

Q.—There is another objection—what is it?

A.—The third is that I made no such statement in any terms at all as is there contained, that the Company could and might bribe members of the Provincial Legislature to get this Private Bill enacted. I absolutely deny the use of such a sentiment at all.

Q.—You deny that you asserted that a bribe could or might be paid?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Now have we got all the points in which that is incorrect?

A.—At that stage, yes.

Q.—Let me proceed with this article. “The Council by a vote of 9 to 3 decided to report to the Private Bills Committee that the Council would deem as fair a service at cost agreement such as is in operation at Toronto with the special provisions that capital stock should be limited to \$400,000 and dividends to ten per cent. with the stipulation that earnings in excess of that amount should be utilized from time to time to reduce charges to consumers and that the rate at the outset should be advanced from 90 cents to \$1.25.” I read that to give you the sense of what follows.

A.—You have now concluded the second paragraph. I see that that starts with an inaccuracy which is attributable to the reporter. It may be another indication of carelessness in his report.

Q.—In what way?

A.—It was incorrect because there was no vote of 9 to 3. I note these inaccuracies rather as pointing to the general inaccuracy of his interpretation of the facts.

Q.—And was there no vote taken?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the result of that vote?

A.—Seven to three.

Q.—It should have been seven to three?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were there when the vote was taken?

A.—Yes.

We will proceed with the rest of the article. “Mr. Ashplant raised objection to this agreement and declared that the Company would find it possible to set aside sums of money to influence the vote of the members of the Legislature against the interest of the citizens.” Is that correct?

A.—It is not correct but it is a pretty fair report of the ordinary reporter's interpretation. I would say that there was no particular inaccuracy other than this: the question of influence or bringing pressure to bear on members of the Legislature is rather different from bringing pressure to bear personally and immediately upon the members of the Legislature themselves.

Q.—I think the best thing to clear it up is to tell the Committee what you did say.

A.—I would say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee that it is not an easy thing to give in short sentences an idea of what was said on that particular point because it is so interwoven with the context and also with what followed that it is necessary for me to refer to just exactly what led up to that.

Q.—If you are going to put it that way I prefer to go through the rest of the article and you can point to the rest of the inaccuracies and then you can make your full statement if you want to. I will read you paragraph four. “Suppose Mr. McCrae should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the Company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through,” he commenced when Mayor Little interjected a protest declaring that he would not sit to hear the honour of the Provincial Legislators so impugned. Mr. Ashplant's rejoinder was that he had not said that this would be done but only that it could be done, and, he added, “it is the most natural thing in the world if the Company should do it.” Is that correct?

A.—No.

Q.—In what respect is that paragraph which we will call paragraph four incorrect?

A.—It is incorrect in the sense that the name of Mr. McCrae as introduced there is not introduced as I introduced it and the reporter in short circuiting what I was saying simply summarized and brought together things that would not otherwise have been brought together into direct contact. That is one point in regard to Mr. McCrae's name.

Q.—You think Mr. McCrae's name is not introduced in the way in which

it came into the discussion?

A.—No.

Q.—As far as the sum of \$15,000 is concerned, was that mentioned?

A.—Yes, I mentioned the sum of \$10,000 or \$15,000 to the best of my recollection. Not so much \$10,000 or \$15,000 in money as in stock.

Q.—Anything else that is incorrect that you want to draw attention to?

A.—Yes, quite a little. There is more than the first one. Mr. McCrae's name was brought in, in a somewhat different way. Then there was the reference to his Worship Mayor Little. Mr. Ashplant rejoined nothing to his Worship at all. His Worship got up and made some remark and retired to the Board of Control room and I made no rejoinder to his Worship at all. I did make a reference in following up the points I was continuing. I desire it to be definitely understood that I did not say that this sort of thing would be done. What I was suggesting was the possibility of the company having at its disposal funds for the achieving of its objective and that it would be a perfectly natural thing for them to do that.

Q.—Perhaps the next paragraph may have something to do with what you were saying about the vote: "John F. Thompson of the same deputation attempted to reinforce Mr. Ashplant's arguments but the Council refused, by a vote of 7 to 4 to hear him."

Q.—Do you remember that?

A.—It is a fairly good synopsis in a certain way of what a reporter would send, but it is totally incorrect.

Q.—Did the reporter not report what you said, did he not get your meaning?

A.—No, evidently he didn't. It doesn't co-incide with other reports.

Q.—Then I don't understand what you mean when you say it is a fairly good report.

A.—I mean that in some respects it is a fairly good report and in so many it is entirely incorrect that in view of what has resulted from it I would say it is an entirely undesirable report.

Q.—Did you not in any way suggest that members of the House or members of the Private Bills Committee could or might be induced to take money to influence them?

A.—No.

Q.—Then why did you mention that \$10,000 or \$15,000?

A.—That is as I have stated. I mentioned \$10,000 or \$15,000 as a sum that might be set aside, if they were provided with \$50,000 of bonus stock, by which the company might achieve its objective.

Q.—How were they expected to achieve their objective?

A.—By the way in which it is found it can best be done, by using funds for the press, for the engagement of solicitors for the development of public opinion in the regular way that they desire to have pressure brought to bear on the members.

Q.—Did you suggest or state that Mr. McCrae might be induced to accept \$10,000 or \$15,000?

A.—I certainly did not say he might be induced to accept anything.

Q.—Then how did Mr. McCrae's name come into the matter?

A.—Mr. McCrae's name came up in my reference to his name in reply to an inquiry that came to me from a member of the Council. I was asked by one of the members of Council "Who would handle this money or stock?" I said the solicitor. Now in this particular case Mr. McCrae was sponsor for the bill in the Private Bills Committee but as I understood it he was not acting as solicitor

for the company. Mr. Graydon is solicitor for the company.

Q.—Was it suggested that this could be given to Mr. McCrae?

A.—Not that I am aware of. Here is the point. It largely turns on what might be regarded as a suggestion. You cannot get this sort of thing clear without being conversant with the character of the context and the whole information on the reference to Mr. McCrae, of what was the intention and what was legitimately the construction placed on it.

Q.—Don't give us inferences. We are asking you to state to the Committee what you stated to the Council on the occasion of March 7. Will you state in your own words what you did state to the Council?

A.—In that respect I would say that I spoke about fifteen or twenty minutes. I have no intention of going from start to ending on that here. There was no set speech prepared or anything in the way of preparatory notes, and no intention of any kind to refer to Mr. McCrae. At the start of the discussion it came in in this way. As you know in general terms the Committee of the Whole was sitting in order to discuss a proposition which was introduced by Alderman J. Cameron Wilson, chairman of the special gas committee, a new proposition which had to go back to the Private Bills Committee to replace that which had been rejected as not an acceptable proposition. That was the origin of the matter and it came back to the City Council for adjustment. Ald. Wilson brings in this further proposition for submission to the Legislature and after he got through the Committee of the Whole discussed this plan, this proposition in detail and the chairman, Ald. John Ashton asked if there were any deputations desiring to be heard either for the Gas Company or in opposition. Mr. Graydon the solicitor of the company asked the advantage of speaking on behalf of the company. The chairman asked if there was anyone for the opposition and I said, "Yes, I wished to speak on behalf of these people in the High Cost of Living Committee," and this is the line I took. I called the attention of the Committee then sitting to the fact that there were in my judgment, many points in this proposition that were not understood by the majority of the Council. I was perfectly satisfied in my mind that one or two of the members of the Council did understand them and I said I would take the liberty of running over the points that, as I said in the Chamber, I heard discussed in the Committee.

Q.—Please try to make it short and pertain to this as much as possible.

A.—I took the opportunity of pointing out that 10 per cent. on \$400,000 was practically equivalent to a stock bonus of \$500,000 at 6 per cent. That, I pointed out, made it a dangerous proposition from many viewpoints. I objected to the bonus stock proposition. I then pointed out to the members of Council—and bear in mind that in this reference to Mr. McCrae I was addressing a Legislative body which was as susceptible to any charge I was supposed to have made as Mr. McCrae was or any member of the Legislature—that this body could have been bribed as much as the Legislature or any member of it, if that was the intention or the suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might think about the Council but you would be less inclined to say that to the face of Council than you would be to say it about another body not there at all?

A.—No. In the meantime we had got to that point; I was saying that this proposition if it was carried through simply would be giving the City Gas Company the equivalent of \$500,000 of bonus stock as value that would accrue to the share-

holders. Such legislation as that was very undesirable and dangerous legislation in many ways, and provided an opportunity for private corporations to use a percentage of such stock as that for the purpose of achieving their objective and making sure it went through. I said "suppose." There was no assertion, no charge. There was only, as Mr. Penny pointed out, a gentle inquiry—"supposing that the Gas Company should set aside \$10,000 or \$15,000 of this stock for the purpose of seeing it get its measure through." Then one of the members of Council said, "Who would handle this stock?" I replied, "The solicitor." At that point is where Mr. McCrae's name was mentioned. I pointed out that Mr. McCrae was sponsor for the bill in the Private Bills Committee but that, as I understood it, he was not acting as solicitor for the company.

Q.—Did you intend to leave the impression that if \$10,000 or \$15,000 was to be handled, Mr. McCrae was the man to handle it?

A.—I should say not.

Q.—What did you intend to convey if you mentioned his name in that connection?

A.—That Mr. McCrae was not the solicitor for the company.

Q.—When one of the members of Council said "Who should handle this money," you said, "Mr. McCrae is the sponsor for the bill in the Legislature?"

A.—No, not at all.

Q.—That is what I understood you to say.

A.—No, no. "Who will handle this stock?"—"the solicitor" comes in between that and Mr. McCrae.

Q.—Is this what you said or what you thought you said?

A.—I will take an oath that that is what I said. I have no knowledge of Mr. McCrae's propensities in such a direction as that. I repudiate the suggestion that he would be liable to take a bribe.

Q.—Are you satisfied with the *London Advertiser* report?

A.—In much the same way

Q.—Are you or are you not?

A.—I am satisfied with none of the reports, if you want to put the word satisfaction to mean that it gives a correct interpretation of my intention or my words. It is neither the intention or my words.

Q.—We are not worrying about your intentions. Does the *London Advertiser* give a fair summary of what you said when you used Mr. McCrae's name?

A.—I said it was just that same gentle inquiry, but it is put in the form of the reporter's summarization.

Q.—Let me read you just a word or so of the *London Advertiser* report. "He gently inquired what was to prevent Charles McCrae the sponsor of the Gas Bill, and other members of the Private Bills Committee of the Legislature being given shares in the company to ensure the passing of the bill." Did you say that?

A.—Not to my recollection.

Q.—The reporter has sworn you did.

A.—Then I will swear I did not in just those terms, only I would say this—bear in mind that I am on oath—I have no recollection of that and no intention, and I cannot see how anyone could carry away the intention from me that Mr. McCrae could be bribed. That certainly was never in my mind. The suggestion that the company could use a certain proportion of its bonus stock to influence the attaining of its objective, why, that is another matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The *London reporter* has sworn that that is a correct report

of what you said, that you spoke of giving the shares to Mr. McCrae and the members of the Legislature.

A.—Oh, no, not in that sense at all.

Q.—It is not a question of in that sense—did you say that or anything like that, or anything from which that newspaper reporter or the *Globe* reporter who says he heard you, could get the impression, that members of the Legislature might get something by way of stocks or otherwise. Did you say anything from which they could get that impression?

A.—No, they did not correctly interpret what I was saying or what I meant.

Q.—Mr. Carty and Mr. Penny of the London *Advertiser* were both present and both wrote their reports without having reference one to the other and both apparently got the idea that you had made that statement. How do you explain that?

A.—I would explain it in much the same way as I explain this; I have here a *Mail and Empire* report by Mr. Carty, as I understand it.

Q.—There is no *Mail and Empire* report here by Mr. Carty. You have been asked a simple question of whether you can explain the fact that these two reporters without reference one to another put in their reports a statement from you that Mr. McCrae could or might be given money to influence him or other members.

A.—I would give no explanation to that at all. I do not think they were justified in making any such interpretation of what I said at all.

Q.—I suppose that if the members of the Council and the Mayor came here and said that the report of Mr. Carty is correct and that the report of Mr. Penny is correct you would still have great difficulty in explaining how they came to that conclusion?

A.—I suppose I would have the privilege of examining them on that. I would say they were in much the same position as I endeavored to point out, just a wrong summarization, a sort of projecting into my speech and intent something that was not in there.

Q.—How did you expect the company was going to expend \$15,000 legitimately in getting its bill through the House?

A.—I don't pretend to say. But I believe there are companies—take the Canadian Manufacturer's Association which is said to have subscribed something like a million or two millions to influence the matter of the tariff—I would say they would do it in much the same way. That was my intent and purpose. That would be that way.

Q.—An advertising campaign? Or how was it to be used?

A.—It was not for me to interpret. I do not intend to interpret.

Q.—Could you suggest any possible legitimate way the company could expend \$15,000 in getting a bill through the Legislature.

A.—You must bear in mind that this was not a particular reference other than a reference in general terms to that, to the possibility of that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But this was a particular bill you were discussing.

MR. FERGUSON: We have a particular bill going through the Legislature. You suggest the taking of \$15,000 to ensure the passing of that particular bill. Now can you suggest any legitimate way in which that money could be spent for the purpose of furthering that legislation?

A.—I don't know if I ever bothered my head to think about it. Possibly if I was to go into that matter I would find ways of spending it if they commissioned me to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean legitimate ways.

A.—Ways regarded as legitimate, perfectly businesslike ways in my understanding of things, that are followed in practice now.

Q.—Do you mean practice in getting a bill through the Legislature?

A.—Well, that is the ultimate object, certainly.

Q.—How would you suggest that that could be spent at that juncture with the bill already before the Committee, knowing that it had gone back to council to see if they could come to some agreement or arrangement, and that it was going to be before the Committee again. In what way, do you suggest, could the company spend \$15,000 legitimately in the passage of that particular bill?

A.—I did not have anything to say about what way they might spend that if it had been spent.

Q.—What had you in your mind?

A.—I had no thought in my mind other than the general question of the dangerous character of legislation of this kind.

Q.—You are getting away from the \$15,000. You had in mind and you did say something to them about the company spending \$15,000 to get the bill through the Legislature. There is no doubt about that. That was the only thing there was up at that time, the getting of this bill through the Committee of the House. Can you suggest to this Committee, or did you suggest at the time you made that statement, that you had in mind and intended to convey the impression that the company could spend that amount of money in a perfectly legitimate way to get that bill through?

A.—It was in pointing out that the stock—

Q.—You are not answering the question. Did you intend to convey the impression that the expenditure of \$15,000 to get the bill through would be an expenditure made in a perfectly legitimate way, or that there would be something improper about the use of that money? Which was it? Which impression did you intend to give?

A.—My reported statement would show that I—

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't like to suggest that you are dodging the question. The question is a simple one. You did say that you mentioned that the company might take \$15,000 and use it to achieve its object which was the passage of the bill.

A.—I didn't say they might. I didn't think for a moment they would.

Q.—What did you say in connection with the use of the \$15,000?

A.—Just as I have already said on record, that I had led up in a general way to this point, and I had said, "Supposing the company should set aside \$10,000 or \$15,000 of this bonus stock to achieve its objective."

Q.—Now, did you mean, when you said that—did you intend to convey the impression—that that amount of money or stock would be used legitimately or did you intend to give the impression that it would be used illegitimately or improperly?

A.—Legitimately if it should be used at all.

Q.—All right, if that is the case; you had in mind the intention to give the impression that the amount would be used legitimately to get this bill through. Can you suggest to this Committee in what way the Company could use that amount of money legitimately to get a private bill through the Legislature? That is what we want to get at.

A.—I do not know any other way than using methods to influence public

opinion in the locality, to bring public opinion to bear on this, to use such measures as corporations ordinarily use in legitimate propaganda. That is why I referred to the necessity for having not merely the statement but the context of what I said. I pointed out that this was a perfectly legitimate procedure, that I understood was the practice of large corporations, not this company alone. My reference was to general propaganda. I did not intend to state and did not intend to imply that anything improper would be done.

Q.—At one portion in the report it said that Mr. Ashplant asked “what is there to prevent Charles McCrae the sponsor of the gas bill and other members of the private bills committee of the Legislature being given shares of the company to ensure the passing of the bill.”

A.—What is there to prevent? Is there any crime in suggesting?

Q.—You are not answering the question.

A.—I would say this in reply. I would like to repudiate what seems to me to be an error in the interpretation of my remarks. All I had to say was regarding what any company or corporation would do. In my judgment the only protection the citizens have got in cases of this kind is the integrity of the legislature, such members as yourselves and the members of the House.

Q.—That is the reason you made that statement?

A.—I say that is the attitude I took on that, my statement was dealing with what the corporations would do.

Q.—This report said “Suppose McCrae should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through.” Did you say that?

A.—Not to my knowledge, no.

Q.—You don't remember whether you said it or not?

A.—I don't believe I said it, I will swear I didn't say it.

Q.—First it was not to your knowledge, next you don't believe you said it and next you will swear to it—I think that is what I wanted to get out. I suppose your position before this Committee is that during the whole course of the meeting there was nothing said by you which could give anyone the impression that you were suggesting that any members of the Private Bills Committee or the Legislature could be improperly influenced to pass this legislation?

