

PEEL'S

Editorial

Peel's Weekly Sales

Have you money—our ads appear in the London Advertiser every Friday offering quality merchandise at money-saving prices.

We endeavor to please our customers by courteous service, by moderate prices and by offering quality goods. It is our constant aim to make trading at Peel's more both pleasant and profitable.

Shopping Bags
Well made,
Regular \$1.25,
69c

Market Baskets
Well made,
Regular \$1.25,
69c

Talking Dolls
Say Ma, Ma,
Regular \$1.25,
99c

Fuse Plugs
Regular 10c
3 for
19c

Gillett's Lye
Regular 1c
2 tins for
25c

Sani-Flush
Regular 35c
tin for
27c

Magic Baking Powder
1-lb. tin
33c

75c Glass Flower Vases
Near cut
25c 35c

Free! Free! Patent Long Enamel Kitchen Fork
A household necessity, given free with \$1.00 purchase

Famous English Toffee
10c bars
4 bars
25c

Big Sale of Matches

EDDY'S MATCHES
Large 15c boxes
on sale
for **34c**

Eden Brooms
Full size
90c value
for **79c**

Castile Soap
Regular 50c cake,
7 for
25c

Butter Dishes
Sugar and Creams
to \$1.00 value
35c

Blades for Gillette Razors, dozen
59c

Try Peel's Pure Coffee
50c
pound

Will Forms
Make your own will, save lawyer's fees
25c

400 Pairs Babies' Rubber Pants
(seconds)
Pull-over Style
small, medium, large, special
3 pair for
25c

Big Sale of Glass Baskets

PEEL'S

EULER BELIEVES POLICIES SHOULD BE MORE ELASTIC

North Waterloo Member Intimates Changes May Come In Tariff.

WOODS CRITICIZES
Refers To Fielding's Proposals As a Rich Man's Budget.

Canadian Press Despatch.
Ottawa, May 18.—Members of all parties joined yesterday in further house debate on budget. The Progressive amendment, said Hon. S. F. Tolmie, minister of agriculture, in the former government was interesting from the fact that Progressives had taken plans from the Liberal platform of 1919 to amend a Liberal budget of 1923. Dr. Tolmie when first heard of the amendment thought there might be excitement at the vote. But on reading its terms, he came to the conclusion—so he told laughing friends—that the division would be as exciting as waving a red flag at a dead bull.

Expressing a personal view, W. D. Euler, Liberal, said Waterloo told the house he had "very little confidence in platforms anyway." He did not think that a government should be asked to go as far as what might be the "ill-digested plank" in any platform. For himself, he could say frankly that the 1919 Liberal platform was not in the public interest. He did not believe that the government responsible to all the people, whether it be the tariff or anything else, had not however, believed that in his budget speech, Mr. Fielding had intended to convey the impression that the tariff was unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians.

For the Progressives, R. J. Woods, of Dufferin, Ontario, criticized the budget as a rich man's budget. He urged that the United States, with its high tariff had taken care of farmers. Farm implements entered the United States from why then should the Canadian government not do the same thing in Canada?

W. J. Lovie of Macdonald, Manitoba, observed that farmers were getting a good deal of advice nowadays about the advantage of mixed farming. But experiments in his community had shown that mixed farming was not a panacea for all ills. Before adjournment, Joseph Archambault, Liberal of Chambly-Vercheres, said some suggested amendments to the income tax. He would increase the exemption for children from \$300 each to \$500, and totally exempt the head of a family of five. Further, he would place a higher tax on unearned than on earned incomes.

Findlay Makes Threat.
J. W. Findlay, (Progressive, South Bruce) observed that he had been buoyed up with the hope of getting something in the way of tariff reductions from this "so-called Liberal government." The time might well come, he added, when the Liberal "oh-oh," when we may be prompted perhaps from a spirit of revenge to join our forces with the Conservative group from which we have no hopes of getting anything.

