27147

657

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS

of the

1st. SESSION OF THE 21st. LEGISLATURE

OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

1944

Volume 1

DEBATE ON THE MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SPEECH OF THE HONOURABLE THE LIEUTENANT- GOVERNOR AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION

Name	Party	Page
1. TAYLOR, Mr. R. Hobbs,	- Prog. Cons. (Huron)	1
2. McDONALD, Mr. J.L.,	- Prog. Cons.	11
3. JOLLIFFE, Mr. Edward B.,	- C.C.F.	22
4. DREW, Hon. George A.,	- Prog. Cons.	59 142
5. NIXON, Mr. Harry C.,	- Lib.	167
6. MacLEOD, Mr. A.A.,	- Lab. Prog.	192
7. MACPHAIL, Miss Agnes,	- C.C.F.	237
8. ROBERTS, Mr. A. Kelso,	- Prog. Cons.	286
9. OLIVER, Mr. Farquhar,	- Lib.	306
10. WILLIAMS, Mr. Arthur,	- C.C.F.	327
11. STEWART, Mr. H.H.,	- Prog. Cons. (Kingston).	358
12. SALSBERG, Mr. Jos. B.,	- Lab. Prog.	405
13. DALEY, Hon. Charles,	- Prog. Cons.	435
14. DICKSON, Mr. W.A.,	- Lib.	448
15. MITCHELL, Mr. Geo. H.,	- C.C.F.	483A
16. MURDOCH, Mr. William,	- Prog. Cons.	491
17. BELANGER, Mr. Aurelien,	- Lib.	530
18. DENISONY Mr. William,	- C.C.F.	544
19. HALL, Mr. Stanley L.,	- Prog. Cons.	587
20. McKING, Mr. H. A. ,	-Lib.	589
21. HANCOCK, Mr. Leslie,	-C.C.F.	608
22. GOODFELLOW, Mr. Wm. A.,	-Prog. Cons.	632
23. LOCKHART, Mr. George,	-C.C.F.	641
24. DONNIE, Mr. Ney,	-Lib.	655
25. LEAVENS, Mr. Bertram,	-C.C.F.	660
26. BENNETT, Mr. George,	-C.C.F.	673
27. MURRAY, Mr. T. F.,	-Lib.	691
28. ANDERSON, Mr. Garfield,	-C.C.F.	711
29. HUNT, Mr. Stanley J.,	-Prog. Cons.	712
30. MILLARD, Mr. C. H. ,	-C.C.F.	725
31. FOSTER, Mr. Dana H.,	-Prog. Cons.	835

---oOo---

Topics	Page
Regarding withdrawal of Restrictions on sale of Beer - Hon. George A. Drew	849
Regarding cooperation between Dominion Government and Provincial Government - Mr. M.F. Hepburn	854
Re cooperation between Liquor Control Board of Ontario and Dominion Government - Mr. A. St.Clair Gordon.....	861
Third reading of Bill "An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory matter referring to Race or Creed" - Hon.Mr.Blackwell	863
Third reading of Bill "An Act to confirm Tax Sales" - Hon. Mr. Dunbar	864
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor assents to Bills (34)..	864
Debate resumed	865
Mr. Dana H. Porter (St. George):	
Re general opening remarks	866
Re assent to Bills	866
Re Planning and Development Bill	867
Re building trades	869
Re automobile industry	869
Re different classes of law	869
Re Criminal law	870
Re law defining commercial transactions	870
Re law governing sale of beer	871
Re Collective Bargaining Act	873
Re Labour Code	875
Re Ontario Bargaining Act	878
Re Collective Bargaining	882
Re varied professions represented in House.....	886
Address to be presented to the hon. the Lieut.-Gov.....	887
House divided	888
Adjournment	888

---o0o---

THE TWENTY-FIRST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

- - - - - - - - - - -

I N D E X E S O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Topics	Pages
Wednesday, FEBRUARY 23, 1944:	
Motion - Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, Mr. Taylor (Huron)	1.
ADDRESS: Seconding Motion - Mr. McDonald	11.
Thursday, FEBRUARY 24, 1944:	
Petition - City of Brantford	20-A
City of Fort William	20-A
L'Union St. Joseph du Canada	20-A
Townships of Anson, Hindon and Minden	20-A
Corporation of County of Essex	20-A
Board of Regents of Victoria University ..	20-A
Corporation of the county of York	20-A
Victor Hoetz, Constantin Van Cool and .... Leopold Constandt	20-A
Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec..	20-B
Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie.....	20-B
Corporation of the Township of York	20-B
Motion to appointment Mr. Patterson (Grey North) as Chairman Com. Whole House - Hon. Mr. Drew	20-B
Motion to appointment Select Committee to name Standing Committees - Hon. Mr. Drew	20-B
Motion respecting reporting Debates - Hon. Mr. Drew..	20-C
Introduction of Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act ".....	20-E
A Bill intituled "The Wartime Housing Act"	20-F
A Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act"	20-F
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act"	20-G
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act.	20-G
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act"	20-H
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Law Society Act"	20-H
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act	20-H
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Trustee Act	20-I
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Surveys Act"	20-I
Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act	20-I

Topics.	Pages.
Bill intituled "The Mortgagors' and Purchaser's Relief Act, 1944".....	20-J
Bill intituled "The Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944".....	20-J
Bill intituled "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944".....	20-K
First order, a resumption of addresses in reply to the speech to the throne.....	20-K
Thursday, FEBRUARY 24, 1944:	
Edward B. Jolliffe.....	22
Letter to Mr. King.....	72
Letter from Mr. King.....	73
Friday, FEBRUARY 25, 1944:	
Motion to appoint a Select Committee to direct expenditure re estimate for art purposes.....	76
Motion to appoint a Select Committee to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library.....	76
Second order; second reading of bill No. 23, "An Act to amend the weed control Act".....	77
Second reading of the bill. Third order; second reading of bill No. 24, "An act to amend the justices of the peace Act"	78
Second reading of the bill. Fifth order; second reading of Bill No. 26 "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act"	81
Second reading of the bill. Seventh order; second reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Tax".....	82
Second reading of the bill No. 30 Ninth order. "An Act to amend the Law Society Act".....	85
Eleventh order: second reading of bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act".....	86
Fourteen order; second reading of bill No. 33, "The Mortgagors' & purchasers' relief Act, 1944".....	88
Fifteenth order; second reading of bill No. 36, "The Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944.....	88
Monday, FEBRUARY 28, 1944:	
re introduction Bill "An amendment to the Rural Power District Services Charge Act"; - Hon. Mr. Challies.....	91
Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development"; first reading of the bill.....	92
Bill intituled "An amendment to the Executive Council Act"; first reading of the bill.....	92
Letter to Prime Minister of Canada.....	92
Letter from Minister of Finance.....	93
Letter from Prime Minister.....	96
Second order; the house in committee on Bill 23 "An Act to amend the Weed Control Act".....	101
Bill No. 24 "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act".....	102

Topics. Pages.