A.—There was nothing said by me that, rightly interpreted, would suggest that I thought any member would accept a bribe or be in any way improperly influenced. I would say there was a possibility of interpreting what I said in the way that efforts might be made by corporations or by their agents. If you had the whole trend of my remarks it would be seen that the attitude I took before the City Council was that the protection of the citizens lay in the integrity of the Legislature. They were open to temptation, and that was the reason I made those remarks.

Q.—You go this far and say that during the whole course of your remarks there was nothing said by you which was intended to reflect or could in any way reflect on the members of the Legislature?

A.—Absolutely, as far as my intention went.

MR. FERGUSON: Then the reporter who reported you must have deliberately mis-stated what you you said?

A.—I fear that unfortunately there is too much reason for some conclusion of that kind, particularly in regard to Mr. Carty.

Q.—You are driven to that position, almost, aren't you?

A.—Although that is the position I do not think I am driven to it.

Q.—Mr. Carty is an intelligent man isn't he?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—And if he was an intelligent man he should be able to understand what you said?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Then if this report is wrong and incorrect then Mr. Carty must have deliberately mis-stated the facts, and Mr. Penny must have deliberately mis-stated the facts?

A.—I don't quite think that needs to be so put.

Q.—Then might Mr. Carty draw from what you stated the conclusions which he has drawn.

A.—I think not, no.

Q.—Then if he could not draw those conclusions from what you said then he must have deliberately stated what was untrue? Which is right?

A.—I believe I have made fairly clear my view of the reporters and their efforts to serve their particular papers' interests and unfortunately I am obliged to make this statement that it is my conviction that reporters get many public men into a great deal of trouble by coloring for their particular paper what a man may say.

Q.—You don't suggest that Mr. Carty had a reason for coloring what you said?

A.—I have reason for thinking that.

Q.—Do you think that Mr. Penny had a reason for coloring his report?

A.—I have evidence here that might imply that either of these papers would not be indisposed to do that. They have advertised me as I have evidence here to show

Q.—Has the *Globe* advertised you before?

A.—The *Globe* correspondent in this case was the publicity agent of my opponent in London.

Q.—Has your name ever appeared in the *Globe* before, to your knowledge?

A.—Many times.

Q.—You were interviewed again by Mr. Carty?

A.—I never saw Mr. Carty, he spoke to me over the telephone.

Q.—In the *Globe* of March 9th, appears an interview with you, and with members of the Council. I draw your attention to it.

“Ald. John Ashton (Labor member) elected by the group represented by Mr. Ashplant's deputation.” I didn't take much notice of what he was saying. He is so confusing. If the others say he said it I wouldn't contradict them. He certainly must have said it. But Mr. Ashplant stated that he had been misunderstood. He was asked by the *Globe* to tell what he believes he did say and gave the following as his account—“I am dealing with your statement—

A.—I am not responsible for any statement Mr. Carty makes.

THE CHAIRMAN: “Mr. Ashplant stated that he had been misunderstood. He was asked by the *Globe* to tell what he believes he did say and gave the following as his account: “I said that the bill proposed involved giving the City Gas Company \$144,000 of bonus stock free and that any company having such facilities would find it possible, if they chose to look upon it as a matter of investment, to pay out commissions or fees to ensure getting the measure through. I was arguing that if the company felt like doing it, it could give its solicitor a good commission or fee in a perfectly honest and legitimate and straightforward way, to see that the

bill would go through. I meant that it could give such money to Mr. Graydon or any solicitor, and then it occurred to me that Mr. Graydon did not speak for his client in the Legislature and that Mr. McCrae had spoken for the company, and I brought in the name of Mr. McCrae in a purely incidental way to show that he was not intended. I meant that such companies could give sums of money to three or four solicitors as is generally done for propaganda purposes. Such companies when they do that sort of thing don't know and don't care, very often, just how the money is spent providing they get what they want." Mr. Ashplant was asked how such propaganda usually works out in practice. "These agents," he explained, "mingle with the members of the Legislature and in private conversation they put forward their arguments and data and influence the Members without the Members being aware of it." Is that right?

A.—That I would say is probably the summary Mr. Carty took over the telephone, when I told him I would not be responsible for it.

Q.—But is it correct?

A.—I told Mr. Carty I would not be responsible—

Q.—Wait a moment. Is it a true account of what you said?

A.—It isn't a correct word for word interpretation.

Q.—Is it a correct summary?

A.—He may have assumed that that was a correct summary.

Q.—I am asking you if it was a correct summary?

A.—I desire to say to you that I told Mr. Carty on that occasion that I would not be responsible for anything he published. That is my position on it. I said I will not be responsible for anything of that sort.

Q.—Listen to the question and answer it if you can, and if you can't, say you can't. I have read a dispatch that appeared in the *Toronto Globe* purporting to be an interview Mr. Carty had with you after a statement had appeared in the *Globe* of the previous day about what you had said in London. I am asking you if this is a fair summary of the statement you made to Carty over the telephone?

A.—I will say yes, for the purpose of answering the question.

Q.—Do you mean that you will say yes, if you don't mean it?

A.—It has to be qualified by the statement that I would not be responsible for any interpretation he put. I merely answer, yes, it is a fair summary.

Q.—That paragraph where it states they may give sums of money to three or four solicitors and that often the company didn't know and didn't care how the money was used, did you say that? Did you tell him that?

A.—That would be a fair summary for him to make. I think it is quite true too.

Q.—When you said the company didn't know and didn't care how the money was used, what did you mean to imply regarding the methods that would be used?

A.—Just as I understand any corporation would probably use it, in propaganda.

Q.—You had nothing in mind about any improper use of it?

A.—No, nothing. I would not imply that a solicitor of a corporation who happened to be a member of the Legislature would thereby be restricted from any corporation practice.

Q.—You mean before the Legislature?

A.—Certainly, of course, before the Legislature but not in private practice.

Q.—You don't think the money would be used improperly by these three or four solicitors?

A.—I would repudiate any suggestion that I intended to imply that Mr. McCrae would ever accept it if he was offered it. I would not say that the Gas Company would make an offer because I don't know whether they would or not. I would say, in my position, that I don't believe Mr. McCrae would accept it.

Q.—There is a small part of this interview I haven't read you. Mr. Carty asked you how such propaganda would work out in practice. You said, "These agents mingle with the members of the Legislature and in private conversation they put forward their arguments and data and influence the members without the members being aware of it." Is that right?

A.—I would say that was a fair interpretation of the whole conversation, yes. I was referring to what I understood to be the usual practice and what is considered to be a perfectly legitimate proposition.

Q.—At what did the Mayor take offence when he protested and left the Council Chamber?

A.—I don't know unless it was the suggestion that it might be used in this legitimate propaganda.

Q.—The Mayor must be very touchy, Mr. Ashplant, to get angry about that?

A.—He is touchy when I am around, always has been.

Q.—You thought the Mayor got angry because you suggested a legitimate practice with Mr. McCrae and the other members of the Committee?

A.—He may have got angry at the suggestion that perhaps he was implied as a member of Council. He was at liberty to take that reference to himself as much as to Mr. McCrae. I don't think he got mad at that?

Q.—If you didn't suggest anything improper to Council why did the Mayor get angry at all? He would not get angry at your suggesting a legitimate practice?

A.—He may have got angry if he thought I was making a successful case against an object he was anxious to achieve.

Q.—Your idea is that the impression you were making was greater than he wanted?

A.—I think that would be quite possible. He is not too well pleased when I am addressing the Council. I do not think the Mayor is very patient when I am speaking perhaps a longer time than he thinks I ought to speak. Sometimes I do speak rather long and I did that time.

Q.—You told us there were ten or eleven of the Council there at the time?

A.—Ten, and the Mayor was in the chair.

Q.—Did he give the chair to the labour member, Mr. Ashton?

A.—Yes he gave him the chair, he took Mr. Ashton off the floor.

Q.—Would you be kind enough to tell us your occupation?

A.—An accountant.

Q.—You have lived in London for thirty years?

A.—Yes.

Q.—To sum up your evidence: You say you never intended to suggest that anything improper could be committed by any member of the Legislature?

A.—Absolutely I had no intention of doing that.

Q.—No such thought was in your mind?

A.—Absolutely no such idea that they would ever accept a bribe.

Q.—And any such conclusion drawn from your statement is absolutely improper?

A.—I would say so, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question. Had you, at the time you were at this meeting any reason to believe that there was anything that had occurred to your knowledge prior to that time, any reason to believe that the members of the Legislature could be improperly approached?

A.—Nothing at all, just this same sort of loose journalistic stuff. I believe this: I am strongly convinced in my own mind that corporations with large bonus stock possibilities in sight in possible legislation do set aside for purposes that they regard as pure business purposes to achieve their objective. And it was what I considered a dangerous proposition, to give corporations of that kind \$500,000 of bonus stock. That is what I was saying was a dangerous possibility. I believe that the members of the Legislature are tempted many times and resist and that the protection of the public lies in the men in the city councils and in the Legislature. I just want to say this:—Mr. McCrae I had never to my knowledge given any justification for the way in which I was interpreted as far as you were concerned personally. I think it was a long-stretched summarization on the part of the reporter who hitched you and me together in the way in which we seem to have collided. I am very sorry this has occurred, and I have nothing to say regarding the evidence of Mr. Carty. I think he thought he had a good thing on Mr. Ashplant and used it. He submitted this report to the Mayor—

MR. BRACKIN: Pardon me, Mr. Carty denied that.

A.—He told me so himself.

MR. McCRAE: You have no reason for intimating that any member of the Legislature has been affected, directly or indirectly, by any influence or bonus or suggested bribe or anything of that sort?

A.—Absolutely none.

The witness was then excused.

Alderman Harley called and sworn; examined by Mr. Ferguson.

Q.—You are an Alderman of the City of London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been an Alderman?

A.—This is my fifth year.

Q.—Your fifth consecutive year.

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you lived in London?

A.—About thirty years.

Q.—What is your occupation?

A.—Lumberman.

Q.—Do you remember being at a meeting of the City Council of London on the 7th of March last?

A.—Yes, I do.

Q.—Do you remember Mr. Ashplant being present on that occasion?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I understand a Bill was going through the Legislature relating to the City Gas Company of London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Ashplant came to talk about that Bill?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you seen the article in the *Globe* of the following morning, March 8th, giving a report of what Mr. Ashplant is said to have stated at that meeting?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I will show you this statement marked Exhibit 3, and ask you if that is the statement you refer to?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Does that report give a correct summary of the speech made by Mr. Ashplant to the Council meeting at London on that occasion?

A.—With the exception of the actual wording which is not quite as I understand it.

Q.—“Suppose Mr. McCrae should be given \$15,000 to get this through and should take a block of stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through.”

A.—That was not my exact knowledge of the wording.

Q.—Suppose you give me your recollection of it?

A.—I took the trouble to jot down what I understood, after I got home. My note is: “There is nothing to prevent the Gas Company giving Mr. McCrae \$15,000 which would be perfectly legitimate and they might or could divide a block of stock among the members of the Private Bills Committee in order to get the Bill through.” That is my recollection of the wording.

Q.—The rest of the article apart from what you have specified, is it correct?

A.—Yes, I think it is.

Q.—Do you remember the Mayor leaving the meeting?

A.—I do.

Q.—He left while Mr. Ashplant was speaking?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know why?

A.—I can't say why he left but I can remember his remarks, “I for one will not remain here and hear the members of the Legislature — I forget the word he used, but spoken of in that manner.

Q.—Do you remember the following day when Mr. Carty got in touch with you on the telephone?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And drew your attention to the article I have shown you, and asked you if that was a correct report of the statement made?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were stated to have given Mr. Carty this, which I will read. “Alderman Harley.—I followed very closely the astounding statements made by Mr. Ashplant. I read the *Globe* report and those are his exact words, stated absolutely correctly.” Is that correctly set out?

A.—That is substantially what I told him over the phone.

Q.—After he had spoken to you over the telephone I understand he wrote this and had you verify it subsequently over the phone?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The sum and substance of your evidence is that you understood Mr. Ashplant was making a suggestion that money could be used improperly with members of the Legislature?

A.—My supposition was, as I have said there, that there was nothing to

prevent them giving Mr. McCrae a fee of \$15,000.

Q.—And divide stock among the members of the Legislature?

A.—And also that they might or could divide a block of stock in order to attain their objective.

MR. ASHPLANT: Alderman Harley has stated an objection to the correctness of Mr. Carty's summarization as reported in the *Globe*. That summarization stated that Carty had "absolutely correctly" stated what I had said.

A.—With the exception of these words I put in.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand Mr. Carty says "suppose" Mr. Harley says you did say, "Is there anything to prevent."

MR. ASHPLANT: You then would state that your notes made at the time are a correct literal interpretation of what I actually said?

A.—That is, as far as my memory served me after I got home.

Q.—Your interpretation from your notes is that I said there was nothing to prevent?

A.—That is my understanding of your words.

Q.—That I did not charge that Mr. McCrae would, if he had been offered it, have accepted a bribe. That I was referring to the fact that there was nothing to prevent the corporation from offering a bribe? Was I reflecting upon Mr. McCrae, or only speaking about the company being able to offer.

MR. BRACKIN: You can ask him what you said or what he understood from what he heard you say.

MR. ASHPLANT: I understand your position to be, and you are going on record that your interpretation as made by the actual notes—

A.—Made after I got home.

Q.—Your interpretation was that I literally used the words that there was nothing to prevent?

A.—Those are the notes I made.

MR. FERGUSON: Why did you make notes when you got home?

A.—Because I anticipated questions being asked.

Q.—It was a little out of the ordinary?

A.—No, I have made notes often.

Q.—I mean the charge was a little out of the ordinary?

A.—Yes.

MR. OKE: Did you take these notes at this council meeting?

A.—After I got home from the meeting I made that note.

MR. WEBSTER: That was before the newspaper could get an account of it in the paper?

A.—Yes.

Witness excused.

Mayor Little, of London, Ont., on being called and sworn testified as follows:—

MR. ASHPLANT: May I have the opportunity of cross-examining any witness?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. When we get through you can follow.

MR. FERGUSON: You are Mayor of London, Mr. Little?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long have you been mayor?

A.—This is my second year.

Q.—And do you remember being at a meeting of the Council in London on March 7th, last?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember who were present, referring to the members of Council?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you tell us who were there?

A.—There were just two of the members of Council absent.

Q.—How many members are there?

A.—Twelve.

Q.—So there were ten present?

A.—Ten present, yes.

Q.—Including yourself?

A.—No, besides myself.

Q.—Was Alderman Harley there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Alderman J. C. Wilson?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Alderman Bridge?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Drake?

A.—Yes.

Q.—W. C. Wilson?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Alderman Boss?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Alderman Brighton?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And Mr. Alderman Ashton?

A.—Yes. Alderman Watkins was there but he was not interviewed subsequent

Q.—Now you have heard the evidence here to-day?

A.—Not all of it.

Q.—Have you not heard all of it? We will have to draw your attention then to the charge that is being investigated here. I am reading now from the proceedings of the House of the 8th of March lasts; (Reads)

“Resolved; That whereas it has been made to appear to the House that at a public meeting of the Council of the City of London, Ontario, held on the 7th of March, one H. B. Ashplant, publicly asserted that the City Gas Company of London, Ontario, could and might bribe Members of this House to induce such Members to vote in favour of a certain Private Bill presented to this House on behalf of the said City Gas Company; Be it therefore resolved that the said H. B. Ashplant be ordered to appear before the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections, at such time as the Chairman may direct, to be examined and for such further action as the House may direct upon report of the Committee.”

Q.—Now, will you relate to this Committee your recollection of what was stated at the meeting by Mr. Ashplant?

A.—Well, Council went into Committee of the Whole, with Mr. Ashton in the chair, and I took a seat in the council.

MR. ASHPLANT: I am not just clear on the procedure that might be followed, but as I understand there are several witnesses that are going to be called and I have the privilege of cross-examining because of my connection with the case, am I not entitled to have all the witnesses retire and not be called until their

examination?

THE CHAIRMAN: Surely.

MR. ASHPLANT: Well, I would ask all the witnesses to retire now until they are examined.

MR. FERGUSON: That should have been done in the beginning.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the desire, that the witnesses to be called after Mayor Little be excluded?

Carried.

MAJOR TOLMIE: Is Mr. Ashplant going to call any witnesses?

MR. ASHPLANT: No, I have no witnesses here. But if I find the case reaches a point where witnesses will be required, I will have six or seven.

MAJOR TOLMIE: Because it would not be fair for Mr. Ashplant to have to make his statements with witnesses here and then object to the others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I suppose Mr. Ashplant's witnesses will have the benefit of seeing in the newspapers what he said. But there are certain Aldermen from London here who might perhaps be excluded. (Witness excluded).

MR. FERGUSON: We had just come to the point where I asked you, Mr. Little, for your recollection of the speech made by Mr. Ashplant in so far as these charges are concerned?

A.—Well, as I said, Council went into Committee of the Whole with Alderman Ashton in the chair. I took a seat in the council. Alderman J. C. Wilson brought in a report of the Special Gas Committee into council, which council proceeded to discuss. Mr. Ashplant asked to be allowed to speak. He was allowed to speak on a two-thirds vote of the Council, if I remember correctly, and he began to discuss this proposed agreement. He brought up the question of the bonus stock and attempted to show that the amount of \$144,000 of bonus stock was equivalent to a bonus of about \$500,000 at six per cent. The first thing I heard to which I paid a great deal of attention was to the effect, "Suppose the Company—I won't be absolutely sure of this—"Suppose the Company, through their solicitor, gives \$15,000 of this bonus stock for the purpose of influencing members of the Legislature? Suppose \$15,000 of it be given to Mr. McCrea?" And at that moment I interrupted and suggested to the chair that Mr. Ashplant would be allowed to make no such insinuations on the floor of the Council Chamber, and I did not propose to stay any longer. I left the room and knew nothing further about it until the following evening. I did not see the report in the Globe. The Globe correspondent, Mr. Carty, telephoned me and said he had a telegram from Toronto asking that this statement be substantiated. He asked me if I had seen it. I said no. He then read the report which he had sent down the night before.