Debate on the budget and the Forke amendment was resumed in the house by R. K. Anderson (Conservative, Halton) who said that the present budget appeared to be drafted not so much for the purpose of dealing with the exigencies of the present financial situation, as for political effect. It was colorless and featureless. The financial minister, who in opposition had been a free trader or a tariff-for-revenue advocate, had become a protectionist now that he was in power. Dr. Anderson asked why this change had taken place.

Anderson Criticizes.
Dr. Anderson said that instead of reducing duties the Liberals had increased them on an average. Also in making a statement in the course of his speech that there would be no further reductions, the finance minister had practically accepted the principle of protection. It was true that Mr. Fielding had changed the name of the tariff from "high protective" to "moderate tariff for revenue," but that did not alter its nature. There were other converts to protection on the government side, including the prime minister and the minister of agriculture.

He asserted that he was not a high protectionist. He believed the automobile industry in Canada needed less protection. The minister of finance might very well have left off 10 per cent on the imported article, and brought the protection down to 25 per cent. In regard to tariff "finality," Dr. Anderson thought there was some doubt regarding the finance minister's statement whether the limit of tariff reduction had been reached. Dr. Anderson believed, however, that the industrial people of Canada would regard his speech as an encouragement to feel safe in going ahead in extending their plants and increasing their manufacturing output.

Dr. Anderson expressed himself as convinced that the time had come when the yearly budget should be balanced and a sinking fund started with which to reduce the national debt. Every effort should be made by the country to meet her responsibilities. The minister of finance had, however, taken no step in this direction. Mr. Fielding preached a good doctrine at times, said Dr. Anderson, but he did not practise. He should attempt to make his budget balance.

Refers To Reciprocity.
The offer of reciprocity was something which the people of Canada had turned against in 1911. If reciprocity were brought about it would necessitate changing the whole transportation system of the Dominion.

Referring to immigration, Dr. Anderson said he would not admit people from Russia until that country had recovered its sanity, otherwise there would be serious trouble from the teaching of Bolshevism in Canada.

In conclusion, he couldn't vote for the amendment because of the reciprocity idea in it; neither could he vote for the budget; he would, therefore, vote against both.

R. J. Wood (Progressive, Dufferin) thought it was impossible for this or any government to find a panacea for all the ills of the present time, but he blamed the government for failing to reduce the tariff. Rural people at any rate were also strongly in favor of reciprocity, and he commended the government's action in

reviving this matter. Like other governments, the present one had a dual policy, one while in opposition and another while in office.

Mr. Woods said that the reduction of the maximum tax on checks to \$1 marked the budget in that respect as a rich man's budget. Wealthy men issuing large checks were favored by the change, whereas the great body of people issuing smaller checks received no benefit. The U. S. with its high tariff, had nevertheless taken care of the farmers, said Mr. Woods.

W. D. Euler (Liberal, Waterloo North) felt that the budget, while not perfect ought to meet with general approval. In view of the conflicting interests of Canada's different sections it behooved everyone to yield something for the common good.

Euler Defends Program.
Mr. Euler said he had little confidence in the making of platforms. He did not believe that responsible government should necessarily be asked to accept anything else. He was upon them by people in various parts of the country, whose suggestions were based upon political expediency as much as anything else. He was of the opinion personally, that the platform of 1919 should not be permitted to shake the government in the matter of tariff or anything else.

That the Progressives had not really anticipated any great change in the tariff and would have been very well satisfied if the minister of finance had not made the statement with regard to tariff stability, was stated by Mr. Euler as his conviction. However, he did not believe that Mr. Fielding intended to convey the impression that the tariff was unchangeable as the law of the Medes and Persians.

Mr. Euler declared that manufacturers of the east had in many cases found it very difficult to get along during recent years. There was necessity for seeing "the other fellow's point of view."

In theory many men were free traders, but they admitted that free trade at present was impossible. The tariff was a protection no matter where or how it was graded. Mr. Forke had criticized the budget in that it did not carry out the 1919 Liberal platform. At the same time Mr. Forke did not offer as an amendment the platform of the Progressives which called for free trade with Britain in five years.