House in committee on Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses Registration Act".....102

House in Committee on Bill No. 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act".....103

House in Committee on Bill No. 30 "An Act to amend the Law Society Act.....107

House in Committee on Bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act".....110

House in Committee on order No. 35, "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944.....110

House in Committee. Bill No. 36, "The Abitibi Power & Paper Company, Limited Moratorium Act, 1944..110

Bill number 25, "The Wartime Housing Act".....126

Second reading of the Bill No. 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".....127

Second reading of Bill No. 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act".....130

Second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act".....130

Second reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act to amend the Survey Act".....131

Second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act to amend the Public Land Act".....131

Order No. 16, second reading of Bill No. 37, "The Holland Marsh Road Act, 1944.....132

Tuesday, FEBRUARY 29, 1944:

Petition - Corporation of the Township of Scarborough..134
Corporation of the Town of New Toronto.....134
Corporation of the Township of North York...134
Corporation of the City of Welland.....134
City of Ottawa Public School Board.....134

Reports of Committees.....134

Introduction of Bills.....135

Bill intitaled "An Act to provide for the Central Filing & Publication of Regulations" (First reading of the Bill).....135

Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act" (First reading of the Bill.....136

Bill intituled "An Act to amend the apprenticeship Act"; first reading of the Bill.....137

Third reading of Bill "An Act to amend the Weed Control Act".138

Second reading "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act"138

Third reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act".....141

Third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act".....141

Third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act" 141

Topics. Pages.

Third reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to amend the Mortgagors' & Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944..... 142

Third reading of Bill No. 36, "The Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944..... 142

Wednesday, MARCH 1st, 1944:

Bill intituled, "Sugar Beet Subsidies Act 1944". First reading of the Bill..... 189

Second reading of Bill No. 39 "An Act respecting the Department of Planning & Development..... 190

Second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Council Act"..... 190

Second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing & Publication of Regulations"..... 191

Second reading of Bill number 43, "An Act to amend the apprenticeship Act"..... 191

Resuming of an adjourned debate on a motion of consideration of the speech of the honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session..... 192

Thursday, MARCH 2, 1944:

Second & final report. Committee on Privileges and Elections 252

Committee on Education..... 252

Committee on Private Bills..... 253

Committee on Public Accounts..... 253

Committee on Printing..... 253

Committee on Municipal Law..... 254

Committee on Legal Bills..... 254

Committee on Agriculture & Colonization..... 254

Committee on Fish & Game..... 255

Committee on Labour..... 255

Resolution No. 4 re rural power - Mr. Challies..... 261

Resolution No. 5 re subsidies for township roads - Mr. Doucett..... 262

Second reading of Bill No. 30 "An Act to amend the Law Society Act"..... 263

The House in committee on Bill No. 25, "The Wartime Housing Act"..... 265

House in Committee on Bill No. 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act"..... 270

House in committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act"..... 270

House in committee on Bill No. 33, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act"..... 271

House in committee on Bill number 34, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act"..... 275

Topics	Pages
House in committee on Bill number 37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944.....	273
House in committee on Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development".....	274
House in committee on Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils".....	280
House in committee on Bill number 41, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations" - Mr. Blackwell.....	281
Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of the speech of the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of this session.....	286
Bill intituled "An Act respecting municipal health services", first reading of the bill.....	360
Bill entituled, "An Act to prevent the publication of discriminatory matters referring to race or creed", first reading of the bill.....	361
Third reading of Bill No. 30, "Enacted to amend the Law Society Act".....	362
Third reading of Bill No. 25 "The Wartime Housing Act".....	363
Third reading of Bill No. 29 "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act".....	363
Third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act.....	363
Third reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act".....	364
Third reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act".....	364
Third reading of Bill No. 37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944".....	364
Third reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development".....	365
Third reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils Act".....	365
Third reading of Bill number 41, "An act to Provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations.....	365
Government notice of motion number 6.....	366
Government notices of motion number 7.....	366
House in committee on Bill number 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".....	368
House in Committee on Bill No. 43, an Act to amend the apprenticeship Act.....	384
Second reading of Bill No. 44, "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944".....	395
Petition - City of Ottawa.....	403
Town of Leaside.....	403
Third reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".....	404

Topics. Pages.

Third order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for the consideration of the speech of the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.....405

Tuesday, MARCH 7, 1944

Petition from Corporation of City of London 456
Corporation of City of Toronto 456
Township of Monaghan 456

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting Ontario Research Foundation" - Hon. Mr. Drew 457

First reading of the Bill 457

Introduction of Bill "An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act" - Mr. Blackwell 457

First reading of the Bill 457

Introduction of Bill "An Act to amend the Municipal Act" - Mr. Brown 458

First reading of the Bill 458

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting City of Ottawa Public School Board" - Mr. Acres 458

First reading of the Bill 458

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting L'Union St. Joseph du Canada" - Mr. Laurier 458

First reading of the Bill 458

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the Township of North York" - Mr. Mitchell 459

First reading of the Bill 459

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the City of Brantford" - Mr. Strange 459

First reading of the Bill 459

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the Townships of Ansen, Hinden and Minden" - Mr. Scott 460

First reading of the Bill 460

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough" - Mr. Murphy 460

First reading of the Bill 460

Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the Town of Leaside" Mr. Murphy 460

First reading of the Bill 460

Welcome to member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. A.W. Downer) Hon. Mr. Drew 462

Reply - Rev. A.W. Downer
Description of conditions in Italy 463
Re morale of men in Italy 464
Desirability of mail sent to men 465
Re Red Cross Campaign 465
Re Conditions in England 465

Topics — Pages

Re Children of British Isles 466
Re Telegram's British War Victims' Fund 467
Re Duration of War 467
Re Leadership given in Canada to members of Armed Forces 468

House reverts to Reports of Committees 469

First report of Committee on Standing Orders - Mr. H.A. Stewart (Kingston) 469

Report Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario re differences in cost of power - Mr. Challies 470