MR. FERGUSON: May I read this and see if this is the report he read to you; (Reads).

"Ex-Ald. H. B. Ashplant, appearing as a representative of the Labor Committee opposing relief for the City Gas Company, created a stormy time in the City Council to-night by asserting that the company could and might bribe members of the Provincial Legislature to get its private bill enacted."

Q.—Now then is that the statement that was read to you by Carty?

A.—Mr. Carty did not read the complete statement, but he did read that part that referred to Mr. Ashplant's statement and I told him I thought it was correct—a correct report of the meeting except that he had the vote wrong.

Q.—He had the vote wrong. That was the only point you took as being

incorrect in Carty's report of the meeting.

A.—And I called his attention to the fact that I did not hear any rejoinder at all.

Q.—Perhaps what you said is summarized in *The Globe* of the next day. I will read to you what you are said to have stated to Mr. Carty and see if it is correct. I am reading now from *The Globe* despatch of March 8th:—

THE CHAIRMAN: The despatch of the 8th, printed on the 9th.

Mr. Ferguson reads:—

“Mayor Little said to-night; ‘I most certainly think that the statements made by Mr. Ashplant warrant a rebuke from the Legislature. Because I felt his statements should not go unchallenged I protested and left the meeting. The same sort of loose talk has been allowed recently at several meetings conducted by these people, notably at the meeting concerning unemployment a week ago, when E. A. Pocock alleged that we had closed our industries and that I had taken up a collection to defray my election expenses. When Ashplant started the same thing before the City Council last night I protested and if I had been in the chair I would not have allowed him to speak another minute.”

“He said that the agreement proposed with the Gas Company would give the company \$144,000 of bonus stock which had come from the consumers. He said there was nothing to prevent the company using it to secure this legislation. When he said that the company might well give \$15,000 to Mr. McCrae, I at once left the meeting and did not hear the finish of his speech.’”

Q.—Is that a correct report of what you stated to Mr. Carty the following day?

A.—Yes, as far as I remember.

Q.—And in that report you gave to Mr. Carty what you considered to be a correct report of what had taken place at the meeting?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Ferguson: I think that is all Mr. Little.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any more questions, gentlemen?

MR. ASHPLANT: Yes. His Worship has just admitted the interview of the 9th in which he had reference to the very undesirable character of Mr. Ashplant. Might I ask the privilege of seeing the reference where Mr. Pocock is mentioned with undesirable utterances?

MR. FERGUSON: Surely.

MR. ASHPLANT: Your Worship, I notice that reference is made here in regard to myself that is rather rough unless it is justified, it seems to me. You say that Mr. Carty here correctly interpreted your views of Ashplant and his general utterances?

A.—I should say so.

Q.—And what was the reason that you made the reference to Mr. Pocock as—

THE CHAIRMAN: Now just a moment. As I understand it the Mayor has given evidence as to whether you did or did not say a certain thing at a certain meeting, and that is, as I understand it, the question before the committee. Now do not let us travel outside of that and get into a discussion about Pocock and some other people. The Mayor's opinion of Pocock, or Pocock's opinion of you is not material. We are not interested in it. But just confine yourself if you can in your questions and cross-examination, to the Mayor's statement, the evidence that he has given that you did say a certain thing at that meeting.

MR. ASHPLANT: You think it would not be of any interest to the committee and would not in any sense affect the interests of Ashplant to enter into any

personal attitude the Mayor might have to influence his attitude in giving evidence of what Ashplant would or might say that would react and be detrimental to Ashplant, if so reported?

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to go into the question on this ground, that he says that, although it is not true, because he has antipathy towards you, I think you may go into it.

MR. ASHPLANT: The point I would like to submit is as to whether you will permit cross-examination on the point of the attitude his Worship the Mayor is likely to have toward Ashplant, and leave the City Council Chamber when Ashplant was present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well go on then, but make it brief, because I do not think it has any bearing, but I do not want to limit you.

MR. ASHPLANT: I think it is rather important. I just asked his Worship if he had any personal antipathy towards Ashplant, and whether he would be influenced in the declaration of public policy by his presence.

MAYOR LITTLE: None whatever, personally.

MR. ASHPLANT: And you would not be irritated then by Ashplant being permitted to speak rather extensively?

MAYOR LITTLE: I think I treated you with every courtesy when I have been in the chair and you addressed the Council.

MR. ASHPLANT: I admit on occasions you did. But have you ever changed your opinion since you advertised me in this advertisement in connection with Lenine and Trotsky, because it seems to me the possibilities of these things are rather far-reaching—an undesirable citizen addressing Council who is mentioned with Lenine would be a citizen who would irritate any man.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has answered the question. He says he has no personal antipathy.

MR. ASHPLANT: I would like to know if he has changed his opinion of me since he advertised?

MAYOR LITTLE: I said I had nothing against you personally.

MR. ASHPLANT: I merely desire to say there is—

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, please. You may ask questions bearing on this case. You can ask questions but you cannot make any declarations of your own opinion to the committee. Just ask questions and he will answer.

MR. ASHPLANT: Have you had any personal relationships with Mr. Carty, who reported this, previous to this City Council meeting?

MAYOR LITTLE: Not for some time.

MR. ASHPLANT: He was your publicity agent in the campaign against myself a year ago when this advertisement appeared?

MAYOR LITTLE: I do not know about the advertisement.

MR. ASHPLANT: At any rate you admit Carty was your publicity agent?

MAYOR LITTLE: In 1919.

MR. ASHPLANT: And you so regarded Mr. Ashplant. He was your campaign manager?

A.—This last year? No. At the same time that Carty was connected with it so was John Bridge and other witnesses.

Q.—What I desire to know is if you still feel towards Ashplant in connection with any possibility of addressing his views to the public in the same way you did in that campaign when Carty reported this *Globe* statement.

A.—I said you are a danger to the community if you have any authority in

the community.

MR. ASHPLANT: Now that is a very definite statement. I would like to have it recorded.

MAYOR LITTLE: That I still hold, although I have nothing against you personally.

MR. ASHPLANT: I desire now to have it recorded. You consider Mr. Ashplant a danger to the community?

A.—In any official capacity. If you stay where you are now you are all right.

Q.—For what reason?

A.—Because of your views.

Q.—On what subject?

A.—Socialism.

Q.—What are they?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh! now, please, are we going—

MR. ASHPLANT: This is rather important. Have you any knowledge that Ashplant is a member or has been a member of any Socialist organization for the last fifteen years or more?

A.—I cannot answer that question at the moment.

Q.—But you surely had such knowledge in order to make such a statement?

A.—I do not know what that has got to do with it.

Q.—But it has to do with the statement that Ashplant is a dangerous man, and I would ask what those views are that would justify that declaration, which prejudices the whole—

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to say that we are travelling pretty far afield. The witness is asked—and quite properly—as to whether he has any personal animosity towards Ashplant which might induce him to color his evidence. He has denied he has anything personal against him, but he says he considers him a danger to the community in any official capacity. I do not think we ought to travel so far afield as to get into a discussion of Ashplant's views on Socialism. The sole question before this committee, and I tried to indicate to Mr. Ashplant when he started his cross-examination, that he should confine it to the question of Mayor Little's evidence, that on the occasion in question he did hear Ashplant say the thing which *The Globe* reporter reported him as having said, and which Mr Ashplant has denied he said. Now stick to the text, please.

MR. ASHPLANT: You admit that you do not remember that Ashplant, in these specific terms as referred to in *The Globe*, said that members of the Legislature could, and might be bribed? You admit that?

A.—No. I do not admit anything of the kind. I said I could not remember the exact words but Mr Carty had telephoned and read his statement the following day when it was fresh in my mind and I corroborated it.

Q.—But Mr. Carty's statement does not embody those words. Did you corroborate the words that Mr. Ashplant might, and could bribe members of the Legislature?

MAYOR LITTLE: Yes, as I remember.

MR. ASHPLANT: I do not find them. I do not find myself that Carty ever made that statement. Did you understand Carty to say for your corroboration that Mr. Ashplant had said that members could, and might be bribed?

A.—He read the statement to me. The statement he read over the telephone I substantiated. I am not prepared to swear that is the statement.

MR. FERGUSON: Here is the statement.

MAYOR LITTLE: The statement says—"Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through." I said, as I remember, that you had stated that.

MAJOR TOLMIE: It seems to me we ought to go on with this a little while longer and I think we ought to ask the permission of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have done that. We attended to that before the House opened.

MR. ASHPLANT: Do you understand the distinction between an assertion and a charge?

A.—Yes, I distinctly understood you to insinuate that the Gas Company might offer \$15,000 of bonus stock to Mr. McCrea to use to get the bill through.

Q.—You distinctly understood that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And I understand you to say you retired from the City Council Chamber?

A.—Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: In protest?

A.—Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: Just one thing. Mr. Ashplant has asked you if Mr. Carty had been your publicity agent in an election and you stated he had been in the election of 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And did he remain your publicity agent in the later election?

A.—No.

Q.—What was the difficulty?

A.—He did not remain my publicity agent throughout the entire election in the campaign of 1919.

Q.—What caused the change? Was there a resignation on his part?

A.—Yes, the work was turned over to somebody else.

Q.—He quit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Before the election in 1919?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Since that time have you had any connection with Mr. Carty?

A.—No, none whatever, excepting he comes in to get news.

Q.—Did Mr. Carty submit that statement to you before sending it to Toronto?

A.—The first I knew anything about it was about four o'clock in the afternoon of Tuesday. He telephoned and said he had a wire from Toronto and he asked me to listen to the statement of the thing he had sent down. And I told him I thought it was correct.

MR. FERGUSON: Just one more question. You are referring now to the statement, the report, that Carty sent down of the meeting?

A.—I did not know anything about it.

Q.—Then he telephoned you and got a statement from you again?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he read to you the second statement before it appeared in *The Globe* of the 9th?

A.—He says he did. I think he did, but I am not prepared to say.

MR. ASHPLANT: Mr. Carty gave me personally to understand that he did submit it to you and also his summary of my remarks that are recorded in *The Globe*.

MR. FERGUSON: Carty says he did not.

Ald. Drake, on being called and sworn, testified:—

MR. FERGUSON: You are an alderman in London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been alderman?

A.—Six years.

Q.—During the past six years?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And what is your occupation in London?

A.—Grocer.

Q.—And do you remember being at a meeting of the City Council in London on the 7th of March?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember Mr. Ashplant being present?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And there were some discussions in regard to a private bill that the City Gas Co. wanted to go through the Legislature?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Now did you see a report of that meeting as it appeared in the *Toronto Globe* on the following day, March 8th?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have not seen it since?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Will you read that report there, and tell the committee whether that is a correct report of what Mr. Ashplant stated to the Council.

A.—(After reading). Yes, sir. As far as I recollect that is correct.

Q.—That is a correct report?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So we have it in the statement in *The Globe*, of March 8th, excepting paragraph three, is a correct account of the statements made by Mr. Ashplant to the Council?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In your opinion?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember being interviewed or spoken to on the telephone by Mr. Carty?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Mr. Carty is the London reporter of *The Globe*?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you have interviewed Mr. Carty?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And I read this and you see if this is a correct report of what you said at the time; (Reads). "Unqualifiedly what Mr. Ashplant said before the Council was exactly as reported, namely, that the members of the Legislature could be

brided by the Gas Company. The whole Council should have walked out with the Mayor. The Council was in Committee of the whole, with Ald. Ashton in the chair. If the Mayor had been in the chair Mr. Ashplant would have been put out of the Chamber. Such conduct is a disgrace to the City of London. Ashplant should make an apology, to remove the stigma he cast on the honor of the members of the Private Bills Committee and the House."

Q.—Is that the interview you gave?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And that correctly sets out your views, after having heard Mr. Ashplant?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. ASHPLANT: When you say that the presentation of *The Globe*, as Carty has reported it, is correct, I understand you to say you had not seen *The Globe*. Did you get that by telephone or personal contact, which?

A.—What I told Carty over the telephone.

MR. ASHPLANT: And you did not yourself see *The Globe* or speak personally to Carty?

A.—It was entirely a telephone matter

Q.—Then you speak of that just in general terms?

A.—Just exactly what I told Mr. Carty over the telephone.

Q.—And you accept in general terms just what Mr. Carty has in *The Globe* that I said?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And when you do that I believe you understand that Mr. Carty does not charge me with having used those exact words, that members of the Legislature could, and might be bribed?

A.—I understand exactly what you said, that the City Gas Company could spend \$15,000 to pass this bill through the House.

Q.—In general terms, without any too particular language?

A.—That is just the same as bribes.

Q.—But as far as the bribe part of it is concerned that would be your construction and not that you heard me use those words?

A.—Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reporter in reporting the thing says Mr. Ashplant used the expression, suppose McCrae should be given \$15,000 to get this through: suppose the Company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among members of the Legislature to get it through, was that said as it is there?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—By whom?

A.—By Mr. Ashplant.

MR. ASHPLANT: Supposing a member of Council should say that he made notes of what Ashplant literally said, and that his notes as made at that same night meeting, at the same sitting at which you heard this, are to the effect that Ashplant said that there was nothing to prevent the City Gas Company doing this, would you say that that was possibly a correct interpretation?

A.—No. I do not say that at all. I say just exactly what is said there.

THE CHAIRMAN: He said his recollection was that you said there was nothing to prevent them doing it. Alderman Drake said suppose they do do it. There is no use splitting hairs.

MAJOR TOLMIE: Your understanding of the language that was used was that this money might be used to unduly influence the Legislature?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. TOLMIE: That is what you understood?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. TOLMIE: That is all I want.

Ald. W. A. Wilson, on being called and sworn, testified:—

MR. FERGUSON: Alderman Wilson, you are an alderman in the City of London?

A.—I am.

Q.—How long have you been an alderman?

A.—Nine years this year.

Q.—And what is your occupation there?

A.—Well, I am a carpenter by trade, but I am travelling the last 20 years.

Q.—How long have you lived in London?

A.—Twenty-five or twenty-six years.

Q.—You know London pretty well?

A.—Pretty well. I ought to.

Q.—Do you remember a meeting of the Council in London on the 7th of March at which Mr. Ashplant was present?

A.—I do.

Q.—Some discussion took place in reference to the private bill which the City Gas Company wanted to get through the House?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And did you see the report of that meeting in *The Globe* the following day?

A.—I do not believe I did.

Q.—I draw your attention to it now and I want to see whether this is a correct report of what was stated by Mr. Ashplant before the Council on that occasion. I do not think I need read it all.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is just one paragraph.

MR. FERGUSON: (Reads)—“Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the Company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through, he commenced, when Mayor Little interjected a protest, declaring that he would not sit to hear the honor of the Provincial Legislators so impugned. Mr. Ashplant’s rejoinder was that he had not said that this would be done, but only that it could be done, and, he added, it is the most natural thing in the world if the Company should do it.”

Q.—Is that a correct report of that part of M. Ashplant’s speech?

A.—I am prepared to say that Mr. Ashplant, so far as I know, did not use “could,” but I think he used the word “might.”

Q.—With the substitution of the word “might” for “could” is the statement correct? For instance let me put in the word that you say is correct. “Mr. Ashplant rejoined that he had not said that this would be done but only that it could.” You say “only that it might be done” With that change would that give a correct account of the speech, or that part of it, as made by Mr. Ashplant?

A.—I cannot say very much now about Mr. Ashplant’s speech. I was not listening to but very little of it. But when he came to that point about the Legislature I looked up and I remember him saying “might,” and I do not think he

ever said "could." I was called up that night by Mr. Carty of *The Globe* to know what he had said. I told Carty that night that I would not say that he said "could" but I was satisfied that he said "might."

THE CHAIRMAN: Might what ?

A.—Oh I suppose might be bribed.

MR. FERGUSON: I was going to say you were called up by Mr. Carty and your attention drawn to the report of Mr. Ashplant's speech by Carty, and you gave an interview to Carty which appears in *The Globe* of the following day, reading as follows; "Ashplant said that the members of the Legislature could or might be bribed, and he was making some pretty broad statements. He should apologize because he threw the reflection that the members of the Legislature could be bribed." You say "could be bribed." so that was your understanding of Mr. Ashplant's speech ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That correctly summarizes your understanding of Mr. Ashplant's speech ?

A.—It was over the phone the night of the council that Carty called up to know what he said.

Q.—He called you up to get your idea of what he had said and then did he call you up again ?

A.—I don't recall.

Q.—You do not remember his calling you ?

A.—No. I had no more conversation with him.

Q.—At all events that is a correct report of what you said to Mr. Carty ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you are expressing your own opinion of what had taken place at that time ?

A.—Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: I think that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions you want to ask gentlemen ?

MR. ASHPLANT: You remember well the meeting at which this matter occurred ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you recollect any stormy scene that was created by the remarks of myself ? Was it stormy ?

A.—No. I did not see any stormy scene. All I know is that Mayor Little got up and would not listen to you. He went out.