The budget offered reciprocity in farm products with United States. Yet Mr. Forke put forward the old 1919 reciprocity agreement which many people of Western Ontario had voted against in 1911.

Referring to the Crow's Nest Pass rates legislation, Mr. Euler said that Liberal members of the committee had helped in putting the agreement against their own interest.

He deprecated the "holier than thou" attitude of some Progressives and also the statement of D. F. Kellner (Progressive, Edmonton) that both old parties took orders from the "big interests." Mr. Euler declared that Mr. Euler declared he would not support any government which he thought was taking orders from any big interests.

Preventing the tariff, Mr. Euler said he believed in a tariff which would allow industries to build up without allowing them to become monopolies or combines. At present farmers and manufacturers were under a common difficulty in lack of Canadian markets to dispose of their products while the United States tariff wall was retained as at present.

Tariff Magnified.
The tariff was magnified out of all proportion, said Mr. Euler. He took the ground that the government should not pay attention to the demands of a single occupational group at the expense of all other classes. He thought the budget was the best compromise which could be obtained and therefore would support it.

Mr. Euler advocated the working out of a logical, reasonable method of taxation. He had never believed in the tax on checks, receipts, and many of the irritating excise taxes. He held that there were three sources of money each year were being lost by marketing scrub cattle. In dairying, too, the breeding up of the cows should be as much as possible from those who could afford to pay; the turnover sales tax. He thought it would be the part of wisdom for the federal, provincial and municipal authorities to get together and to try to do away with some of the duplications in taxation.

Turning to the National Railways, Mr. Euler expressed the greatest optimism in their future.

The business on the government lines was increasing by leaps and bounds, because the people were beginning to realize that it was in their own interests to use their own railways.

"I believe that in less than five years, the National Railways will pay not only operating expenses, but also fixed charges," said Mr. Euler. He advocated a revaluation of the whole system taking as a basis the value of an efficient system without duplication of lines which would do the work performed now by the National Railways. When this was done he would charge the system only with fixed charges pertaining to such a system. When the system was paying operating expenses and these fixed charges, whatever profits were left should be applied to decreasing rates. The present system should not be loaded down with all the obligations of the roads prior to their being taken over.

The budget debate was continued in the evening by Hon. S. F. Tolmie, (Conservative, Victoria City). It was satisfactory, Mr. Tolmie said, that the opinion was gaining ground that Canada must have a certain amount of protection particularly in view of the customs tariff imposed by other countries and the difficulty of making up the revenue without customs duty. Furthermore, there was the matter of competition. Today Canada was meeting competition from the other side of the Pacific with cheap transportation to Canadian shores. Japan had a splendid steamship service, and was able to place her goods in Canada in some cases cheaper than they could be manufactured at home.

Urges Improvement.
Dr. Tolmie proceeded to urge the necessity for Canadian farmers to build up and improve. Vast amounts of money each year were being lost by marketing scrub cattle. In dairying, too, the breeding up of the cows should be as much as possible from those who could afford to pay; the turnover sales tax. He thought it would be the part of wisdom for the federal, provincial and municipal authorities to get together and to try to do away with some of the duplications in taxation.

Turning to the National Railways, Mr. Euler expressed the greatest optimism in their future.

The business on the government lines was increasing by leaps and bounds, because the people were beginning to realize that it was in their own interests to use their own railways.

"I believe that in less than five years, the National Railways will pay not only operating expenses, but also fixed charges," said Mr. Euler. He advocated a revaluation of the whole system taking as a basis the value of an efficient system without duplication of lines which would do the work performed now by the National Railways. When this was done he would charge the system only with fixed charges pertaining to such a system. When the system was paying operating expenses and these fixed charges, whatever profits were left should be applied to decreasing rates. The present system should not be loaded down with all the obligations of the roads prior to their being taken over.