Bill "An Act to amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act" - Mr. Challies 471
Re: Removal of Service Charge 471
Re Importance of Hydro in Farm 471
Re History of Hydro 472
Re Explanation of Rate Structure 472
Re Amalgamation Programme 473
Re Finances regarding Hydro 475
Re comparison of rates 476
Re Universal use of Hydro 476
Re Refrigeration 476

Second reading of the Bill 479
Re Service charge - Mr. Wismer 483
Re action of "The Georges" 484
Re Griffith Farm 484
Re Educational grant 485
Re Interest on Farm Loans 485
Re Social Services 486
Re Hospitalization 487
Re "Special Privileges" 487
Re Tag Days 489
Re Vocational Training 490

Mr. William Murdoch (Essex South) 491
Re Riding of Essex South 491
Re Decentralization of Industry 491
Re Productivity of Essex South 492
Re Development of Essex South 493
Re Present Day economic Problems 495
Re Development of Natural Resources 497
Re General remarks 498
Re Juvenile Delinquency 499
Re Educational facilities 500
Re helping so-called "little people" 500
Re spiritual up-lift 501
Re value of education 501
Re Basis of all Legislation - Education 501
Re New Canadians - labour 502
Re Development of Individuals 503
Re Striving towards common goal 504
Re Utilizing all our talents 504

Mr. A. Belanger - motion to adjourn - carried 506

Wednesday, March 8th, 1944.

Reports by Committees
Re adoption of Commission on Colonization 507

Motions: "Downer" added to certain Committees 507

Introduction of Bill "An Act Respecting the Township of York" - Mr. Jolliffe 507

Topics — Page

Introduction of Bill "An Act to Amend the Transportation of Fowl Act" - Mr. Goodfellow 508
First reading of the Bill 508

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL:
Re Editorial in Toronto Daily Star, March 7,..... 508
Re effect of Editorial 509
Re Liquor Control Board duties & problems 510

House resolved into Committee of the whole - Mr. Drew 511

4th Order, Bill No. 36, "An Act to Amend the Rural Power District Service Charge"..... 512
Re expense of meters & transformers - Dennison..... 513
Re Service charge - Johnston 513
Re Hydro rates - Challies 514
Re Grey County Federation of Agriculture request..... 517
Re Reply to Federation of Agriculture - Challies 518
Re Division of Hydro 520
Re abolition of service charge 520
Re readjustment of rates - Drew 520
Re operating profits 1943 521

Sections 1, 2, 3 carried - Committee rise & report certain Bill..... 522

House resumed 522
First reading of the Bill 522
Re Hydro Electric Advisory Council 522
Re Clarification of Act 524
Re Ontario Municipal Electrical Association 525
Re Advisory Council - Challies 525
Re " " Services & fees - Drew 527
Re " " - Millard 530
Second Reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act to Amend Hydro Power Commission"..... 531
Second reading of Bill No. 47 "An Act Respecting Ont. Research Foundation"- Drew..... 531
Question re Section 3 of the Act - Dennison 533
Reply, Section 18 - Drew 533
Re scope given Ont. Research Foundation - Drew 534
Re cooperation between National Research Council and Ontario Research Foundation 535
Re co-ordination between Department of Planning & Development and Ontario Research Foundation 536

Debate Resumed - MR. AURELIAN BELANGER:

Re opening remarks to Speaker 538
Re Speech to Throne 540
Re Address of Mr. Williams (Ontario) 540
Re " " Mr. MacLeod (Bellwoods) 542
Re French-Canadians 543
Re " " attitude toward Br. Commonwealth .. 546
Re spiritual features of addresses 549
Re marriages 551
Re Juvenile Delinquency 553
Re birth control 554
Re Religious education in the schools 555
Re Teaching of French in schools

Topics	Page
House Resumed .O..P..W.....	564
Mr. William Dennison:	
Re National unity	565
Re socializing farm machinery.....	565
Re public health plans	566
Re Sewage disposal facilities	572
Re fuel problem	574
Re Hydro	574
Re Measures brought by U.F.O.	576
Re Changing of Conservative Party's name	578
Re Annual appointment of C.C.F. leaders.....	579
Re Names given to C.C.F.	579
Re "Public Opinion"	584
Re Hymn to the Glory of Free Enterprise	586
Mr. Stanley L. Hall:	
Re opening remarks	587
Re Dept. Planning & Development	588
Mr. Ross McEwing:	
Re general remarks	590
Re length of term of Parliament	592
Re agriculture	593
Re stockyards	595
Re Lands and forests	597
Re Education	600
Re Christianity in Education	601
Re Training schools	602
Re Agriculture	604
Re Farm Comforts	606
Re limiting speeches to forty minutes	607
Mr. Leslie Hancock:	
Re general remarks	608
Re Conservation of Natural resources	609
Re soil conservation	609
Re conservation service	614
Re water control	618
Re grass fires	619
Re Department of Planning & Development	620
House adjourned	621
Thursday, March 9, 1944	
Orders of the day: 1st Order - Passing of Bill No. 38 "An Act to amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act".....	624
House resolved into Committee of the Whole	625
Third Order, Bill No. 44 "An Act to amend the Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944".....	625
Sections 1, 2, 3 & 4 form part of Bill	625
Fourth Order - "an Act to amend Power Commission Act".....	625
Sections 1 & 2 (Sec. 2 as amended) 3, 4, 4 & 6 form part of Bill	626
Fifth Order - Bill No. 47, "An Act respecting Ontario Res. Foundation".	626
Sections 1 and 2 form part of Bill	627
Re subsections A & B of Sec. 3, relationship to Dept. of Planning	627
Sections 3,4,5,6,7, & 8 form part of Bill	628
Discussion re section 9	628