Q.—In any case, as far as your memory serves, there was nothing exciting at that time, that this arose out of *The Globe* summary afterwards. Had you simply had the *Mail and Empire* report or the *Free Press*, or the *London Advertiser* you would never have thought any more about it ?

A.—No, I would not.

Q.—As a matter of fact you saw the report of the meeting in the *Free Press* of London and the *Advertiser* and you thought there was nothing to excite the idea that Mr. Ashplant thought the members of the Legislatures could be bribed

A.—No, nothing that I could take from them.

Q.—Had you not been called up on the telephone by *The Globe* reporter it would never have occurred to you in that form ?

A.—I would never have thought anything of it if I had not been called up that night o

Q.—The reporter of *The Globe* brought the matter to you in that forceful way ?

A.—Well, I have listened to you very often talking in council and I do not take very much stock in what you say.

The Chairman: There are a lot of frank people in London.

Q.—Do you think Ashplant is less reliable than the reporter for *The Globe* for instance ?

MR. FERGUSON: Oh no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well now if the alderman doesn't want to answer he should not be obliged to pass his opinion as to which is the more reliable, Ashplant or *The Globe* reporter.

Q.—Do you think from your knowledge of Ashplant that his words would be sincere, or do you think he would manipulate just to save his skin?

THE CHAIRMAN: You need not answer that question, as to what you think about Ashplant.

MR. WILSON: Well, I have had quarrels with you, and you and I have got on very well. I liked you in the Council fine. I sat alongside you a good many years and I think you are a pretty good alderman.

MR. ASHPLANT: Well, that hardly saves a man. Do you think Ashplant intended to convey the idea that Mr. McCrae would accept a bribe—that the utmost limits of the expression would be in regard to what the Gas Company would do?

A.—Yes. I do not remember you speaking of Mr. McCrae at all. I have lost track of it if you did.

Q.—From what you remember of the meeting, is what you gather in your memory relative to what the Gas Company might be disposed to do, or to what McCrae would do?

A.—To what the Gas Company would do.

Q.—And there was nothing to prevent the Gas Company from doing anything?

A.—Nothing to prevent the Gas Company.

Q.—Did Ashplant give any idea that Mr. McCrae would accept bribes?

A.—No, I do not think you did. I do not remember Mr. McCrae's name at all.

Q.—Well, Mr. McCrae's name was mentioned, but it was very vital as to whether you took the impression of one of those two points, as to whether the trend was to point to what the Gas Company would do, or whether it led to the other side and whether the inference led to what the Legislature would do or Mr. McCrae.

A.—Well, I cannot answer that question. I do not know. I was not very much interested in your speech, and I have heard you so often when you were talking I let you go on and never said a word.

Q.—It would be fair to say that aside from being called up by Carty, you would not have thought Mr. McCrae was mentioned at all?

A.—I would not.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said a little while ago that you were not paying much attention, but when he mentioned members of the Legislature, then you began to pay attention—

A.—That was the only thing—

Q.—What was the mention he made of the members of the Legislature?

A.—I understood he said “might be bribed.”

Q.—Members of the Legislature?

A.—But I am not prepared to say he said “could.”

Q.—But what made you pay attention was the statement “members of the Legislature might be bribed?”

A.—Yes, because I would not want anybody to say members of the Council might be bribed.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said Mr Ashplant said, “There is nothing to prevent the Gas Company?”

A.—Yes, that is it.

Q.—Nothing to prevent them doing what? What was it he said?

A.—I do not know. I suppose something about dividing up some money. I cannot tell you what he said. I do not know that I can answer that question intelligently.

Q.—But when he mentioned Legislature and might be bribed that is the time you woke up?

A.—That is the time.

MR. WEBSTER: Often things go on when you do not pay much attention?

A.—Often. There was a resolution went through Council a month ago that I knew nothing about, because I am Chairman of the Board of Works and I was figuring on my report. I was so occupied that I did not see it and it went through without my knowing anything about it.

MR. WILSON: Who is going to pay our expenses down here?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, perhaps our Provincial Treasurer will pay them if he doesn't unduly overload the estimates.

MR. WILSON: The Deputy Sheriff said we had better come or we would be made to pay a fine of \$100. He said you will get paid.

Alderman Brighton, on being called and sworn, testified;

MR. FERGUSON: You are an alderman in London?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you been an alderman?

A.—This is the second year.

Q.—How long have you lived in London?

A.—Thirty-seven years.

Q.—What is your occupation?

A.—Baker.

Q.—Were you present at a meeting of the City Council on March 7th, when discussion took place in reference to a private bill the Gas Company wanted to get through the Legislature?

A.—I was.

Q.—And did you hear Mr. Ashplant speak on that occasion?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And do you remember what he said? Perhaps I can shorten it. Did you see a report in *The Globe* of the next day?

A.—No, I didn't see it.

Q.—You didn't see it?

A.—No.

Q.—Well, I will read you one paragraph here. This is the important one:—

"Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through," he commenced, when Mayor Little interjected a protest, declaring that he would not sit to hear the honor of the Provincial Legislators so impugned. Mr. Ashplant's rejoinder was that he had not said that this would be done, but only that it could be done, and, he added, it is the most natural thing in the world if the company should do it." Do you say that that is or is not a correct summary of what Mr. Ashplant said?

A.—Well, I would say that I did not take much notice of what he did say.

Q.—Well, see if we can refresh your memory. Do you remember *The Globe* correspondent in London communicating with you on the following day?

A.—He did not communicate with me.

Q.—There is an interview which Carty has sworn he had with you by telephone. Here is what *The Globe* reported on the following day. Carty says he communicated with you by telephone, drew your attention to the report as it appeared in *The Globe* that morning, and then he got from you this statement; "Ashplant made the statement that the Gas Company might use the money for bribery to get its higher rates agreement through. No other meaning could be taken from his words. I took it as a serious reflection on the City Council. He has no right to cast unfair reflections on men in public office, and should apologize." Did you make that statement?

A.—That is the only view I could take from the statement he made.

Q.—Then although you do not remember giving this interview to Mr. Carty, that correctly sets out your view of Mr. Ashplant's speech?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you say that is the only view you could take?

A.—The only view, yes. That is the way I would figure from a man making a statement in the way of talking about distributing stock. I took no other view from it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whom did he say could be bribed?

A.—He didn't say anybody.

Q.—Did he mention what individuals?

A.—Not by name.

Q.—But where was it to go to, or where might it go?

A.—Well, I do not know. I have entirely forgotten about the incident. The thing slipped my mind. I dismissed it from my mind. I have plenty of other business to look after.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody want to ask the witness any questions?

MR. ASHPLANT: Do you read the reports of the Council meetings in the local papers of London?

A.—I certainly do.

Q.—And did you notice anything strange in the absence of any reference to a stormy time, or the bribing of the Legislature in the local press?

A.—Well, I don't know that there was any stormy time at the Council that I know of that night.

Q.—Your memory does not recall any stormy scene?

A.—No, there was no stormy scene there. The only instance was in regard to the Mayor getting up and leaving the chair.

Q.—That was in a perfectly normal way, nothing stormy about it?

A.—No.

Q.—Well then, *The Globe* would be apparently the only source of recalling to your memory the idea of bribing the Legislature? If it had not been that *The Globe* made this particular form of presentation of Ashplant's remarks, would it rest upon your mind very much?

A.—Well, remarks similar were being made that left that impression.

Q.—But it left a lasting impression on you that the City Gas Company might use funds that way if it felt so disposed, or did it leave the impression that members of the Legislature were of that character that they could be bribed? You see there are the two distinct attitudes, whether Ashplant in his remarks indicated what the City Gas Company would do in attempting certain things or whether Ashplant's remarks were intended to point out that the Legislators would accept anything of the Gas Company, if it felt so disposed to give.

A.—I do not think it would possibly refer to the members taking bribes.

Q.—Then you will admit that so far as what is left on your mind of Ashplant's remarks is concerned, it is in reference to what might be the policy of the Gas Company if they chose to put out \$15,000?

A.—I took that impression from your speech.

Q.—But that was another question entirely about the Legislature or Mr. McCrea accepting it? Mr. Ashplant did not intimate that the Legislature would accept?

A.—I certainly did not think you referred to "could". That might have been before, but I fancy the impression you left on the public in London is right along those lines of your statement—the impression you left.

MR. FERGUSON: The impression left on your mind was that this money was to be used for bribery purposes?

A.—Along those lines .

Q.—Improperly used, at all events?

A.—I would judge so.

THE CHAIRMAN: What did the Mayor say when he got up to leave? Did he give no reason for leaving?

A.—No, he didn't. Not that I am aware.

Q.—Are storms frequent in Council there?

A.—Well, I didn't see any storm that night. It was reported so but I didn't see it.

MR. FERGUSON: I have no other witnesses to-day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Graydon was summoned; Mr. Graydon is the Magistrate of London, and he had a couple of preliminary hearings in a murder case this morning and several other things, and he telephoned me yesterday and said he had not been subpoenaed until yesterday and it was entirely impossible for him to put over his whole court on account of these important cases coming up, and he wanted to know if he could be excused to-day, and under the circumstances I said I did not think the Committee would insist on his being here, if he would come any other time. Now is there any other witness that it is desired should be summoned? Do you want to bring witnesses, Mr. Ashplant, or are you content to rest your case as it is? It is this way; Mr. Ashplant said to the Committee, "I did not say that; I did not intend to say it. I did not intend to cast any reflections on Members of the Legislature or intimate that they could be bribed." And he denied any such intention. He said he had no reason to believe that and

did not desire to convey that impression. And he goes the length of saying that nothing he did say is open to that construction. Now, in the light of that, does the Committee desire to hear any further witnesses, that is witnesses who will come and say he did say it or he did not say it? Personally, I think that if Mr Ashplant desires to call witnesses he should be given the opportunity to do so. On the other hand he may not desire to do so after hearing the evidence here to-day.

MR. CURRIE: Did Mr. Ashplant go this far, as to say that if anything that he did say was capable of that interpretation that he desires to withdraw it and is sorry for having so expressed himself?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, he did not go that far. He has denied that he used the language which is attributed to him. There have been four or five or six witnesses who have sworn he did use that language.

MR. CURRY: Perhaps he would now, and say he did not intend to have the words interpreted in the manner in which they have been interpreted, and if they are capable of that interpretation then he is sorry.

MR. ASHPLANT: Well, that is actually the position. I am just precisely in the position that I started out, that I distinctly deny that I used the words that have been attributed to me in *The Globe*, the first paragraph, which seems to have been the basis of the charges, that I made use of that phraseology. But there is this position. It does not appear to be the slightest use to get away from the fact that certain members of the Council took certain ideas from that, that I did say, whatever I said. Well, now then, I have just this position on that--that I am sincerely sorry that any such interpretation of what I said should ever have been published as appeared in *The Globe*.

MR. CURRY: No, no. You are sorry for having made use of the words in respect to which any such interpretation could be made.

MR. ASHPLANT: Certainly.

MR. CURRY: And if any such interpretation could be placed upon any words of yours that you desire to withdraw and express your regret for having used them.

MR. ASHPLANT: Certainly.

MR. CURRY: You say certainly but you do not do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing we do this. Supposing Mr. Curry puts down in writing what will be satisfactory to the Committee and you sign it, and we will put it in the records, and everybody will go away happy and be satisfied.

MR. ASHPLANT: In the terms of the words just said I will sign. Just this reservation, that it will not embody any admission on my part that I do myself admit I did make this statement, because I did not. I do admit that there was that interpretation, that it was possible of me having made this statement without my memory serving me to that extent, and I am quite willing to say what you have said.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, that these perfectly respectable aldermen and Mayor, who pledge their oath that you did say it—they have sworn to that, that you did use this expression—that you would not be prepared, having heard their evidence, to deny that you did?

MR. ASHPLANT: Well, I might produce half-a-dozen men to say I did not. I admit the other fellows have got it on me in that sense. I can see it is no use for me to bring witnesses here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you willing, for Mr. Curry, to write out that if you did say anything from which that inference could be taken that you desire to withdraw

it and express regret?

MR. ASHPLANT: Yes.

MEMBER: And won't say it again?

MR. ASHPLANT: I will have my notes with me when I say anything like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is alright then, Mr. Ashplant. Every blot on the escutcheon of the Legislature has been removed as far as I can make out.

David James Taylor, of Wiarton, Member of the Legislative Assembly for the riding of North Grey, on being called and sworn, testified:—

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Taylor, I read to you the extract from the notes and proceedings of the House here in reference to a statement attributed to you, said to have been made on the 11th day of June last. This is the report as appearing in the Press:—

“The principle of the \$2,500 indemnity for the Members is wrong, but I did favour a bonus for the present Session. The hotel bill alone was about \$4 a day, and in the Session each member would spend about \$700. And if you don't believe me just try it,” said Mr. Taylor. “If the Member was a farmer he had to hire someone to run his farm, while if he was a labourer, he lost his job. If the public want honest service they should pay their representatives a fair amount. Every dollar I get, the public will know about it,” said Mr. Taylor, telling of an offer of \$1,000 he had received—and refused—for his influence in a certain measure, and three weeks after his election. “And if the past Governments had not been in the habit of taking money on the side, how was it that the man should come to me?” queried “Mr. Taylor.” Did you make that statement, Mr. Taylor?

A.—I made the statement up to about the last paragraph. I made no reflection on past members. It was personal with myself. I made the statement regarding the thousand dollars being offered to me.

Q.—You did make a statement regarding a thousand dollars offered to you? And was a thousand dollars offered to you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You were offered a thousand dollars, you say? Was that in the nature of an inducement to pass legislation, in regard to a certain measure?

A.—If you will allow me to relate the incident I think it will save time. I think the day was Saturday, if I recollect, November 1, 1919. In the morning there is an early train gets into my town about 6.31. There was a party came in and walked out to my home about a mile out and in a conversation with me in my home—he was supposed to represent one George Menzie, of Owen Sound, who was desirous of the vice-chairmanship of the Workman's Compensation Board—this gentleman was supposed to represent this Menzies and he started in saying he thought Mr. Menzies should get this job, and the statement that Mr. Menzie was willing to pay me \$1,000 for my influence in endeavoring to obtain him this position. That was in November, 1919, and I rather think it was the 1st of November.

Q.—Do you know the name of the man who came to you?

A.—At that time I did not ask his name, and I did not give it any consid-

eration, only the few minutes in my home, and I did not give it much thought until I made the assertion on the platform as stated there. It came to me later, when the press gave it such notoriety, I noticed more the extent of my assertion and endeavored then, through descriptions to parties in Owen Sound, to find the man who had approached me, but was unable to, and on the Monday after this was brought up in the House, I think it was Monday, the 14th of March, or on the Monday nearest to that date, I went to Mr Menzie's home and asked him if he had sent or caused to be sent in any way anyone to me making this offer. He absolutely denied it and said he had not. Then on the following, or not the following but I think Thursday the 24th of March I received a letter at my home address which, if the Chairman will read, will, I think, explain why I made the statement. It is post-marked Detroit, March 22nd.

MR. FERGUSON: We have the letter here. The letter is being produced.

MR. TAYLOR: It will explain my authority on making the remarks I did.

THE CHAIRMAN: (reads) It is dated, "Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A." There is a postmark, March 22nd, 1921."

Mr. J. D. Taylor, M.P.P.,

Warton, Ontario.

Dear Sir,

I was handed some days ago a copy of the *Toronto Star*, in which I saw something has been said in the Government about a remark that you made about being offered a sum of money to use your influence for the appointment of a certain man to a Government position. Now I have thought that you might be placed in a somewhat awkward position over the matter, as I do not suppose you know my name, but I am the man that called on you at your home near Warton and amongst other things I did suggest that you might very easily make \$1,000 in this way, but I am pleased to be able to say that you absolutely refused to accept any money consideration for your influence in any way.

I may say further that I had never met you until the day of our conversation and I knew nothing whatever about you, but during the election I heard conflicting stories about you and so I took the trouble to call on you for the sole purpose of testing you out as to your honesty in political matters.

I was not asked by any person to see you or to make any offer to you, but did so entirely off my own bat.

I thought it only fair that I should write you on this matter, but hope my action will not get you into any trouble.

I am now living in Detroit, having left Owen Sound last fall.

(signed) W. WILCOX.

Q.—Do you know any person of that name?

A.—No.

Q.—Never remember having met him?

A.—No, I don't remember meeting him, but I have called up people in Owen Sound and endeavored to find out if there was such a man in Owen Sound as that and I have found out that such a man did live in Owen Sound.

Q.—You live on a farm, do you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did he drive out?

A —.No, he came out on the early train.

Q.—Are you near the station?

A.—About a mile.

Q.—He walked over from the station.

A.—Yes.

Q.—This statement you made at the picnic, this part of it, "Every dollar I get the public will know about it," said Mr Taylor, telling of an offer of \$1,000 he had received—and refused—for his influence in a certain measure, and three weeks after the election."

A.—I said on a certain matter. I did not say measure. That was corrected by *The Star*.

Q.—That is what you based it on?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The rest of the statement you say is not right?

A.—"If past governments have not been in the habit of taking money"—I did not refer to that at all.

Q.—Do you know the reporter on *The Star* who reported this?

A.—Well, I knew the boy who was there. I do not know where he is at the present time.

Q.—Do you remember his name?

A.—Yes, his name is Scott.

Q.—And he is the one who reported your speech at the picnic?

A.—Yes sir.

MR. FERGUSON: I do not think there is anything else, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should have called the Committee's attention to the fact that the cancellation stamp is on the stamp on this letter.