The budget debate was continued in the evening by Hon. S. F. Tolmie, (Conservative, Victoria City). It was satisfactory, Mr. Tolmie said, that the opinion was gaining ground that Canada must have a certain amount of protection particularly in view of the customs tariff imposed by other countries and the difficulty of making up the revenue without customs duty. Furthermore, there was the matter of competition. Today Canada was meeting competition from the other side of the Pacific with cheap transportation to Canadian shores. Japan had a splendid steamship service, and was able to place her goods in Canada in some cases cheaper than they could be manufactured at home.



UPTON SINCLAIR.

noted American novelist, is under arrest in Los Angeles, California, charged with criminal syndicalism and unlawful assemblage in consequence of his activities on behalf of 600 striking longshoremen, who have been jailed.

which, he understood was provided for, but never had been enforced.

In addition to encouraging the sheep breeding and wool industries, the former minister of agriculture advocated encouraging the industries which were engaged in the manufacture of wool cloth in Canada. If the manufacturer was able to do business he would create a steady demand for wool, and Canada's sheep population would soon increase.

Joseph Archambault (Liberal, Chambly-Vercheres) said he proposed to discuss the budget resolutions in the committee stage. He did wish, however, to make some suggestions on the income tax, since Mr. Fielding had intimated that there might be a separate bill covering income tax changes. He urged that the exemption for children be raised from \$300 to \$500, and that the head of a family of five children be totally

exempt. This, he said, would be a means of encouraging larger families and overcoming race suicide. Since he had introduced his resolution on this question he had received petitions of indorsement signed by 15,000 heads of families.

He urged that income from inherited capital should pay the highest tax; second, should be income from accumulated capital, and the lowest taxation should be placed on salaries of persons.

Findlay's Criticism.
Mr. Archambault declared that many wealthy individuals receiving large incomes did not pay tax because their incomes were derived from dividends of corporations. The tax was collected from the corporation. If a company made sufficient profit to pay the income tax and also declared large dividends, the dividends should be taxed.

J. W. Findlay (Progressive, South Bruce) said that he was most disappointed in the budget coming from a so-called Liberal government. He had always claimed to be a Liberal in the true sense of the word, but he was far from being able to support this budget. Even the supporters of the government seemed to find difficulty in expressing strong approval of the budget in their speeches. He had hoped for some substantial tariff reductions from a government which had been elected on the tariff platform of the 1919 Liberal convention. The time would come when the people would again have an opportunity to express their views, but next time they would know that the government had abandoned its pledges and divorced itself from the platform adopted in that year.

The debate was adjourned by L. H. Martell (Liberal, Hants).

BANKING COMMITTEE.
Ottawa, May 18.—Two contentious sections of the bank act occupied the Commons' banking and commerce committee yesterday, and only one of them was finally passed, the other being still under discussion when the committee rose for the day.

The discussion was much less acrimonious than in the morning, and one amendment proposed by a western member was accepted. This was the proposal by D. F. Kellner, Progressive of Edmonton, that bankers' liens on cattle should not apply to animals exempt from seizure under provincial law. At the morning sitting, Mr. Kellner had offered an amendment to apply a similar provincial exemption to all bank mortgages, but this was rejected, the chief objection expressed being that in Alberta the homestead of 160 acres was exempt.

At the afternoon sitting another western amendment was rejected. This was a provision suggested by G. G. Coote (Progressive, Macleod) that G. Coote (Progressive, Macleod) that liens on seed grain should apply only to the crop and not to other property of the borrower. After this amendment was defeated, however, the chairman, Hon. A. K. Macleod, proposed a conference between Mr. Coote and the bankers to draft an amendment to meet the situation brought up by Mr. Coote.

A new amendment to deal with the complaint made by insurance companies, that banks were influencing the placing of insurance was introduced by J. J. Hughes, Liberal, Prince Edward Island. The new amendment takes the place of another on the same subject proposed by Mr. Hughes. He stated that the amendment now proposed was acceptable to both the banks and the insurance companies.

The committee then proceeded with the discussion of Section 88 regarding bank loans and bank liens. G. G. Coote (Progressive, Macleod) moved an amendment to the subsection relating to seed grain loans. This amendment limited the banks lien to the seed and crop and to an amount not greater than the loan. The lien, said the amendment, shall not be taken upon any other property of the borrower.