I N D E X X

Topics	Page
House resumed	631
7th Order - 2nd reading of Bill 48, "An Act to amend the Commissioners for taking affidvaits Act" - Blackwell	631
Mr. Wm. A. Goodfellow (Northumberland) debate resumed	632
Re general opening remarks	632
Re Legislature's domination over municipal affairs	635
Re Hydro	636
Re Agriculture	636
Re proposed County committee	638
Re Municipal health services	638
Re Education	639
Re post-war planning	640
Mr. George Lockhart (Rainy River)	
Re general opening remarks	641
Re Agriculture	642
Re packing plants	643
Re Lands and Forests	645
Re Mineral resources	645
Re Tourist industry	646
Re Agriculture	647
Re Farm contribution to food	648
Re Methods of Farming	651
Re health of live stock	651
Re electricity	652
Re farm debts - loans	653
Mr. Roy Downie (Lambton East)	
Re Agriculture	656
Re farm labour camps	657
Re Hydro	659
Re returned soldiers	659
Re elections	660
Mr. Bertram E. Leavens (Woodbine):	
Re statement in Evening Telegram	660
Re " " Orillia Packet & Times	661
Re Security of farm homes	662
Re Welfare and Social services	663
Re Children's allowances & Mothers' allowances	665
Re Old age Pensions	669
Re Blind	671
Re Point of Order - H. Conner	673
Mr. George Bennett (Windsor-Sandwich):	
Re general complimentary remarks	674
Re future of province	675
Re future of education	677
Re past events	679
Re spending of money at present	680
Re Speech from the Throne	682
Re Five-point system of Education	683
House adjourned to 8:00 P.M.	684
Mr. George Bennett (Resumes)	
Re 25-point system	685
Re appointment of outside Committees	686
Re Hydro in politics	687
Re unemployment	688
Re maximum wages	689
Mr. T.P. Murphy (Renfrew South)	
Re general remarks	691
Re comments on address of Mr. George Bennett	692
Re Education	696
Re Religion in schools	697
Re immigration in Canada	699

Topics	Page
Re Lumbermen and Timber	702
Re difference between organized and unorganized territory	706
Re Reforestation	707
Re Hours of labour	710
Mr. Garfield Anderson (Fort William):	
Re Labour and Industry	712
Re teachers' salaries	713
Re Highway equipment and wages paid	714
Re new provincial parks	715
Re Timber policy	718
Re resolution passed by Joint Committee of Councils of Port Arthur and Fort William	719
Re exportation of wood	722
Mr. Stanley J. Hunt (Renfrew North):	
Re general remarks	722
Re South Renfrew conditions	725
Re future planning	726
Mr. Charles H. Millard (York West)	
Re general remarks	728
Re legislation of province	732
Re York West	734
Re election campaign	735
Re Government's program	737
Re Education	738
Re School tax	739
Re Education	743
Re unemployment	744
House adjourned	744
Friday, March 10, 1944.	
Introduction of Bill "An Act Respecting the County Agriculture Committees"	745
First report of Provincial Auditor	746
Re newspaper article on St. Lawrence Waterways	747
Re newspaper articles on proposed health plan	748
Re Ontario Government's cooperation with Dominion Gov't	749
Third reading of Bill No. 44, "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act"	753
" " " " " 42, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act"	754
" " " " " 47, "An Act Respecting the Ontario Research Foundation"	755
House resolved into committee of the Whole	755
Bill No. 43 "An Act to amend the Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act"	756
Sections 1, 2 and 3 form part of Bill	756
House resumed	757
Report certain Bill as amended	757
Ninth Order, 2nd reading Bill No. 46, "An Act to Prevent the Publication of discriminatory matters referring to Race or Creed"	757
Amendment to above Act	757
Remarks re above Act ....Premier Drew	758
Objections to amendment - Murphy	766

Topics	Page
Remarks re racial discrimination - Mr. Alex. MacLeod..	767
Remarks re racial discrimination Act - Mr. Millard....	770
Second reading of Bill No. 46	771
" " " " "An Act to confirm tax sales"...	771
Debate resumed	771
Mr. Charles H. Millard (York West):	
Re cooperation between Federal Government and Ontario Legislation.....	772
Re welfare	773
Re Old age pensions	774
Re Ontario Hospital service for feeble minded ...	776
Re stockyards	777
Re value of public enterprise and development....	779
Re Oil resources	781
Re Highway development.....	782
Re post-war employment	782
Re letters to members of overseas armed forces...	784
Re hours of labour, holidays	787
Re labour code	790
Re post-war problems	793
Re markets for manufactured products	794
Re press statement re higher standard of living..	796
Re free enterprise	797
Re private enterprise	800
Re school tax	801
House adjourned	804
Monday, March 13th, 1944	
Introduction of Bill "An Act respecting Victoria University" - Mr. Porter	805
First reading of Bill "An Act respecting Victoria University....	805
Introduction of Bill "The Cheese & Hog Subsidy Act, 1944" - Hon. W.G. Thompson	806
First of reading of Bill "The Cheese & Hog Subsidy Act"	806
Introduction of Bill "An Act to amend Credit Union's Act"	806
First reading of Bill " " " " " "	807
In re article Toronto Daily Star re election procedure..	808
Discussion - Hon. George A. Drew	808
Report by Chief Electoral Officer	810
Discussion re Election Act - Mr. Jolliffe	816
Orders of the Day	816
Re removal of restrictions on Sale of Beer - Hon. Mr. Drew.....	817
Discussion re removal of restrictions in above	817
Letter - Rt. Hon. Mr. King to Hon. Mr. Drew re Alcoholic beverages - March 2, 1944	818
Letter Hon. Mr. Drew to Rt. Hon. Mr. King re Alcoholic Beverages - March 10, 1944.....	821
Re arranging conference Dominion-Provincial Govts. Hon. Mr. Drew.....	825
Third reading Bill No. 48 "An Act to amend the Commissioners for taking affidavits Act"	825
House in Committee .....l.....	826

Topics	Page
Re Bill No. 46 "An Act to Prevent the Publication of discriminatory matter referring to Race and Creed".....	826
Amendment to Bill 46 - Hon. Mr. Frost	826
" " " 46 - Mr. Murphy	827
Discussion on amendment - Hon. Mr. Blackwell	828
" " " - Mr. Murphy 829	
" " " - Mr. Jolliffe	830
" " Sec. 2 - Mr. Strange 831	
" " amendment - Mr. Salsberg	832
Seventh Order "An Act to confirm tax sales".....	834
Adjournment	835
Tuesday, March 14, 1944.	
Reports by Committees	836
Report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders - Mr. Stewart (Kingston)...	836
First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills	837
Introduction of a Bill "An Act to Amend the Milk Control Act"- Mr. Geo. Lockhart	838
First reading of the Bill " " " " " " .	838
Introduction of a Bill "An Act Respecting the Guardianship of the Dionne Quintuplets" Mr. Blackwell	839
First reading of the Bill " " " " " ...	839
Purpose of the Bill " " " " " ...	839
Letter from Mr. Dionne to Hon. Mr. Blackwell.....	841
Introduction of a Bill "An Act respecting the Township of North Monaghan" -Goodfellow	841
First reading of the Bill " " " " "	841
Introduction of a Bill "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie" - Mr. C. Overall...	842
First reading of Bill " " " " " ".	842
Introduction of a Bill "An Act respecting the Ottawa Civic Hospital" - Mr. Laurier.	842
First reading of Bill " " " " "	842
Introduction of a Bill "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto" - Mr. D. Porter.....	843
First reading of Bill " " " " " "..	843
Introduction of a Bill "An Act respecting the County of York" - Mr. G.H. Mitchell..	843
First reading of Bill " " " " " ...	843
Introduction of a Bill "An Act respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec" - Mr. Nixon	844
First reading of Bill " " " " " ..	844
Arrangement for voting of Armed Forces in Haldimand-Norfolk by-election - Jolliffe 845	