MR. FERGUSON: I tore that off before noticing.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is an American stamp. What I wanted to ask Mr. Ferguson to go into, it was on behalf of Mr. Menzie, has anything been produced to show whether Mr. Menzie was or was not an applicant for the position?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can prove he was an applicant.

Q.—How do you know?

A.—Well I have letters on me now that he has been since applying, and I think it can be shown from the old files that he was an applicant previous, shortly after this position was made vacant.

Q.—Where does he live?

A.—He lives in Owen Sound.

Q.—And you say from investigations you made in the Department.—

A.—Well, I have been investigating in the department since he has been writing here, and in fact I was asked to meet him before the election and was told at the time that he was an aspirant for this position. I did meet him but he did not broach the question to me. This was before the election.

MR. FERGUSON: Has he ever succeeded in getting this position?

A.—No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Still without one is he?

A.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It looks as if he might likely remain without this one. Any other members of the committee would like to ask any questions? You have nothing further, Mr. Ferguson?

MR. FERGUSON: Nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all then. Are there any more witnesses on this

matter ?

MR. FERGUSON: The only thing that is left open in this is the last part of the charge that is referred here. Mr. Taylor is alleged to have said that "if past governments have not been in the habit of taking money on the side, how was it that the man should come to me ?"

THE CHAIRMAN: Well is not that only an inference for him draw; suppose he did say it ? Is there anything else on this matter. That is all then Mr Taylor. Are there any more matters ?

MR. FERGUSON: The only other matter is the Burnaby matter, and then there are two other matters that we are not prepared to proceed with at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about the Burnaby matter ? That is a very serious matter ?

MEMBER: What about the Swayze matter ?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not so serious.

MR. FERGUSON: As far as the Swayze matter is concerned I do not know what is to be done about that. I have no instruction to call any witnesses so far as Swayze is concerned. If the committee wants to go into it, into Mr. Swayze's statement, that will have to be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us first determine when we will sit again. We ought to get through this week. We must get through this week because we might not be sitting next week. What day will we take the Burnaby matter up ? How can he be got at ?

MEMBER: He is only out about 18 miles. You can get him by telephone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well' what have we got this week ? That won't take very long, and then we will be practically through. I would say have Mr. Burnaby here on Thursday if that is agreeable to the committee and Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: That is agreeable.

MR. WEBSTER: Make it 130 p.m. Thursday.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all right. With regard to these other things, take the Swayze - MacBride controversy, and the statements concerning the member for Parry Sound made by the *Telegram*. What are we going to do about that ? Take the Hall matter ? Have you looked into that Mr. Ferguson, to ascertain whether or not so far as the charges are concerned, if charges they be, that they reflect on the honorable member, whether at the time referred to in the charge he was a member of the House. Because if they were not how does it affect the matter,

MR. FERGUSON: I do not think it makes any difference. I do not think this committee has any right to investigate this charge if it is not a matter appertaining to the House. I took the trouble to look into it and I am convinced that it is not a subject of investigation before a committee of this kind.

The Chairman: Very good. Does the committee desire in the light of Mr. Ferguson's opinion- decide now -whether we will go any further with that matter, or whether we will not.

MR. WEBSTER: What is the use of going any further ?

MR. CRIDLAND: I move that the committee discharge the case.

MR. TOOMS: I second that.

MR. FERGUSON: Members of the committee had better report that they feel that it is not a matter that comes within their jurisdiction.

THE CHAIRMAN: If someone will make a motion now upon record, that in view of Mr. Ferguson's opinion that the statements made about Mr. Hall are not statements made of and concerning a member in his capacity as a member of the House, and therefore this committee cannot take cognizance of them - will somebody make a motion as to what we shall do with this ?

MR. WEBSTER: I will make that motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRIDLAND: I will second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded, that in view of Mr. Ferguson's opinion that the charges known as the Hall charges which were referred to this committee for investigation are not charges relating to Mr. Hall in his capacity as member of the House, and are therefore not properly the subject of investigation by this committee, it is moved that this committee take no further action with regard to this matter known as the Hall charges.

On the motion being put to a vote the Chairman declared it carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now what about the Swayze-MacBride matters ?

MR. FERGUSON: I do not know what evidence can be given with regard to that, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The difficulty about this - it was a statement made in the house - it is simply a statement that a certain honorable member in connection with his conduct as a member of a commission appointed by the government, to the effect, as I recollect it, that he played both ends against the middle. It was a statement of an honorable members opinion. How are we going o investigate that ? How are we going to investigate the mental attitude of a member of this House, as to his sincerity or insincerity, his mental state.

HONORABLE MEMBER: A man can think what he likes so long as he doesn't say it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I say. You may call in twenty-five witnesses who may all say that we are of the opinion that a certain member of the commission. that from what we saw of him and the way we heard him talk we are of the opinion that he was insincere. And you might bring forty or fifty others here who are of the opinion that the honorable member was perfectly sincere throughout. Where have we got ?

HONORABLE MEMBER: Nowhere.

MR. FERGUSON: I doubt very much if you can investigate the condition of a man's mind very well.

MR. TOOMBS: Seeing that we can arrive at nothing definite I would move that the case drop.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any seconder ? Moved by Mr. Tooms seconded by Mr. Hicks that in view of the fact that the statement or charges relating to the honorable member for South Brant in connection with his conduct as a member of the hydro investigating committee at Chippawa Falls last year, that such an investigation would simply be an investigation of the honorable member's mental attitude, with nothing tangible as to acts done or anything of that kind by him, that this committee does not feel that any good purpose would be served by going on with an investigation of what is known as the Swayze - MacBride matter and therefore no further proceedings be taken by the committee in connection with that matter. That is the understanding of the matter.

Upon the motion being put to a vote the chairman declared it carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: That leaves only Mr. Burnaby. Will somebody make a

motion to have him here. Moved by Mr. Webster that R. W. E. Burnaby be summoned to appear Thursday April 28 at 1.30 with the usual documents Carried.

APRIL 29TH, 1921.

The Committee met on Friday, April 29th, 1921, at 1.30 with R. L. Brackin in the chair.

Mr. R. W. E. Burnaby, on being called and sworn, testified:

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your full name?

A.—Ralph W. E. Burnaby.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Burnaby, you live in North York?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you are President of the United Farmers Co-operative Association?

A.—No, the United Farmers of Ontario.

Q.—And you made a speech at Kettleby, last June?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I will read to you the matter that has been referred to this Committee to draw your attention to it. This is under date of June 23rd, and appeared in the Globe and in the Aurora Banner: "Mr. Burnaby declared that a direct attempt had been made to bribe him, cited the offer made, and said he was ready at any time to back up his statement:—'I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately,' the U.F.O. President said, 'But I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him that I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job.' "

Q.—Are you correctly reported?

A.—Oh, practically.

Q.—Now, would you mind telling the Committee on what you based that statement?

A.—Well, Mr. Chairman, if I am in order, I would like a ruling from you as to what right this Committee has to ask me here to-day. I have said and done nothing affecting any member of Parliament whatever. I would like to have your ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you read, please, Mr. Ferguson, the reference on this matter from the House?

MR. FERGUSON: The reference is as follows:—"And whereas one, R. W. E. Burnaby, of North York, President of the U.F.O. Co-operative Association did make a statement on or about the 23rd day of June, 1920, as reported in the Press, as follows:"— And then follows what I have just read to you. It continues:

"And whereas all these statements are serious reflections on the independence and honour of the Legislature; and whereas the dignity and honour of the House and the safety of the public interests demand that these allegations be fully and thoroughly investigated and proper punishment be meted out to anyone who may be found guilty of any of the acts alleged; be it therefore resolved that in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government to refer the allegations

and charges to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections."

MR. CURRIE: Just exactly what was the charge?

THE CHAIRMAN: The charge was that he made this statement:—"I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately," the U.F.O. President said, "but I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him that I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job."

MR. CURRY: What is Mr. Burnaby's contention?

A.—That there is nothing in there that reflects on any member of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want a ruling on that I will take first Mr. Ferguson's opinion, as counsel to the Committee. I think it is proper and right that we should have that. Is it the desire of the Committee that we should have the opinion of counsel on the point raised by Mr. Burnaby. First, let me understand this, as I understand your position it is this, you do now object to being examined with respect to this matter?

A.—Oh, no, I am not taking that stand, but I want to know the right of this Committee to call me here. I have said or done nothing to reflect on any member of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you make no objection to being examined then there is nothing for the Committee to rule on.

MR. CURRY: He makes the objection to being called here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is this. Do you now say that you object to being examined with regard to this matter upon the ground that this Committee has no jurisdiction to make the enquiry?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you do object to being examined on that ground, that this Committee has no jurisdiction?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you are not willing to waive that objection in the public interest?

A.—Oh, I am quite willing to waive the objection..

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, we will go ahead.

A.—But I think it is only fair that I have a ruling on this quite important point.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Burnaby says he is willing to waive his objection there is no use ruling on an academic question. If he comes here and says, I do not desire to be examined and do not wish to give evidence on the ground that the Committee has no jurisdiction and I am not willing to waive that objection, then I will rule. But if he says he is willing in the public interest to waive that objection in order that the matter may be inquired into, I do not think there is anything to rule upon. That is the position exactly. Mr. Ferguson can ask you any question he likes, and if you object to answering questions I will rule on them as they come up.

MR. CURRY: Now that the question has been raised, it should be settled. What is the opinion on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Burnaby says, himself, he has no objection.

MR. BURNABY: I will waive it. If there is any public interest to be served I have no objection.

MR. FERGUSON: If the Committee wants my opinion I will give it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee desire Mr. Ferguson's opinion. Carried.

MR. FERGUSON: I think that this committee has jurisdiction to investigate this charge for this reason. It does relate in my opinion to the members of the House and is or may be a reflection upon them for this reason. In the first place the bribe that Mr. Burnaby was offered has, in my opinion, nothing to do with this House or the members of it, but the first part of his address, or the part that we are dealing with, is this: "I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately," the U. F. O. President said, But I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years.

MR. BURNABY: Well, I don't think that is correctly reported.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I am basing my opinion entirely on this report being correct, and if it is correct I think this Committee has jurisdiction.

MR. BURNABY: Well, we had better go on.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, you said Mr. Burnaby, I think, that this report is substantially correct. Would you mind just relating in your own words to this Committee the basis you had for your statement.

A.—Why just shortly after or about the time that the Government was advertising for a Purchasing Agent a man came into my office, and made me a direct proposition that I would use my influence to get him this job and he got it at \$6,000 a year, there would be a thousand in it for me as long as held the job. Now I was in the office alone when this man came in and I told him I would use my influence to see that he did not get the job. And as he was going down the steps he was pretty mad and somewhat flushed. Mr. Morrison said, "Well, what is the matter with that fellow," And I said, "Take a look at him." All he could see was his back as he was going down the steps. And then I told Mr. Morrison just what happened.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, now, dealing first, perhaps, with the prior part of this statement, where you said, "I know nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the Press lately," the U.F.O. President said, "but I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years." That, I think, is the important part.

A.—Well, I think I have more sense than to make a statement just like that.

Q.—Then is that not a true statement?

A.—No, I don't think it is exactly true.

Q.—Would you mind telling the Committee what you did say, that gave the reporter the idea that you did say it or caused him to write it.

A.—Of course I cannot begin to remember the exact words, but it would be probably more like this, "This is no new thing," or, "We have heard of such things before." I certainly would guard my words in that way.

Q.—Well, on what would you base that statement, that this is no new thing?

A.—Well, I have heard about them. I guess everyone of us have.

Q.—Well, do you know of any instance where a bribe has been offered, or offered and accepted by any member of the Legislature?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You don't? And you have no evidence at all that such a thing ever

happened ?

Q.—Then if you did say, “This is no new thing,” you were scarcely fair?

A.—Well, perhaps, I did not make myself clear. I was making no charge against any particular bribe. The accusation is no new thing. There is not a man in this room that has not heard it. That is the stand I took. That is what I intended to convey.

Q.—You said that charges of this kind were nothing new?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But, I take it now, to clear the matter up, you personally know of nothing whatever upon which a charge of that kind might be based?

A.—No. Only hearsay, the same as the rest of them.

Q.—So far as that point is concerned then, we can take it that there is no reflection on honorable members of the Legislature?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—Now in regard to the other part of the statement, do you know who the man was ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you mind giving us his name ?

A.—No. I could not give you his name. The reason why I cannot give his name is this, that only the two of us were in the office, and I cannot prove because there was no one else there, that the man made this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know his name?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I think you ought to give it to the Committee?

A.—No, I will not give his name.

MR. LENNOX: Now I think witness ought to give the name. It doesn't matter whether he can prove anything or not. That question doesn't arise. The question is did this conversation take place. And he may not be able to prove it, but we have a right, surely, to sift this thing to the very bottom and find out the man who made it. The man who made it may be liable for criminal action. I do not know whether he is or not, but the public ought to know who the man is so other people may be protected against him. And I feel pretty strongly on it. Mr. Burnaby has made the assertion, at the beginning he boasted that he can “back up his statements.” He ought to back them up now by giving the name of the man. Either Mr. Burnaby, when he made the statement, could not back it up or he could. If he could back it up that only means that he could prove it. If he could not then he should not have made the statement. I think the Chairman's ruling is perfectly correct and that we ought to have the name of the man who made the statement.

MR. BURNABY: The reason why I object to giving the man's name is this, that if I give the man's name probably before night he would issue a writ for libel against me and I could not protect myself at all.

MR. LENNOX: He has got to prove—

MR. BURNABY: Well, I object to giving the man's name. I gave the Premier sufficient information so he would know the man was not an applicant for the job.

MR. LENNOX: Does the Premier know the name?

PREMIER DRURY: No, I do not know.

MR. CURRY: I think the honorable member for North York is enlarging on the head of the man's liability to criminal prosecution for an offence of that kind. Mr.

Burnaby may have had a duty to perform—I think possibly he did—of giving the Crown Attorney the facts. Whether he performed that duty is another matter.

MR. BURNABY: I did.

Q.—With the Crown Attorney?

A.—No, the Attorney General.

MR. CURRY: That is just as good.

MR. LENNOX: Better. But did he give the name?

PREMIER DRURY: No. He did not give the name to anybody.

MR. CURRY: Then I think there is no question about it, he has done his whole duty, and in regard to that matter I do not think this Committee are interested at all whether a man came and offered him a bribe. When I am not a member of the House and I am offered a bribe to use my influence to get a man a position, and I accept that bribe, I would be liable to criminal prosecution, but if I resisted it surely doesn't mean, because I choose to say that I was offered a large bribe, that it is any reflection on any member of this Legislature.

MR. BURNABY: The man asked me to do something which was wrong and he was willing to pay me for it and I refused to do it. What has that got to do with this Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will clear it up this way. Have you given his name to the Attorney General or any other authority?

A.—No. I gave the Attorney-General sufficient information so he would know that he was not one of the applicants.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is true, but not sufficient information to enable him to base a prosecution on?

A.—No.

Q.—You say you object to giving his name?

A.—Yes.

MR. LENNOX: Now you have ruled that he should?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I will rule that, and if the ruling is objected to it is up to the Committee.

MR. LENNOX: What my honorable friend Mr. Curry says is not to the point at all. Now the gravamen of this statement of Mr. Burnaby's is just exactly as my learned friend Mr. Ferguson, put it; that was contained in the words: "This kind of thing has been going on for years. Thank God I am not in the Government." Now that is a reflection, as you have ruled, and in the opinion of the learned counsel, upon the integrity and honesty of the members who were here prior to the time the statement was made. Surely we have a right to know the name of the man that made the statement to you in view of the serious reflection that was cast throughout the whole of this Province. If the statement was made, we ought to know two things. We ought to know the name of the man for the purpose of knowing whether any reliance can be placed on what he says. Furthermore we ought to know the name of the man to be able to ascertain whether when the applications come up for this position, the Government, when they deal with it, will be able to put their finger upon this man. Up to the present time, according to Mr. Burnaby's evidence, this man may still be selected as Purchasing Agent.

PREMIER DRURY: No.

MR. LENNOX: Well, you say no. I say yes. If his statement is correct, if they do not know the name of the man, then they do not know who the man is that

made this bribe or made this offer to Mr. Burnaby. You cannot get away from it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course I suppose this is it. The Government knows who the applicants are. Mr. Burnaby says he gave sufficient information to eliminate this man from being selected for the position.

MR. BURNABY: I just gave the Attorney-General the man's three initials and the last letter in his name.

PREMIER DRURY: I had some correspondence with Mr. Burnaby which I think should be submitted to show the position the Government took, and that will clear this whole business up.

MR. LENNOX: I think the public would like to have the name. I move that we do here have the name.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair is that Mr. Burnaby must give the name of the person who offered this bribe. Mr. Burnaby, I understand, is not satisfied and desires an appeal from the ruling. I am going to leave it to the Committee to say whether that ruling shall be upheld.

MR. BURNABY: I objected and asked you for your ruling on that matter. Your counsel has already said that you have no jurisdiction in that matter.

MR. LENNOX: I am asking if the correspondence that was submitted to the Government has been available to Mr. Ferguson?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has never been asked for.

PREMIER DRURY: The only correspondence that ever took place is in my pocket. I want it before the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That correspondence does not contain the name of the individual in question.

MR. LENNOX: Before the vote is taken I want Mr. Burnaby on record as to his objection to giving the name. Is there any other reason than what you have given for your objection to disclosing the name of the party whom you allege made the offer to you?