"I object to a sacrificial form being in the act," said Major J. C. Power (Liberal, Quebec South). Mr. Coote explained that some local bank managers had taken security in crops for loans that seed loans, not legally be done. "But it is done," put in Alfred Speakman (Progressive, Red Deer). Hon. H. H. Stevens (Conservative, Centre Vancouver) pointed out that the existing clauses regarding seed grain loans had been put in the act at the request of the west. Besides it would be easy to get around the proposed amendment by a power of attorney.

The committee then proceeded with the discussion of Section 88 regarding bank loans and bank liens. G. G. Coote (Progressive, Macleod) moved an amendment to the subsection relating to seed grain loans. This amendment limited the banks lien to the seed and crop and to an amount not greater than the loan. The lien, said the amendment, shall not be taken upon any other property of the borrower.

HAVE YOU TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF THIS BED OFFER?

A SIMMONS BED, SPRING AND MATTRESS

FOR ALMOST THE PRICE OF THE BED ALONE

Don't Miss This Chance! Only a Few Outfits Left.

See Our Windows

SEE WINDOWS

Over Thirty Outfits Sold During First Day's Selling Wednesday

This outfit consists of a Simmons Pure Felt Mattress, with roll edge, handles for turning, and beautiful ticking; Genuine Simmons Bed in walnut finish and square tubing, and a Simmons Coil Spring, all for the price generally asked for a bed alone.

30

SENDER IT TO YOUR HOME

Balance Small Weekly Payments

This Outfit Worth \$50 On Sale Now For Only

\$37.50

RUSH SPECIALS!

BIG \$400 WALNUT SUITE, buffet, table, china cabinet and diners. For... **\$200**

\$300 ITALIAN WALNUT SUITE, inlaid buffet, table diners and table. For... **\$179**

\$100 COIL SPRING, 3 ft. 6 in. For... **\$4.95**

\$75 OLD ENGLISH HALL RACK, full with mirror. For... **\$39**

\$15 PARLOR CHAIR, mahogany veneered back. For... **\$7.50**

\$225 MASSIVE ITALIAN OAK DINING-ROOM SUITE, heavily finished. For... **\$129**

\$116 WALNUT FINISH BED-ROOM SUITE, dresser, chiffonier and bed. For... **\$109**

\$40 FUMED OAK BED, full size. For... **\$19.50**

\$38 WHITE ENAMEL WOOD BED, full size. For... **\$15**

\$175 TAPESTRY CHESTER-FIELD, chair and rocker, daisy veneered. For... **\$95**

\$150 HAPPY THOUGHT COMBINATION RANGE, coal or gas. For... **\$95**

\$40 BLUE VELOUR EASY ROCKERS. For... **\$25**

RUSH SPECIALS!

\$35 SOLID MAHOGANY BOOK STAND. For... **\$19**

\$80 WALNUT DESK, full top. For... **\$35**

\$125 FELT MATTRESS, 4ft. 6 in. wide, slightly marked. For... **\$6.50**

\$65 CHINA CABINET, walnut finish. Queen Anne design. For... **\$39**

\$75 DINING-ROOM SUITE, in fumed elm, buffet, table, china cabinet and diners. For... **\$109**

\$80 GENUINE LEATHER COUCH, massive golden oak frame. For... **\$37.50**

\$125 DRESSER AND BED TO MATCH, in walnut finish. For... **\$89**

\$125 LARGE WALNUT FINISH DRESSER, with large top. For... **\$29**

\$80 WALNUT FINISH PERCHER. For... **\$37**

\$65 NEAT WALNUT ENAMEL MEDICINE CABINET. For... **\$6**

\$65 LARGE REED BABY CARRIAGE. For... **\$39**

DRAPERY BARGAINS

Nottingham Lace Curtains only, pair... **\$1.95**

50 pieces Scrim, yard... **15c**

\$5.00 Marquisette Curtains, pair... **\$3.50**

These Specials on Sale To-morrow.

THE ONTARIO FURNITURE CO.