Topics	Page
Regarding withdrawal of Restrictions on sale of Beer - Hon. George A. Drew	849
Regarding cooperation between Dominion Government and Provincial Government - Mr. M.F. Hepburn	854
Re cooperation between Liquor Control Board of Ontario and Dominion Government - Mr. A. St.Clair Gordon.....	861
Third reading of Bill "An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory matter referring to Race or Creed" - Hon.Mr.Blackwell	863
Third reading of Bill "An Act to confirm Tax Sales" - Hon. Mr. Dunbar	864
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor assents to Bills (24)..	864
Debate resumed	865
Mr. Dana H. Porter (St. George):	
Re general opening remarks	866
Re assent to Bills	866
Re Planning and Development Bill	867
Re building trades	869
Re automobile industry	869
Re different classes of law	869
Re Criminal law	870
Re law defining commercial transactions	870
Re law governing sale of beer	871
Re Collective Bargaining Act	873
Re Labour Code	875
Re Ontario Bargaining Act	878
Re Collective Bargaining	882
Re varied professions represented in House.....	886
Address to be presented to the hon. the Lieut.-Gov.....	887
House divided	888
Adjournment	888

---o0o---

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Speaker: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Wednesday, February 23, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
FEB 24 1944
RECEIVED

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reports of Committees?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day?

THE CLERK: The First Order, consideration of the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, opening this Session.

Mr. R. HOBBS TAYLOR: (Huron) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

> That an humble Address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:-
>
> To the Honourable Albert Matthews,
>
> 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 Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved by Mr. Taylor (Huron) seconded by Mr. McDonald:

> That an humble Address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:-
>
> To the Honourable Albert Matthews,
>
> 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 Your Honour has addressed to us.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. HOBBS TAYLOR: (Huron) Mr. Speaker, when yesterday I witnessed the birth of this Legislature, the twenty-first of this Province, I was reminded that it was at a time when the world was in the throes of bitter strife, when even the outlook on life was changing, and when the flower of our manhood, - many of them -- have offered the supreme sacrifice, and many are and many will and throughout the history of mankind, never before has the horror of war touched every portion of this world in which we live; and when I realized that the thought is heavily upon us that the war is still to be won, and that throu gh sacrifices, cruel ones, we of Canada must realize, only too well, unfortunately, the meaning of "blood, sweat and tears", and that this country will realize as never before, when the healthy boys move out and the wounded boys move in, that the days are moving quickly to a final phase of this world at war. And then, when we realize that victory -- a word that we turn to as if it was costing so little, and that the sacrifices to produce that word "victory" may not mean much to all of us as a body politic, to us civilians, we must feel that the war is just starting.

When Germany and Japan are fighting on their own soil, they will fight more viciously because, look at Russia, where even the children fought to save their fatherland, and we must not allow ourselves to lose the war here by thinking that it is almost won.

The word "Ortona", and many other names of battles yet to be fought, will live in the hearts of Canadians with the same sense of sacrifice that Vimy, Paschendaele and Cambrai did in

the last war.

I trust that the members of the Legislature feel as I do, that in any programe brought to our consideration, will see the response of one mind, and one unity of purpose. Surely the price of victory is a common price, and a common sacrifice.

Yesterday, as I listened to the speech from the throne, I was glad to see -- and I feel that the people of this Province begin to realize -- that when a party and the leadership of that party realize that it must put into effect as soon as possible the twenty-two points upon which they appealed to the electorate, it has shown and will show the sense of responsibility of office, with its duty to implement the speeches when on the hustings.

It is clear to the Government, and supporters of that Government, that to-day the common man, the man on the street, in the small store, the farmer on his farm, and the man no matter what field of occupation he may be in in the national economics will never submit again to the practices of a small and powerful group to tap the life blood of this country, the economic life blood of this country, by these small groups.

Mr. and Mrs. Ordinary Citizen are concerned largely, I feel, with the humanities of life. Mr. Ontario wants the advantages to be gained in education in all its phases, no matter where he lives, either in the cities, or the towns, the hamlets, or the rural communities. He also wants up-to-date medical procedures, no matter where he lives in our fair province, and, above all, he wants the assurance of a job now and in the future, and at a return from which he can secure these things.

No place on this earth can give a better standard of living than this province of ours. But I feel that the majority of us do not think it is necessary to destroy the years of

constructive labour to accomplish this. The Government programe, as viewed from the speech from the Throne, yesterday, realized this; in fact the essence of this thought is the motive power by which they produced that speech.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture, if given a chance, can stand on its own feet, and I was pleased to note, as a representative coming from a constituency largely made up of farmers, that the Government realized the cardinal fact that remote control from a man behind a desk, even if he sat in the east block of the Parliament buildings, alone was not sufficient to stimulate this impetous which is needed for agriculture, and I was pleased to see that the Government of the day, and the Department of Agriculture realized that the man who tilled the soil, the man who worked the land, that he and his brethern should be consulted and from that consultation the proper stimuli for the betterment of this industry could be arrived at.

The man who tills the soil, the farmer, is entitled to an income on a par with the great contribution that he has made, and is making to the national economics of this country. Agriculture cannot be made attractive to the bright young minds of this country if they see their parents slaving day by day, as they had to do in the past, and receiving a hand-out in the form of subsidies from any Government, and, Mr. Speaker, I feel that agriculture and this country as a whole needs the attraction of the bright young minds of this country.

It is also gratifying to see that the Department of Agriculture has a definite concrete plan, to consult these men of the soil, and to give leadership and to receive leadership from them for the benefit of this great industry.

I commend the Minister of Education for the realistic view he has taken of this problem of education. I commend him for the sincerity that he has shown in the reorganization, up to date, in the Department of Education, by appointing such men as he has, which augurs well for the advancement of the

teaching profession and learning in the Province of Ontario.