MR. BURNABY: No, there is no other objection—just for my own protection, that is all.

MR. FERGUSON: Would it be better to have the correspondence produced before the vote, so that members can vote more intelligently.

THE CHAIRMAN: Subject to the approval from the ruling of the chair, the ruling is that Mr. Burnaby must answer the question.

MR. CURRY: Is not a witness who is called before this Committee to answer questions, to be protected?

MR. FERGUSON: I think he is protected.

MR. CURRY: Then let the witness understand that he is protected from action for damages.

MR. FERGUSON: No doubt about it. He is protected from action for libel.

THE CHAIRMAN: This Committee has all the powers of a court in evidence. You would be protected from libel. Do you still refuse to give the name of the man, who offered you the bribe?

MR. BURNABY: Yes, I object.

MR. LENNOX: You understand perfectly, you are free from any danger of any action, civil or otherwise.

MR. CURRY: The only action you would be liable for is one for perjury—for telling an untruth.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all.

MR. CURRY: In a civil action or in a prosecution any man who tells an untruth in either would be liable to prosecution for perjury.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under these circumstances do you still refuse to answer?

MR. BURNABY: I refuse to give the man's name.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you gentlemen vote on that question of the appeal which Mr. Burnaby desires I am going to read this correspondence.

MR. LENNOX: I do not know what is in the correspondence but is that hardly fair? Mr. Burnaby says he will not answer that question. He gave his reason for it. His reason has no reference whatever to any correspondence between him and the Premier. Surely the correspondence that passed between the two of them has nothing to do as to whether he shall answer or not.

MR. BURNABY: One of my reasons is that this Committee has no jurisdiction in this matter—there is nothing that affects any member of the House or any member of the Government.

MR. LENNOX: You have been over-ruled in that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ruled on it and he says go on and ask questions, and he has answered.

MR. LENNOX: I think you ought to put that vote again to the Committee on that question.

MR. CURRY: But should the Committee not be in a position to know the good faith that Mr. Burnaby showed at the time when that offer was made to him. If this was written at the time immediately, when the matter was fresh, ought not that to be in the minds of the Committee. I think they should have that information.

MR. TOOMS: I would much rather see the correspondence which took place between Mr. Burnaby and the Government before voting on this matter. It would help me to decide. My mind is not surely made up on this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Burnaby is not represented by counsel and I am going to do everything I can to indicate a spirit of fairness. Personally I do not think the correspondence has anything to do with the question as to whether he shall or shall not answer the question, but I am going to read it. From the Premier to Mr. Burnaby, dated June 28, 1920.—(reads):

Toronto, June 28, 1920.

Dear Mr. Burnaby:—

My attention has been drawn to the press accounts of your statement made at Kettleby, on June 23rd, in which you asserted that you had been offered a bribe of \$1,000 a year to use your influence in favour of the appointment of some unnamed person as Purchasing Agent by the Government. You will, of course, understand the seriousness of your statement. This position has not yet been filled and it may be that among the applicants is the very man who offered you this bribe. It therefore becomes necessary that you should give whatever information you have in this matter to the Government, in order that we may be on our guard. You will be doing less than your duty if you endeavor to shield the one who has been guilty of such an offence. I would thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very sincerely,

R. W. E. Burnaby, Esq.,
Jefferson, Ontario.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then another letter from the Premier to Mr. Burnaby of the 15th of July, 1920. He says:—

Toronto, 5th July, 1920.

Dear Mr. Burnaby:

A few days ago I sent you a letter with reference to a statement made by you at Kettleby on the 23rd of June, but up to the present time I have not had the pleasure of hearing from you.

In case my communication has been mislaid or gone astray I am forwarding you another copy and will be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

R. W. E. Burnaby, Esq.,
U.F.O. Headquarters,
Toronto, Ont.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, third, there is a letter from Mr. Burnaby to the Premier, of the 10th of July, 1920:

July 10th, 1920.

The Hon. E. C. Drury,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Mr. Drury:—

In reply to yours of June 28th and July 5th, would say that immediately upon receiving yours of June 28th I telephoned your office but found you were away. I gave the information you desire to Mr. Raney, and he promised to convey it to you.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) R. W. E. Burnaby.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then there is simply a memorandum for Mr. Grant enclosing copy of memo. sent Mr. McCutcheon, and his reply. Who is M.C., the initials?

THE PREMIER: I cannot say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then there is a communication from Mr. Raney to Mr. McCutcheon, June 29th, this was the day following the letter of the Premier to Mr. Burnaby:—

Toronto, June 29, 1920.

Dear Mr. McCutcheon:—

You no doubt saw Mr. Burnaby's reference to somebody who had offered him a bribe of \$1,000 for his influence in securing the position of Purchasing Agent.

Mr. Drury wrote Mr. Burnaby asking him for the name of the party, and he now advises me over the phone that the initials and the last letter of the surname are "J.S.F—y." This will sufficiently identify the party to enable you to ascertain whether he is on the list of applicants for the position.

You may if you please let me hear from you after you have made a search.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) W. E. Raney.

J. M. McCutcheon, Esq.,
Civil Service Commissioner.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then Mr. McCutcheon writes back on July 2nd, 1920, and says:—

July 2nd, 1920.

Hon. W. E. Raney,
Attorney-General,
Parliament Buildings.

Dear Sir:—

I have your letter of June 29, and wish to advise that there is no name on the list of applicants for the position of General Purchasing Agent with the initials and the last letter of the surname "J.S.F—y."

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. M. McCutcheon.

MR. DEWART: Well, of course, he might have thought, he might have applied to the Government.

PREMIER DRURY: Well, he did not apply to the Government at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: This file of correspondence will go in as one exhibit and will go in as Exhibit 1, the understanding being that it can be copied and returned to the Premier's office. That being the situation I am going to ask for a vote now on the question as to whether or not the ruling of the chair, that Mr. Burnaby must give the name of this gentleman, "J.S.F—y," shall be sustained. Now, then, the motion is shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

MR. LENNOX: Honorable members will know that if the name is given we will have the opportunity of calling this man to give evidence here. He might come forward and admit it.

HON. MEMBER: Mr. Burnaby says he won't give the name.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, of course, if he goes down and occupies a lonely cell on bread and water for several days he will probably change his mind. All those who are in favour?

On the vote being put the Chairman declared the motion to sustain the ruling of the chair to have been lost.

MR. DEWART: I ask for the ayes and nays.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair has been reversed and Mr. Burnaby will not be required to give the name. Certain honorable members asked for the ayes and nays. The Clerk will take the ayes and nays.

The ayes and nays were then recorded by the Clerk.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, then, are there any further questions?

MR. FERGUSON: In view of the ruling, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has any other honorable member any questions to ask?

MR. LENNOX: Do you know Mr. Farquharson, reporter for The Globe?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is he the reporter who was present at the picnic?

A.—I am not sure. Yes, I think he was.

Q.—And did the reporter for The Globe after the meeting get into communication with you, and read you the report that he was going to have published the next day?

A.—No. Not that I recall.

Q.—Did he call you up by telephone? Did you call him up?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you see the report of your speech with respect to this prior to its appearance in the Press?

A.—No.

Q.—Was it read to you prior to its publication?

A.—No.

Q.—Then was there any arrangement with any member of the Government or any suggestion on the part of any member of the Government that this statement should be made at that picnic.

A.—Yes, I mentioned it to a member of the Government, that I was going to make a statement.

Q.—What member of the Government did you mention it to?

A.—Mr. Raney.

Q.—What did you say to Mr. Raney?

A.—I just said I was going to make a statement.

Q.—Just give me the words you used to him?

A.—As far as I can recall, "I am going to tell the picnic at Kettleby, to-morrow, about my bribery charge."

Q.—Anything else said?

A.—That is all that I recall.

Q.—Did Mr. Raney ask you what it was? Did he show any interest in it by making any enquiries?

A.—I think I probably told him about it.

Q.—Did you tell him probably what appears in the report?

A.—Oh, no.

Q.—Well, now, you say you probably told him. Let us understand what your recollection is of what you really did tell him?

A.—Well, I object to these questions, Mr. Chairman. I did everything that mortal man could do to protect the Province against this man, and this looks more like a political game than anything else to me.

MR. LENNOX; Don't you be too uneasy about the political aspect. I suppose your statement was not political?

THE CHAIRMAN: What did you do towards punishing the briber?

A.—There was no bribery. I refused to do what is wrong and we have all had such experience.

THE CHAIRMAN: He was committing a criminal offence. What did you do towards securing his punishment? Nothing at all? If you don't want to answer that question say you don't want to.

A.—All right.

MR. LENNOX: What did you tell Mr. Raney before you made that speech at Kettleby?

A.—I have answered that question, Mr. Chairman.

PREMIER DRURY: Was that before you made the statement?

MR. TOLMIE: That question is quite legitimate? Did he deliberately, after talking the matter over with the Attorney General, make the statement? Now we want to know what was said.

MR. CALDER: If he went out deliberately and made this speech then we should have all information.

MR. LENNOX: What did you say to Mr. Raney prior to making this speech?

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you say as to this?

A.—I think I have answered the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just answer again and tell him briefly what you told him, just in effect.

A.—I told him, "I am going to tell the picnic at Kettleby, to-morrow, about my bribery charge."

THE CHAIRMAN: And was that as far as you went?

A.—I told him what it was.

Q.—Did you tell him the name?

A.—No, I told him a man had offered me this thousand dollars bribe if I could get the job as Purchasing Agent for him.

PREMIER DRURY: Where did you tell him that?

A.—In his own office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you go to him because he was Attorney General?

A.—I just happened to be there on other business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did Mr. Raney ask for the name of the individual that had done this?

A.—I think he did.

Q.—And what did you tell him?

A.—I did not give it to him.

MR. LENNOX: How long was that before you made the speech?

A.—I cannot tell you.

MR. FERGUSON: He said "to-morrow."

A.—Well, I did not mean to say to-morrow. It doesn't matter. I don't know just exactly when it was.

MR. LENNOX: Tell us what Mr. Raney told you. Tell us what Mr. Raney said. You had told him about a criminal offence that occurred. Now what position did he take

A.—I don't just recall. Why not bring Mr. Raney and ask him?

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not trying Mr. Raney. If it should be necessary we will call him.

THE PREMIER: I have sent for Mr. Raney. I think he should hear this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you rather we would wait until he comes?

PREMIER DRURY: I think so.

MR. CURRY: The other point of this charge that this committee has something to do with, that is as to the portion of the charge in which he said, "This thing has been going on for years".

MR. LENNOX: Well, you go on with that and we will wait. Have you any objection to this going on?

MR. CURRY: No objection. But we have no jurisdiction.

MR. LENNOX: Well, you say we have not although we have and the Chairman says we have.

(to Mr. Raney)

THE CHAIRMAN: In order that you may understand, the situation is that Mr. Burnaby says not. This offer was made to him, and before he made this speech at Kettleby in which he made the statement which we read in the house, he was in your office on some other matter and he mentioned it to you casually that he at the picnic was going to tell the public about the attempt that had been made to bribe him. He says that according to his recollection he told you the circumstances and you asked him for the name of the individual.

MR. LENNOX: He said he did not tell Mr. Raney.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that Mr. Raney asked Mr. Burnaby for the name of the man who had attempted to bribe him and Mr. Burnaby refused to give it, or said he did not desire to give it. That is as far as we have got.

MR. LENNOX: Then do you recall what Mr. Raney said to you when you disclosed this information about the bribe?

A.—No, I do not recall.

Q.—You have no recollection?

A.—No.

Q.—Well, did he suggest that you should explode it at the picnic, or not?

A.—Certainly, not.

Q.—After you had told him?

A.—No.

Q.—Did he ask you to refrain from making the reference to it?

A.—No, I do not think so.

Q.—Now, are you sure that it was not the understanding between you and the Attorney-General that this statement was to be made the next day at the picnic?

A.—It certainly was not the understanding because I did not take it up that way. I said I might say it. It certainly was not the understanding.

PREMIER DRUMBY: You were making up your mind entirely independently?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—You did not ask Mr. Raney whether you should or should not.

A.—No. And he did not express an opinion.

MR. LENNOX: Then what was your object, in view of the Premier's question, in going to Mr. Raney or telling him anything about it?

A.—I just happened to be there and I mentioned it at the time.

Q.—On other business?

A.—Yes, on other business.

Q.—We won't bother you about the other business, but then was the subject discussed between you and Mr. Raney?

A.—It was just mentioned.

Q.—Had you any object in view when you mentioned it to Mr. Raney?

A.—No. It was just at the time of the Hick's charges. Mr. Hicks and I were going to this picnic together. It was just mentioned in conversation.

MR. LENNOX: I might just mention for the benefit of the Attorney General that Mr. Burnaby objects to telling the name of the man amongst other reasons on account of criminal action that may be brought against him. It has been explained to him that anything he says here he need have no fear of.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, Mr. Raney, he has refused to give the name of the man who made the offer on the ground that if he gives the name he will be in this position, that this man can bring an action against him for slander, and that there was no one there except himself and the man, no other witnesses, and he fears he would not be able to prove his charges, that is he would not be able to successfully defend an action for libel.

MR. BURNABY: And, besides, I still maintain that this committee has no jurisdiction.

MR. RANEY: Well, that is what I was wondering about and I was going to ask.

MR. CURRY: Mr. Burnaby waived jurisdiction.

MR. FERGUSON: This is what Mr. Burnaby is said to have stated: "I know

nothing about the famous bribery charge that has been delighting the press lately," the U.F.O. President said, "but I want to tell you ladies and gentlemen, that this thing has been going on for years. Thank God, I am not in the Government, but I have been offered a bribe and I can back up my statement. When the Government advertised for a purchasing agent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, I was offered \$1,000 a year if I would use my influence to have a certain man appointed, the \$1,000 to continue as long as he held the job. I told him that I would use my influence, but see that he did not get the job."

MR. BURNABY: Well, it should be "to see."

MR. CURRY: And counsel has informed us that in regard to the last charge this committee has no jurisdiction.

MR. FERGUSON: I did not put it that way. I said I did not think this committee would have jurisdiction at all except if it were not for this part of the statement, "But I want to tell you ladies and gentlemen, this thing has been going on for years." that is, referring to the bribery charges. My information was that reference gave this committee jurisdiction because it was something that reflected on the honors of the members of the Legislature.

MR. CURRY: Accusations have been going on—

MR. LENNOX: You said accusations. He adopted what you so kindly said. The word was never referred to by him until you put it in his mouth.

MR. CURRY: Quite so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Burnaby took objection at the outset that the committee had not any jurisdiction. I put it to him and asked whether he objected to giving evidence before the committee on that ground, was he willing in the public interest to waive any objection of that kind he might have. He said he was willing to waive it and we went ahead on that understanding.

HON. MR. RANEY: Does that leave still the question that was raised by Mr. Ferguson. You have a certain portion of this statement which is said to be within the jurisdiction of this committee. Now the fact that the witness waives jurisdiction is neither here nor there. If there is no jurisdiction, there is no jurisdiction.

MR. FERGUSON: The only point is these statements are linked together.

HON. MR. RANEY: Well, you come back to somebody made a statement to Mr. Burnaby which does not affect the honor of members of this house.

HON. MEMBER: I don't think so.

MR. BURNABY: Does it concern even the Government? Does it concern the Government to know who this man was?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it does. I should think he might be liable to prosecution.

MR. BURNABY: Well, that is a different aspect. This Committee is not laying the foundation of criminal charges.

THE CHAIRMAN: This committee has already ruled upon appeal that Mr. Burnaby should not be required to give the name. That has been dispensed with. Now what is the point?

MR. FERGUSON: The only point, as I understand it, is Mr. Lennox's interrogation as to the conversation that took place between the witness and the Attorney General prior to the statement he made at the picnic. Mr. Lennox wanted to know the purport of what you said. He has told what he said but not what you said. He said the Attorney General asked him for the name of the individual and that he refused to give it.

MR. WIDDIFIELD: This committee has ruled that it is not necessary. Why

go on investigating?

MR. FERGUSON: I suppose Mr. Lennox wants to ask something further.

MR. LENNOX: I want the conversation that took place between the Attorney General and the witness.

MR. BURNABY: There was certainly very little and I do not recall it at all. I just mentioned it. As far as I recall it, it was a casual remark.

MR. LENNOX: Did Mr. Raney insist, as Attorney General of this Province, upon finding out the man who had committed a criminal offence?

A.—He asked me for the name and I refused to give it.

Q.—More than once?

A.—I do not know.

MR. LENNOX: Tell me what you mean by this, 'I can back my statement up.' What does that mean?

A.—I do not know that I made that statement.

Q.—Well, you swore that it was substantially correct. Did you make that statement?

A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Nothing that would give that impression?

A.—I do not think so.

Q.—I have a report here from the Aurora Banner which contains the same statement, almost identical with The Globe's.

A.—I think probably it was copied from The Globe.

Q.—Am I to understand that you did not say that you could back up your statements?

A.—I don't think I said it—no.

Q.—Well, if you did say it, would it be true?

A.—Well, I have already pointed out how impossible it would be to prove it. It would be one man's word against another's.

Q.—But if you made that statement would it be true? You could back up the statement?

A.—That is the reason I object to giving the man's name.

Q.—Then what did you say when you said, "Thank God, I am not in the Government?"

A.—I don't think I said that?

Q.—Will you swear you did not say that?

A.—No. It doesn't make any difference. I will make the statement now if you want me to.