Too long has the system of education been a relic of the horse and buggy days. It is a simple truth which bears repeating and repeating, that the strength of a nation and of this Province depends to-morrow upon the teaching they receive to-day.

I was also pleased to see that that great enterprise of the Province of Ontario, Hydro, is under consideration, and that the Government has realized that it is at the cross-roads, and that with a courageous policy, this generator of power to the factories of this Province, that which gives light and comfort to our homes, and is intended to be the chore-boy of the farm -- as I say with a courageous outlook and a courageous policy it can become of greater service to the people of our Province than it has in the past, even though that has been great.

That changing policy was manifested last January First by the unification of rural hydro rates. As an initial step, that is good. It brings us more nearly to the dream of those who conceived and founded this great enterprise. It will bring closer that dream of thirty years ago, when every rural home in the Province of Ontario will have the benefits and comforts that to-day can be found most anywhere in the land. The municipalities have been pledged to support this great enterprise, and I feel that the people of this Province will commend any policy that realizes this and that if they have supported the policy, they are entitled to equal advantages from such an enterprise.

To-day, Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the possibility of unemployment, and why should we not be? Never again should unemployment be allowed to recur. True, the lessons which we should kn ow from the great depression of the thirties, that mismanagement and fear and lack of courageous handling of the nation's affairs contributed largely to that depression, and I was very pleased to note that the different departments of

this Government realized that this must be so, that to-day is the time to plan, so that we do not have a recurrence of unemployment.

To illustrate that thought amongst the departments of Government, I will mention Highways, where they have a workable plan in black and white, not any ethereal, effervescent theory, but a plan spreading over four years that is ready to be put into operation to prevent in a measure, and in a large measure, the possibility of unemployment in that period of transition from war economics to peace economics. This plan can be put into operation the moment the red light changes to green. This plan, as mentioned yesterday, can absorb many millions of hours of man power.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, may I for a moment come to the field of health. We all received a shock when we read the published account of those who sought to serve in the armed forces in this war. That terrific -- and no other word can explain it but "terrific" -- percentage of rejections on grounds of medical unfitness, was shocking, in the very flower of manhood, in that age group which we thought represented the highest in health and vigour of our youth. From this comes the urge that it is the duty of governing bodies, Provincial and Dominion, to do something about the slipping of the national health, indeed, to do something must be done. This Legislature undoubtedly will receive for our consideration many suggestions to overcome this. Many of them will be unworkable; many of them, I expect, will be but dream fancies.

Back of all this we have the peculiar condition in Canada which we must face in regard to this problem. Canada is a nation that must conserve its population more than any other country in the world.

We have three and one third population to the square mile -- the lowest in the world. Even though this country has opportunities unheard of from a health stand-point, we have

already become a nation of older people. Has any health scheme or health insurance, if you like, the hope of changing this staggering condition, so staggering that even from a materialistic stand-point, the loss of Canadian economics in wage earnings or salaries, if there happen to be any, in agriculture. The combined earning power, combined returns for the delivery of goods, for another twelve months, will hardly make up the annual loss to the economics of this country through illness and sickness. It is futile to arrange medical care to heal an individual, and then return him to his employment only to have him return again with the same sickness. Any scheme that will help this situation must get after the causes of it. We must see that there is balanced nutrition in all our classes of this country. There must be a cleaning out of our slum districts; there must be an improved housing scheme; we must have an improved and forward looking industrial hygiene, and, besides all that, we must concentrate on a health propaganda, educati nal efforts, and so forth, toward the prevention of diseases. That is the picture in Canada to-day. Let us be realistic in any scheme that may be put forward, realistic to the resources that we have at our hands to make use of in the formation of a health programe, because if we do not, we defeat our own aims.

We have not enough medical men in this country to-day, or even in the pre-war years, where the populati n was much greater than to-day, to render all the services that we would like to have immediately done. Nor have we the hospital accommodation necessary to make available any health scheme that would cover all the ills. This is a realism that we must take into consideration. It takes ten years to make a Doctor, but I do not think that is any reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should not tackle this problem and I submit that any health insurance scheme, or medical service shceme, call it what you like, must

be built up with a basic project first; it must be built up piece by piece, much the same as a jig-saw puzzle, and let the enduring thought remain in everybody's mind that the type of service we need in this country to cure the ills that I have mentioned, must be the type of service which will contend against these things. The type of service must be of the highest. The peop le, and all of them, no matter where they are, must receive the latest and best that medical science can produce, and no scheme that does not live up to these ideals of service will accomplish its aim.

This scheme must be built in such a way that it will attract the most brillian minds, not only of the medical profession , but of the sister professions associated in combating and curing diseases.

In the difficult days that lie ahead, we will have many panaceas advanced, and in the vanguard of these, I am afraid that the suggestion may be that by a twist of a political pen a vista of Utopia with all its social securities will be immediately opened up to us.

Now then, any country that ~~predicates~~ predicates a way of living based on social security alone is already half dead. This country was not built by men who considered security first, but by men who demanded only opportunity and a place to work and to endure, and to accomplish.

SEVERAL HON MEMBERS: Hear, Hear..

MR. R. HOBBS TAYLOR: Let us have all the security possible. Yes. But not the security that ties our hands and drives us all to a dull level of mediocrity. What I cannot believe is that the wisdom of the people ever sprung from half-baked judgements, derived from plausible orators, from people who say after they listen to these plausible orators, "He promises well, therefore I will accept the promises as true". That is not the wisdom of democracy. This is purely the result of being spoon fed, and the result w ll be the loss of freedom

of the people. The progress of Canada, as a whole, and its groups in the past half century has not been exceeded by any other country considering the percentages of population anywhere on this earth but it has been built up by free enterprise, and this should be sufficient evidence to practical people, at least, that the Canadian economics is sound, and favourable to further progress. First of all, Mr. Speaker, in spite of modern distractions, our past revolved around the home, and I say to business men, educators, politicians, economists, all and sundry, that this fact must be recognized. Things that favour the home will endure. Things that work against the home will fail.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. R. HOBBS TAYLOR: A true conception of the rising standard of living starts there -- food, clothing, shelter, furniture and the necessities of a home, a garden and a car, schools, libraries and churches, a hospital, theatres, parks, newspapers, books, reading, telephones, electric lights, roads, sidewalks, and even trees. The common things that serve to make secure the home life. This is the standard of Ontario. Manifestly, a rising standard of living, taking into consideration economic factors is a sham. Ten per cent or twenty per cent more wages would satisfy no one if the whole structure of society slipped to a lower level of character and intelligence. Few Canadians there would be who would rather have an advance of wages under those circumstances, but I feel that most Canadians would rather have a ten per cent improvement in the quality of goods, in honesty, in good-will, in political sincerity, and in national unity, than even a forty per cent advance in wages. Throughout the years it has been abundantly clear that by the very nature of our free enterprise system, there has been brought to us the necessities and the comforts required for life. And as each year went by this has happened by increasing quality and quantity. But these are not the things, sir, that are necessary to raise the standard of living. They will not do.