Q.—Thank God, you are not in the Government?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Well, I agree with you. Now I want you to tell me do you know whether the Attorney General conveyed the information you gave him to the Prime Minister?

A.—Well, he said he would. The evidence here shows that he did.

Q.—Then did you have any conversation with the Attorney General other than the occasion he refers to in his letter subsequent to the date of the picnic?

A.—I have no letter from the Attorney-General.

Q.—Did you see any?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you speak to the Prime Minister about it afterwards?

THE CHAIRMAN: On the 28th, or on the 29th you telephoned the Prime Minister. He was away and then you got in touch with Mr. Raney.

A.—We had no conversation regarding the matter. I just gave him the information.

Q.—Did you again, after that again, have any conversation with Mr. Raney with respect to this matter?

A.—Oh, not for a long time afterwards.

Q.—Well, when?

A.—I cannot tell you just exactly when, but it would be two or three months ago.

Q.—What occurred then?

A.—I think I spoke to Mr. Raney over the telephone and asked him if he could recall the matter, and he said, "Well I have a very faint recollection of it." He could not recall the details of it.

Q.—What was your object in getting in touch with Mr. Raney two or three months ago?

A.—The question was raised in our conversation. I just mentioned it.

Q.—Well, there must have been some reason for it

A.—I don't recall just exactly the reason.

Q.—Do you recollect what Mr. Raney said to you, over the telephone?

A.—He just told me he had a very faint recollection of it.

Q.—He would not stop at that, surely. Did he say anything else?

A.—I don't recollect.

Q.—I think you did say, if the impression got abroad from your statement that members of the Legislature had been bribed, that there is no foundation for it, so far as you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: He said he knew of nothing.

MR. BURNABY: You remember the word Mr. Curry gave us?

MR. LENNOX: Mr. Curry isn't giving evidence. Have you any reason from anything you know to even suspect any member present, sitting in the Legislature or any member who ever has sat in the Legislature?

A.—Certainly not. I have already answered that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: One thing I don't get. You remember saying that Morrison, when the man was going away all that Mr. Morrison could see was his back? Did Mr. Morrison know the man?

A.—No, he doesn't know him.

MR. LENNOX: You say that Mr. Morrison was present but not in the same room?

A.—No, I did not say that.

Q.—Is that correct?

A.—What do you mean by that?

Q.—You say he saw him going down the stairs?

A.—You are not familiar with the U.F.O. offices, or you would understand how it happened.

Q.—I am trying to get familiar. Where was Mr. Morrison at the time this offer was made to you?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Was he in the building?

A.—He must have been.

Q.—Where was he when he saw this man, the back of this man going out?

A.—He was behind him. The man was going down the stairs and Mr. Morrison saw the fellow was in a fluster and he said, "What is the matter with that fellow?" And I told him what happened.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you did not tell Mr. Morrison his name, and never have?

A.—No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other members would like to ask questions?

MR. BURNABY: I have never given anybody his name.

MR. TOLMIE: Just one question, I would like to ask if in the conversation you had with the Attorney-General, when I understand that you casually told him you might tell the people, do you recall the Attorney-General having asked who it was?

A.—No, I do not recall.

Q.—He didn't make any comment?

A.—I didn't say he didn't. I say I don't recall.

Q.—To the best of your recollection he didn't advise you one way or the other?

A.—I don't recall it.

MR. WEBSTER: When you made this statement that this matter had been going on for years, did you mean that the bribery had been going on for years or that the talk about bribery had been circulating around for years?

A.—That is what I said, exactly.

MR. OKE: I would like to know whether Mr. Morrison knew this gentleman or whether he had reason to believe Mr. Morrison knew him?

A.—I know Mr. Morrison didn't know him. The Chairman asked me the same question.

MR. LENNOX: Do you know where the man lives?

A.—No, I don't. He lives in Toronto.

Q.—As soon as we find his name it would be no trouble to ascertain his whereabouts.

A.—I haven't seen him since.

Q.—Can you tell us his occupation?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—Had you been acquainted with him prior to the time he approached you with this offer?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long had you known him?

A.—I had known him a great many years.

Q.—What was his position during the time you knew him?

A.—That is going over the same ground again, and we have had a ruling on that. There is no public object to be gained and I object.

MR. LENNOX: I ask that the question be answered.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee has ruled that he is not bound to give the man's name. Mr. Burnaby has said he is a man he knew at that time and that he has known him many years, and that he lives in Toronto. I will interpret the ruling of the Committee as meaning that he is not obliged to give information by which the man could be identified, and I will have to rule that he is not bound to answer a question as to what the man's occupation is. I think that interprets the desire of the Committee.

MR. LENNOX: That ruling is based upon the fact that he refuses to give the

answer to the question because it may identify the person who offered him a bribe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LENNOX: Well, you are backing up the statement pretty well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else the Committee desires to examine on this matter?

MR. LENNOX: I believe the Attorney-General might offer some information. I suggest that the Attorney-General tell us what he knows about it.

It was thereupon moved that the Attorney-General be called and the motion being put to a vote was carried by 15 to 7.

Hon. W. E. Raney called and sworn ; examined by Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: You heard the charges referred to this Committee for investigation, and some evidence has been given by Mr. Burnaby with reference to a conversation between you and him, before he made his speech at the picnic at Kettleby. Will you tell the Committee your recollection of the conversation you had with Mr. Burnaby?

MR. RANEY: My recollection is not distinct, but I recall him speaking to me in my office—I think it was one evening about the time of the Hicks incident—and saying that some bribe had been offered him. I have no recollection of him stating anything about his understanding regarding the matter or mentioning anything about the picnic, or saying anything about it elsewhere, but if he recollects saying that I would not contradict him. My entire recollection of it is as I have given it to you.

Q.—You cannot recollect anything further regarding this statement?

A.—No, I recall—something was said here to-day. I think the Premier wrote a letter to me asking for some information and Mr. Burnaby, I think, called me on the phone and gave me some information.

Letter produced and identified by Mr. Raney.

MR. RANEY: Yes, apparently Mr. Drury wrote to Mr. Burnaby and Mr. Burnaby perhaps wasn't able to communicate with Mr. Drury, or Mr. Drury was out of town.

Q.—Yes, he said he didn't get Mr. Drury, he said he got you?

A.—I then wrote to Mr. McCutcheon giving him the information given me by Mr. Burnaby.

Q.—That was a telephone conversation?

A.—I think so.

Q.—There is nothing else you know about the matter?

A.—No.

MR. LENNOX: Did you take any steps as Attorney-General to find out the party who offered this bribe?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you realize at the time that it was a criminal offence?

A.—I suppose so, yes. But the thing came to me in that way. You could come to me and tell me something of the sort but I would not feel free to act the part of a spy or informer.

Q.—I quite agree with you there.

MR. OKE: In view of the fact that Mr. Burnaby was not a member of this House, and being asked that question, would you say then it was a criminal offence?

A.—I would not like to enter upon a discussion of that. It might or it might not be. Perhaps Mr. Curry is better able to answer that. I think it would

verge pretty closely to a criminal offence.

MR. CURRY: I think it is an offence to offer a man money to use his influence improperly, and that would be improperly. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

MR. LENNOX: You no doubt saw the report in the Press of the statement made by Mr. Burnaby at the Kettleby Picnic?

A.—I don't recall it.

Q.—At all events it was brought to your attention that a bribe had been offered because you got into communication with Mr. McCutcheon—the letter shows that?

MR. OKE: I would like to clear that question up; if that is a criminal offence then it looks to me as if it would be an offence for a member of this Government to use his influence to get a man a job in connection with this Government?

MR. CURRY: For a consideration, yes.

MR. LENNOX: After it became public property by the appearance of the statement in the press did you take any action?

A.—No.

Q.—You took no action?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you at any time as Attorney-General, discuss that aspect of the case with Mr. Burnaby or with any member of the Government?

A.—I don't think I did with Mr. Burnaby, any conversation I had in the matter was, I should think, with the Premier.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think you should give that.

MR. LENNOX: I am not going to ask what took place. I suppose that is a matter we are not entitled to know.—Now coming down to the second conversation. Did you get in touch with Mr. Burnaby or did he see you—for the second conversation?

A.—Before I wrote the letter to Mr. McCutcheon?

Q.—Mr. Burnaby told us that two or three months ago he again got in touch with you?

A.—My recollection of that is that it was subsequent to this matter being mentioned in the House.

Q.—He says it was long before that?

A.—My recollection differs from that. It was shortly after—a day or so—the time it came up in the House. My recollection is that it was in connection with what he had seen in the paper, that he was likely to be summoned.

Q.—Did you send for him or did he come to see you?

A.—I don't think he came to see me. He telephoned me.

Q.—What is your recollection of what he said and of what you said?

MR. BURNABY: May I just say this? That was on the 19th or 20th of January, that that conversation took place.

MR. RANEY: Then it must have been before the House met. I do not remember what took place, but I remember him calling me on the telephone.

Q.—You don't remember what he said?

A.—No.

Q.—And you don't remember what he said?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you seen him since?

A.—Not unless my impression about his having spoken to me since the matter was raised in the House is correct. I only recall him speaking to me once after

giving me this information. My impression was that it was after the matter was raised in the House. I apparently was wrong if there was only the one occasion.

Q.—You haven't been in communication with him within the last few weeks?

A.—No.

MR. BURNABY: There was a second conversation with Mr. Raney, the one he referred to, a few weeks ago. I called him when this thing came up in the paper. I asked him if I had to appear before the Committee, and he said, "if they summon you, you will have to."

MR. RANEY: That is the one I referred to.

MR. HAY: I would like to ask the Attorney-General if, since he has been in his present position these cases of bribery have been so numerous that he recalls any others reported to him in which no action has been taken?

A.—I don't think I have heard of any the public hasn't heard of. Those I have heard of are those, the subject of inquiry before this Committee. Frankly I have not been much impressed by them.

MR. TOLMIE: Do you remember Mr. Raney when the matter was casually mentioned to you in the first place whether you asked for the name of the man?

A.—I don't recall that.

MR. HAY: You would not be interested in prosecuting anyone for bribery for a thousand or so?

MR. LENNOX: This was \$1,000 a year.

MR. HAY: As Attorney-General I think you might have been interested?

MR. RANEY: If you came to me and said someone had offered you a bribe I would not feel free unless you told me who it was, to take action. I am not seeking to exonerate myself. If anyone wants to blame me they are free to do so.

MR. LENNOX: That might be an excuse that might be proffered if that statement hadn't been made at the picnic and become public property.

MR. RANEY: I don't say it was an excuse, Mr. Lennox. I am not making excuses. I am telling the facts. If I am to be excused it will not be by myself. I am not asking to be excused.

Q.—You didn't make any efforts to ascertain who it was?

THE CHAIRMAN: He said that.

The witness was then excused.

MR. HALL: Before this Committee dissolves I want to have a word to say. I had a matter that was to be put before this Committee. I understand it was put before the Committee in my absence. The solicitor told me that when the time came I would be notified I was not notified and the case was dealt with without my having the courtesy shown me of having an opportunity to listen to the deliberations on it. Now I have some inquiries in regard to the matter and I understand that the Committee were quite satisfied that inasmuch as this matter was a transaction of the Telegram that it was of such small moment that we need not go into it. If that was the ruling of the Committee that the Telegram's statement was so unreliable and not worth bringing before this Committee then I am satisfied.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Committee was based upon opinion of much as the statements of the Telegram which Mr. Hall complained of in the House were not statements having reference to Mr. Hall in his capacity as a member of the Legislature or reflected upon him in his capacity as a member of the Legis-

lature therefore the matter was not properly before the Committee, that the Committee had no jurisdiction in the matter. The Committee decided not to take up the time of the Committee or of the House in investigating something this Committee had no jurisdiction over, not that it was too small a matter.

MR. HALL: I hold that this Committee didn't understand the case, or else the solicitor didn't understand the case.

MR. CURRY: The solicitor had the charge before him.

MR. HALL: I don't care what he had. I know this case better than he does. I was not mayor of the town. I was referred to as R. R. Hall, M.P.P., in black-face type.

MR. FERGUSON: That doesn't make any difference. The charge has to be made in relation to your position as a member of the House. If you want redress you will have to go to the Courts.

MR. HALL: Wasn't I a member of the House? I wasn't mayor, I was a member.

MR. FERGUSON: I want to make myself clear. I was not aware that the Hall matter was going to be dealt with on the day it came up. I was asked and gave my opinion that the charge in the Telegram had nothing to do with Mr. Hall as a member of the Legislature. The charge was a personal one and if he happened to be a member of the Legislature at the time that was merely an incident. If Mr. Hall desires a remedy he will have to go to the Courts.

MR. HALL: I was only a member at the time. I wasn't mayor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee desire to take any action on the statement in the Telegram?

HONORABLE MEMBERS: No.

MR. HALL: I said I was satisfied if that was the Committee's view, as reported to me, that the charges in the Telegram were of such small moment that it was not worth while investigating them.

MR. WEBSTER: I would like to say, as the member who moved the motion that the Committee take no action that apart from the advice given by Mr. Ferguson I thought no one should take the Telegram very seriously anyway.

The Committee then adjourned after appointing a sub-Committee to draft a report for submission to the House.

EXHIBITS**Exhibit No.**

Toronto, March 10th, 1921.

Dear Mr. Hicks:

I enclose copy of your letter of the 23rd June last.

I have the original on file if you should desire it.

Yours sincerely,

W. E. RANEY

Andrew Hicks, Esq., M. P. P.

Encl.

June. 23rd 1920.

Hon. W. E. Raney,

Attorney General,

Parliament Buildings,

Toronto.

Dear Sir,

I have read the letter written to you by Mr M. C. Fox, M. P. P. dated the 22nd. inst. which you showed me to-day.

The statement that I made at London with reference to moneys being available to members of the Legislature to corruptly influence their votes on matters before the House at the late Session, was based entirely upon a remark made to me by Mr. Fox. Apart from that statement I have no information whatever as to any approaches having been made to any of the Legislature to corruptly influence his action in respect to any legislation before the House. No money was ever offered to me, and so far as I know, no money was offered to any other member of the House, and no improper proposal ever made in that connection either directly or indirectly.

I, of course, accept Mr. Fox's statement without reservation. Apparently the whole matter was based on a misunderstanding on my part of his remark.

Yours very truly,

(sd) ANDREW HICKS.

This is exhibit 1 referred to in the evidence of J. D. Taylor given before the committee on Privileges and Elections this 26th day of April, 1921. R. L. Brackin, chairman.

Kingsville, June 22nd, 1920.

Dear Sir:

In answer to your inquiry with reference to statements that have appeared in the press connecting my name with alleged offers of money in the matter of Amendment of the Beach Protection Act of last session I desire to say that no one ever approached me either directly or indirectly with any offer of money or other corrupt proposal in connection with this Legislation. Not only so but no one has ever approached me since I have been a member of the Legislature with any offer of money or corrupt proposal in connection with any matter whatsoever.

I think I can understand how Mr. Hicks received the impression which he appears to have. There was before the session of the Legislature litigation pending between the Township of Pelee Island and the Sandusky Company which has been engaged in removing sand under the waters adjoining Pelee Island, the Township authorities claiming that the operations of the Sand Company were causing the erosion of the shores of the Island. The company offered to pay to the Township the sum of \$50,000.00 in settlement of that action and the offer was refused by the Township Council. I recall mentioning to Mr. Hicks the fact that the company had offered \$50,000.00 to settle the matter. I had no thought that he would understand that I meant by that statement that any money had been offered to the members of the Legislature or that there had been anything improper in the proposal.

Yours sincerely,
(sgd.) M.C. Fox

HON. W. E. RANEY,
Attorney General,
Toronto.

Exhibit No. 3

London, Ont., March 7.—Ex-Ald. H. B. Ashplant, appearing as a representative of the Labor Committee opposing relief for the City Gas Company, created a stormy time in the City Council to-night by asserting that the company could and might bribe members of the Provincial Legislature to get its private bill enacted.

The Council by a vote of 9 to 3 decided to report to the Private Bills Committee that the city would deem as fair a service at cost agreement such as is in operation in Toronto, with the special provisions that capital stock should be limited to \$400,000 and dividends to ten per cent., with the stipulation that earnings in excess of that amount should be utilized from time to time to reduce charges to consumers, and that the rate at the outset should be advanced from 90 cents to \$1.25.

Mr. Ashplant raised objection to this agreement, and declared that the company would find it possible to set aside sums of money to influence the vote of members of the Legislature against the interest of the citizens.

Mayor Protests.

“Suppose McCrea should be given \$15,000 to get this through; suppose the company should take a block of this stock and distribute it among the members of the Legislature to get this through,” he commenced, when Mayor Little interjected a protest, declaring that he would not sit to hear the honour of the Provincial Legislators so impugned. Mr. Ashplant’s rejoinder was that he had not said that this would be done, but only that it could be done, and, he added, it is the most natural thing in the world if the company should do it.

John F. Thompson of the same deputation attempted to reinforce Mr. Ashplant’s arguments, but the Council refused by a vote of 7 to 4 to hear him.

Ald. Wilson attacks Ald. Ashplant.

Ald. J. C. Wilson, Chairman of the committee which negotiated the agreement, hotly condemned Mr. Ashplant’s address as the worst distortion of facts and figures he had ever heard. Ponzi had nothing on you Mr. Ashplant,” he declared.

"Your whole address has been purely and simply destructive, without one suggestion of a possibly better arrangement.