Neither the re-distribution of wealth, nor any other governing boards, will enable a man to make up his mind to be more considerate, more courteous, less selfish, more friendly, and more public spirited. The first important Canadian problems are not wheat and lumber, but and increased scale of living, better thinking and finer aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is before us. We have the privilege of wasting the years with futile wrangling amongst different pressure groups, each group hoping to unload its burdens on the other, but the other group having as many burdens to carry as the particular pressure group which is trying to unload. But we have this alternative, to go forward joyfully together in happiness and prosperity as a nation, indeed, and in truth.

(Page 11 follows)

Mr. J. L. McDONALD (STORMONT): Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion before the house I would like to refer first to a period back seventy-seven years ago. I represent the riding of Stormont, and seventy-seven years ago the honourable John McDonald became the first prime minister of Ontario. He also represented the County of Stormont.

Now, may I say that I consider it a great honour to have the privilege of seconding the motion before the house. The County of Stormont is one of a union of three counties, Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry, which is noted for several things, amongst them being one of the outstanding regiments of highlanders in Canada.

The capitol town of the three counties is the town of Cornwall, which is situated on the bank of the mighty St.Lawrence River, just below the Long Sault rapids.

Situated in the town are a great number of industries, , including the rayon industry, the great firm of Cortauld's, the Howard Smith Paper Company, the Canadian Cotton, the C. I. L., and several other industries. They also have a daily newspaper, which has a very wide circulation, and I may say that in the post war period we have lots of room for any new industries which would care to settle there.

Now, as I represent a county the chief industry of which is agriculture, I will devote most of my time to agriculture.

The County of Stormont is mostly agriculture, and the chief branch is the cheese production. We make more cheese per acre in the County of Stormont than any other county in the Dominion of Canada, and as cheese is an export article we are very much interested in any plan for foreign markets.

Beside cheese we have large whole-milk market in Montreal, and for concentrated milk.

In passing I might say also that in the year 1942 the all American champion bull calf was exhibited by two farmers from Stormont County, and also at the export food show, the champion bacon hog came from Stormont County.

Now, agriculture at the present time is in a fair state, but it

is not in as healthy a state as it should be. Having been connected with farmer organizations for the last ten or twelve years I have had the experience of hearing a great deal about agriculture, both from the practical side and the technical side, and from 1930 to 1939, during the depression, farm prices were very disastrous. My experience has been that agriculture was looked upon as a secondary thing in Canada. I disagree with that, for if you have not the proper agriculture in Canada, you cannot get prosperity. Here you have one of the greatest markets for your manufactured products, right here in Canada.

In order to put my argument across, I will give you some instances of what the farmers were facing. To start with, we have two economics; we have an economic for agriculture, and an economic for the other industry. The economic for agriculture is that the price structure is based on supply and demand. That economic is quite all right when there is any demand, but when the demand is not there, it is very disastrous to agriculture.

I might tell you of an incident I had at one of our conventions, just to show the handicap we were under. One of our speakers gave us a great lecture on public markets, and on the subject of supply and demand, and he went at great length into this system being the best system in the world -- the market. Of course, he was not a farm man.

An hon. member: He would be sure to know.

MR. McDONALD: When he finished his remarks I had the audacity to ask him a question, and I asked him when he returned home to his employer would he suggest to his employer that the employer advertise or call for tenders every month for his position and that he accept the lowest tender, and that he tender for the position. He said "no I will not". He did not think it was right, but still he thought the farmers should be placed in that position. That is one of the things we have accomplished. I am pleased to say that we are making some headway along that line.

Then again we have what we call the "arm-chair farmer". He is in about the same class as a fire-side general in this war. He comes to all our farm conventions. We always seem to have him; I do not know why, but he always seems to be present, and he then takes a piece o

paper and a pencil and in no time at all he can take a farm and can produce a hog, and make a very good profit on it, or he can take a cow -- anything at all -- and make a big profit. But there is one thing that always struck me about that procedure, and that is that these gentlemen never bought a farm, nor farmed themselves.

Now, some of these gentlemen here with us, some of the officials in our agriculture department, both here and at Ottawa, may be doing the same thing. We have some who are better at lecturing than giving a practical demonstration. I think in any agricultural policy there should be more practical demonstration and less on the technical side. The farmers of Ontario, as a whole, are as intelligent as any other group of people---

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

MR. McDONALD: Of course some of them may be below par, but you will find that in any group in the province, it does not matter where you go.

Now, there is another point in connection with the two economic systems, upon which we were lectured recently and which we consider is one of the causes of the poor prices we were getting. That was the loss of the market in Britain for our bacon and cheese. Naturally we did. There was a reason for that. In 1930, any farmer producing milk or cheese got the sum of fifty-two cents per one hundred pounds for his milk, and along about that time -- I cannot just recall the date -- if he had a hog, he got five cents a pound. Now, if the farmer would have produced an abundance of hogs and cheese, and held the market in Britain, there would have been only one outcome, but it would not have been a very great consolation to that farmer if somebody, after he had all his little possessions set out on the road, had patted him on the back, and said, "Mister, you have accomplished a grand thing; you have held your market." -- but he had lost his home.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: Who took that step?

MR. McDONALD: Another reason why our position is not better than it is at the present time is that in the last number of years we have taken from the soil, and have put nothing back. I believe in

the last sixteen years something like over one million acres has gone out of production. That means that during the last number of years we just could not afford to put back into the soil some of the minerals and plant food which we should have put back. That it seems to me is a subject to which we might give a good deal of study. We may be late in instituting any plan, but it is better late than never, and I believe that at one time Egypt was the garden of the world, and yet to put Egypt back into crops would cost a lot of money.