Votes 8 to 3.

The Mayor and the following Aldermen voted in favor of the agreement: Ald. J. C. Wilson, Ald. John Bridge, Ald. Harley, Ald. Brighton, Ald. Boss, Ald. Drake and Ald. A. Wilson. Three nays were recorded: Ald. Ashton, Ald. Wenige and Ald. Watkinson.—Toronto Globe, March 8, 1921.

Exhibit No. 4

London, Ont., March 8.—London wants an investigation of the statements of ex-Alderman Ashplant that members of the Legislature "could be bribed" regarding the London Gas Company Bill.

Mayor Little said to-night: "I most certainly think that the statements made by Mr. Ashplant warrant a rebuke from the Legislature. Because I felt his statements should not go unchallenged I protested and left the meeting. The same sort of loose talk has been allowed recently at several meetings conducted by these people, notably at the meeting concerning unemployment a week ago, when E. A. Pocock alleged that we had closed our industries and that I had taken up a collection to defray my election expenses. When Ashplant started the same thing before the City Council last night I protested and if I had been in the chair I would not have allowed him to speak another minute.

"He said that the agreement proposed with the Gas Company would give the company \$144,000 of bonus stock which had come from the consumers. He said there was nothing to prevent the company using it to secure this Legislation. When he said that the company might well give \$15,000 to Mr. McCrea, I at once left the meeting and did not hear the finish of his speech.

Deems Either Allegation Insulting.

Ald. Frank E. Harley said: "I followed very closely the astounding statements made by Mr. Ashplant. I read *The Globe* report, and those are his exact words, stated absolutely correctly. In fact it is time that Mr. Ashplant's wild statement reflecting alike on members of the Council and of the Legislature should be curbed. I considered it a serious insult to members of the Private Bills Committee, either the statement that the members might be bribed or the explanation that they are open to be bribed. In either case the allegation is insulting and demands an apology. Someone should stop his habitual insulting reference to people in public office.

Council Aggrieved as Well.

Ald. J. C. Wilson (Chairman of the special committee which negotiated the agreement with the Gas Company) said: "Absolutely the statement made by Mr. Ashplant in his remarks, that the Gas Company might use stock to influence the members of the Private Bills Committee, was unwarranted and insulting, and the action of the Mayor in protesting and leaving the Council chamber was justified. Mr. Ashplant's remarks were insulting not only to the members of the Private Bills Committee, but to the members of the Council, and that is what I replied in condemnation. I believe the Legislature should take what action is in their power to make Mr. Ashplant apologize and withdraw."

Time to Call a Halt.

Ald. John Bridge stated: "The statement as given in *The Globe* is correct.

If the Legislature has not arrived at a time to call a halt to loose talking such as the statements made by Mr. Ashplant before the City Council last night, then the Legislature deserves what it gets."

Declares Apology Due.

Ald. G. B. Drake stated: "Unqualifiedly what Mr. Ashplant said before the Council was exactly as reported, namely, that the members of the Legislature could be bribed by the Gas Company. The whole Council should have walked out with the Mayor. The council was in committee of the whole, With Ald. Ashton in the chair. If the Mayor had been in the chair, Mr. Ashplant would have been put out of the chamber. Such conduct is a disgrace to the City of London. Ashplant should make an apology to remove the stigma he has cast on the honour of the members of the Private Bills Committee and the House."

Pretty Broad Statements.

Ald. W. A. Wilson said: "Ashplant said that the members of the Legislature could or might be bribed, and he was making some pretty broad statements. He should apologize because he threw the reflection that the members of the Legislature could be bribed.

No Doubt of What he Said.

Ald. William Boss stated: "Mr. Ashplant said that the Legislature could be bribed by the Gas Company. There is no doubt of that. I was at the meeting and heard exactly what he said."

Took it as Reflection on Council.

Ald. B. F. Brighton said. "Ashplant made the statement that the Gas Company might use the Money for bribery to get its higher rates agreement through. No other meaning could be taken from his words. I took it as a serious reflection on the City Council. He has no right to cast unfair reflections on men in public office, and should apologize."

Wouldn't Contradict.

Ald. John Ashton (Labor member elected by the group represented by Mr. Ashplant's deputation) said: "I didn't take much notice of what he was saying; he is so confusing. If the others say he said it I wouldn't contradict them. He certainly must have said it.

Mr. Ashplant's Statement.

But Mr. Ashplant stated that he had been "misunderstood." He was asked by *The Globe* to tell what he believes he did say, and gave the following as his account

"I said that the bill proposed involved giving the City Gas Company \$144,000 of bonus stock free, and that any company having such facilities would find it possible, if they chose to look upon it as a matter of investment, to pay out commissions or fees to insure getting the measure through. I was arguing that if the company felt like doing it, it could give its solicitor a good commission or fee, in a perfectly honest, legitimate and straightforward way, to see that the bill would go through I meant that it could give such money to Mr. Graydon, or any solicitor, and then it occurred to me that Mr. Graydon did not speak for his client in the Legislature and that Mr. McCrea had spoken for the company, and I brought in the name of Mr. McCrea in a purely incidental way to show that he was not intended. I meant that such companies could give sums of money to three or four solicitors as is gen-

erally done for propaganda purposes. Such companies, when they do that sort of thing, don't know and don't care, very often, just how the money is spent, providing they get what they want."

How it Works Out.

Mr. Ashplant was asked how such propaganda usually works out in practise. "These agents," he explained, "mingle with the members of the Legislature and in private conversation they put forward their arguments and data and influence the members without the members being aware of it."

"At what did the Mayor take offence when he protested and left the Council Chamber?" Mr. Ashplant was asked.

"The Mayor gets mad at me on general principles," he answered. "I suppose that he took offence at my statement that the company could influence the members of the Legislature in its behalf by such legitimate propaganda."

Exhibit No. 5

A maximum rate of \$1.25 per 1,000 cubic feet for gas under a "service-at-cost" plan similar to that on which the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto operates was agreed upon by the City Council and representatives of the Company last night. The proposal will be submitted to the Legislature for ratification within a few days.

The plan was recommended by the special committee on gas after a two-hour conference with the company in the afternoon. There was another lengthy and warm discussion at the council meeting, in which H. B. Ashplant joined, as representative of the Citizen's Committee.

Will Examine Books.

Under the proposed settlement the city will accept the company's capitalization at \$400,000. Of this \$256,000 is paid-up and \$144,000 is to be transferred from profits and loss account. The council is to have the right to examine the company's books through its own auditors or other experts it may choose. No further stock is to be issued except for plant and main extensions, and any stock issued is to be sold publicly. A reserve fund representing five per cent of the company's assets is to be created to which all repairs and renewals will be charged. Any premium from the sale of bonds is to accrue to this account as well as any operating surplus. Whenever the surplus in this fund is equal to a gas rate of five cents the rate is to be reduced by that amount. The company is to be allowed a ten per cent. interest on the capitalization and \$2,500 for the payment of a board of directors of which the Mayor is one member. Any deficit in operation is to be met from the reserve fund and may be paid back out of earnings. The city is to be permitted to purchase immediately at par \$5,000 worth of stock.

"Pretty Steep," says Wenige.

The council went into committee of the whole to consider the proposition which was outlined by Ald. Cameron Wilson, chairman of the special committee on gas. He pointed out that the three basic clauses of the agreement were the amount of capitalization to be allowed, the return on it, and the rate. Ald. Wenige pointed out that the increase was 40 per cent. He thought it "pretty steep." Ald. W. A. Wilson said that Toronto was already paying that rate. Ald. John Bridge said other cities were paying more. Ald. Watkinson suggested sending the proposal to the people for indorsation. Ald. Bridge and other members said there was no

time, as it had to come before the Legislature in two weeks.

Opposed by Deputation.

H.B. Ashplant opposed the basis of settlement. The intention of the Legislature was that the consumers and not the City Council should be consulted, and this had not been done, he contended. The ten per cent return on \$100,000 was equal to six per cent on half a million. He gently inquired what was to prevent Charles McCrea, the sponsor of the Gas Bill, and other members of the private bills committee of the Legislature being given shares in the company to insure the passing of the bill.

Mayor Withdraws.

Several Aldermen voiced their objection to this, and Mayor Little said he would not sit and listen to such statements. He withdrew from the Council chamber until Mr. Ashplant finished his address. Mr. Ashplant argued that there would be nothing wrong in the possibility he had suggested, but firmly held that it was a "possibility." There was no reason to change from the 90 cent rate, he said.

Ald. Cameron Wilson replying to the address, characterized it as the greatest distortion of facts and figures and figures it had ever been his pleasure to hear.

Equal to Ponzi.

Ponzi had nothing on Ashplant, the Alderman said. Mr. Ashplant's whole address had been nothing but destructive criticism. He characterized his handling of figures as childish, and placed in the same class his suggestions that the matter be submitted to a popular vote or a mass meeting. If the council was not capable of representing the people it should resign. He believed that the seat of Government was still at the City Hall.

"No; it's the next door," said Ald. Bridge, referring to the Labor Temple.

"It's at the Chamber of Commerce," suggested Mr. Ashplant.

At this juncture J. F. Thompson, secretary of the Citizen's Committee, rose to join in the debate. Mr. Thompson's oratical efforts on previous occasions were evidently recalled by the city fathers, as they watched the hands of the clock creeping slowly toward the hour for adjournment.

Refused him an Audience.

"All right; we'll give you five minutes," said Ald. Ashton who was presiding. "No, put it to a vote," demanded others.

Four Aldermen favored giving him an audience; six indicated that they could struggle along without his help.

"They're afraid of him," was Mr. Thompson's caustic comment. "I'm not," retorted Ald. Cameron Wilson who was one of the quartet which offered to hear him. "Well, well we can appeal unto Cæsar," was Mr. Thompson's closing shot.

A vote on the proposal showed seven aldermen and the Mayor in favor of it, and three aldermen opposed to it. The latter were Aldermen Watkinson, Wenige and Ashton. Those in favor of it were: Aldermen Cameron Wilson, Wilson, Harley, Bridge, W. A. Wilson, Drake, Boss and Brighton.

Exhibit 5 referred to in the evidence of Herbert H. Perry. R. L. Brackin, chairman.
London Advertiser, March 8, 1921.

Exhibit No. 6

Detroit, Michigan,
U. S. A.

Mr. J. D. Taylor, M. P. P.
Warton, Ontario.

Dear Sir:—

I was handed some days ago a copy of the *Toronto Star*, in which I saw something has been said in the Government about a remark that you made about being offered a sum of money to use your influence for the appointment of a certain man to a Government position. Now I have thought that you might be placed in a somewhat awkward position over the matter, as I do not suppose you know my name, but I am the man that called on you at your home near Warton and amongst other things I did suggest that you might very easily make \$1,000 in this way, but I am pleased to say that you absolutely refused to accept any money consideration for your influences in any way.

I may say further that I had never met you until the day of our conversation and I knew nothing whatever about you, but during the election I heard conflicting stories about you and so I took the trouble to call on you for the sole purpose of testing you out as to your honesty in Political matters.

I was not asked by any person to see you or to make any offer to you, but did so entirely of my own bet.

I thought it only fair that I should write you on this matter, but hope my action will get you into any trouble.

I am now living in Detroit having left Owen Sound last fall.

W. Wilcox

Exhibit No. 7

Toronto, June 28th, 1920.

Dear Mr. Burnaby;—

My attention has been drawn to the press accounts of your statement made at Kettleby on June 23rd., in which you asserted that you had been offered a bribe of \$1,000. a year to use your influence in favour of the appointment of some unnamed person as Purchasing Agent by the Government. You will, of course, understand the seriousness of your statement. This position has not yet been filled and it may be that among the applicants is the very man who offered you this bribe. It therefore becomes necessary that you should give whatever information you have in this matter to the Government, in order that we may be on our guard. You will be doing less than your duty if you endeavor to shield the one who has been guilty of such an offence. I would thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very sincerely.

R.W.E. Burnaby Esq..

Jefferson, Ontario.

Toronto, June 29th, 1920.

Dear Mr. McCutcheon;

You no doubt saw Mr. Burnaby's reference to somebody who had offered him a bribe of \$1,000 for his influence in securing the position of Purchasing Agent.

Mr. Drury wrote Mr. Burnaby asking him for the name of the party, and he now advises me over the phone that the initials and the last letter of the surname are "J. S. F—y." This will sufficiently identify the party to enable you to ascertain whether he is on the list of applicants for the position.

You may if you please let me hear from you after you have made a search.

Yours sincerely,
(sgd.) W. E. Raney.

J.M. McCutcheon, Esq.,
Civil Service Commissioner.

Toronto, July 2nd. 1920.

Hon. W. E. Raney
Attorney General,
Parliament Buildings.

Dear Sir;—

I have your letter of June 29th, and wish to advise that there is no name on the list of applicants for the position of General Purchasing Agent with the initials and last letter of the surname "J.S. F—y."

Yours truly,
(sgd.) J.M. McCutcheon.

Toronto 5th. July, 1920

Dear Mr. Burnaby,

A few days ago I sent you a letter with reference to a statement made by you at Kettleby on the 23rd. of June, but up to the present time I have not had the pleasure of hearing from you.

In case my communication has been mislaid or gone astray I am forwarding you another copy and will be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

R.W.E. Burnaby Esq.,
U.F.O. Headquarters,
Toronto, Ontario.

THE
UNITED FARMERS OF ONTARIO.
Head Office; 130 King Street, East.
Toronto, Ont.

July 10th. 1920.

The Hon. E. C. Drury,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Mr. Drury,—

In reply to yours of June 28th. and July 5th., would say that immediately upon receiving yours of June 28th I telephoned your office but found you were away. I gave the information which you desire to Mr. Raney and he promised to convey it to you.

Yours faithfully,
(sgd.) R.W.E. Burnaby

B-M.
Not part of Exhibit 1.

ONTARIO.
DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Toronto, July 13th, 1920.

Memo. for Mr. Grant:

I enclose for your file a copy of the memo. sent Mr. McCutcheon and a copy of his reply.

Encl.

April 29-21. This file of correspondence is filed as Exhibit 1. on the examination of R. W. E. Burnaby. R. L. Brackin, chairman.

INDEX

TO THE REPORT AND EVIDENCE, ETC., OF THE COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

ARMSTRONG, JOHN, examined	136-7
ASHPLANT case, the	499-506, 539-41, 565
ASHPLANT, H. B., examined	509-23
AUTOMOBILE, purchase of	315-27-44
" Exhibit	419
BIGGS, F. C. examined	225-44
Bonds, redemption of	40-67
BRIGHTON, Alderman, examined	537-39
BURNABY, R. W. E. examined	546-52-62
" " Letters	552-4
" " Exhibits	572
CALLAHAN, EDWARD J., examined	409-13
CARTY, ARTHUR C. examined	499-505
Clemency, applications for	105
DAWSON, WILLIAM, examined	380-409
" " Exhibits	420
Documents, mislaid	104-5, 109-123
DRAKE, Alderman, examined	532-4
DUNLOP, A. E. examined	165-6
ELLIOTT, OSCAR, examined	344-80
ELY, R. H. examined	143-55
Exhibits	419, 440, 565-50, 572
FAIRBAIRN, R. P., examined	159-65, 166, 178-80
Fisheries, mislaid letters	104-5, 109-123
" Exhibits	440
FLAVELLE, J. D., examined	105
FOX, M. C., examined	• 507-8
Furniture, purchase of	159-65, 166-77
Game Law	124
Exhibits	432, 440
HAIGHT, WALTER L. examined	124-131
HALL case, the	545, 564-5
HARDING, R. T., examined	67-104
HARLEY, Alderman, examined	523-25
HICKS, ANDREW, examined	489-96, 498
Exhibits	570
HOGARTH, GEORGE, examined	244-263
JEROME, M., examined	327-33, 337-44
KNIGHT, CHARLES H., examined	141-3
LEE, F. G. examined	166-78
LITTLE, MAYOR, examined	525-32

MATHEWS, WALLACE, examined	293-99
Minutes and Proceedings—Pub. Accounts	23-39
" " " Privileges and Elections	473-77
MOORE, GEORGE, examined	131-36
Moving Pictures	344
Exhibits	420
MOWAT, J. M., examined	307-15
McCULLOGH, J. W. S., examined	315-27, 333-37
MCDONALD, D., examined	109-23
McLEAN, W. A., examined	264-72
McNAUGHTON, NEIL, examined	151-52, 155-9
ONTARIO TEMPERANCE ACT	105, 307-15
Exhibits	422
PARKIN, L. C., examined	180-93, 299-306
PENNY, HERBERT H., examined	505-6
PEPALL, A. H., examined	40-67
Privileges and Elections, Report	469-72
" " Minutes and Proceedings	473-77
" " Statement of cases	478
" " Counsel engaged	481-2
" " Argument	482-89, 496-9
" " Evidence	489
Public Accounts, Report	21-2
" " Minutes and proceedings	23-9
Public Institutions, purchases	165-80
RANEY, W. E., examined	562-4
Rehabilitation Report	1-17
REYNOLDS, R. A., examined	193-225, 272-86
ROGERS, J. E. examined	104-5, 109
SPENCER, THOMAS, examined	137-43
SWAYZE-MACBRIDE case	544-5
TAYLOR, DAVID J., examined	541-3
" " exhibits	571
Timber Enquiry	67-104
" " exhibits	454
Truck purchase	180
" " exhibits	413
WILSON, W. A., examined	534-37
WOODWARD, PERCY, examined	286-93