Then there is the question of reforestation. That is another very important and very pressing problem. The forests are being cut off, and there is nothing replacing them. The outcome of it is, and is bound to be, that we are leaving our soil drift, the water supply is shrinking, and if something is not done, it will be a case, no doubt, where we will have lost a lot of land, and there will be a lot of land going out of production.

I would like to congratulate the government on the reduction in hydro. I think that is of great benefit to the farmers, especially in the eastern sections of Ontario. We were in the high rate area. There may be some district which did not get as much reduction as we did in the east, but we appreciate it. This will stimulate the extension of hydro in our rural areas, and I do not know of any section in the country where electric power is needed more than on the farm. I do hope that our metal controllers sees fit to release metal as soon as possible so that we may go on with the hydro extension.

Now, we come to a subject that is a very live one in our country, and that is the deep waterways development, with which hydro is connected. The deep waterways development is something like the weather of which Mark Twain said "everybody talks about it, but nobody seems to do anything about it". If this deep waterway is proceeded with, there will be a large acreage of land along the St.Lawrence River which will be flooded. The land along the flooded areas being very level, the water will spread for miles back from the river, which will leave, when the development is completed, breeding places for mosquitoes, frog ponds, bull-rushes, and catfish, which is not a very good advertisement for that part of Ontario. We have tried to impress upon the Dominion Government that side of the question, but so far we have not received much encouragement, and I would suggest that the Ontario Government, when taking into consideration the

tourist traffic, might give some consideration to ways and means of controlling these flooded areas, and beautifying the countryside. I think the time has come when we should pay a bit of attention to the improvement of the land, rather than getting everything out of it we can, and leaving the rest.

Now, as regards health: That is something which my hon. friend, the member from Huron spoke about, and he understands the situation much better than I do. However, in regard to the starting of the health plan, may I say that we in the county of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry gave a health unit for the rural parts of the three counties, and I believe it is the first health unit in any rural part of Ontario. We have had this unit for several years, and while it is not doing as extensive work as we would like, we are very pleased with what it has accomplished, and in my opinion I believe we have received full value for any money expended in connection with it, not only by what the health unit has accomplished, but for what it has discovered, which really shows why we established that unit. There are also the hospital services which I believe will be extended, as there is a considerable shortage in most of Ontario at the present time. Then, there is education, and that, I think, applies to us all.

(Page 16 follows)

4.00 p.m. When we look back to 1939 we probably in our minds go back to when we went to school, and remember the conditions we endured during those six years.

Now, regarding the municipalities. With eleven or twelve years experience in that line, I had occasion to see the workings of the municipal act. To start with, at the present time, our system of municipal taxation is out-moded. When that was first put upon the statute books, I believe it worked quite satisfactorily, but from the studies I have made I consider it only worked satisfactorily until about 1914, and from then up to the present time it just seems to be working just the opposite, opposite to what it should. One fault is the assessment act. According to the assessment act, the ratepayers who improves his property, and at the same time beautifies the surroundings of his property, is penalized by additional taxation. His neighbour who does not believe in building and beautifying the property, buys bonds, and is rewarded. That, I think, has a tendency to restrain people from owning their own homes. Consider a young man who feels that he would like to own his own home. He buys a lot, and builds a house upon it, and before he has the last nail driven, his taxes are increased, which is not very much encouragement for a young man to build a home for himself.

And so, too, agriculture is handicapped under the present act. A farmer may have a large amount of land, and yet a very small income off of it, but he pays a large tax. If he is in the same school area as another ratepayer who owns a house and lot, the farmer pays the taxes for the education of his children on his buildings and on his land, while the ratepayer with simply a house and lot, pays according to the size of the property, which means a very great discrepancy in the cost of education between one and the other.

And personally, I would suggest perhaps the best cure for that would be a study of the situation, forgetting all about the

present system of municipal taxation, and let us think up a system that is more equitable.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: As regards labour: As far as the labour end of it is concerned, I am not so much concerned about that, and I will leave that to our hon. minister of labour, to handle that problem.

Being a veteran of the last war, there is one thing I would like to say a few words upon, and that is that quite a number of the boys are saying today, in conversations, - they are asking the question, "What are we fighting for?". I remember during the last war there were great promises made as to what the boys would come to, when they came home, but when the boys did come home some of them were very much disappointed; what met them was not what they had been promised at all.

Then we come to post war economics. There is one thing that strikes me very forcibly, and that is why we should have prosperity in war time, but not in times of peace. The situation seems to be that in times of peace we produce too much and we have a surplus, but the surplus is only artificial. When we look into the situation, it is not really a surplus, but rather under-consumption.

But now, in order to effect a cure for that situation, we have plans drawn, but I think we are going at it in the wrong way. As an example, supposing we were driving in our motor car, and we found that it was missing, and we drove into a garage. The garageman says, "EH You need a new set of spark pluge", and he puts them in - for $5.00 - and you drive out, but your car is still missing. You come back to the garage, and he says, "Oh, the carburator is not working", and he fixes that and you drive out, and again have the same thing. I do not think you would go back the third time. What you expect, when you take your car to a garage, is to have him examine it and, find out why it is missing, and then repair it, and I think that is what we should do. At the present time I would say that we have passed over the area of economic security to the economics of plenty in the production

line, but we are still in the area of the economics of security, in the distribution.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: Now, engineers and scientists, by planning and invention have accomplished the production end of it from security to plenty, but our system of distribution, which seems to be in charge of our so-called economic experts has lacked efficiency, and I think probably it might be a good idea if we had our engineers and scientists take over the distribution, and they might accomplish as good a job along that line as they have in production.

There is one thing along that line that struck me very forcibly during the depression. We lost our foreign market, but simply because our neighbour would not buy our goods, what was stopping us from trading between ourselves in Canada?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: I think if we solved that problem, we could trade between ourselves, and then we can go amongst our neighbours to trade. I think if we can set an example here in Canada as to what can be accomplished, the other countries in the world, I am sure, will adopt that system, and it might even be that we would not have a recurrence of war every so many years. We have today a man in this world called Hitler. He is a fiend. We all agree on that. He is a mad man. Look at the situation. What created Hitler? What was the reason that the people of Germany selected Hitler, a paper hanger, as their leader? That is something we probably should all study. I claim that very likely economics had something to do with it, and I think the time has come, to be very frank, when we should go into this question, and we may find that it all boils down to the question of our distribution of what we produce. If we can solve the distribution question it will be then just a question of how much we produce to show how high

our standard of living is going to be.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: Now, I am not one who believes that the state owes every person a living. I believe that the state owes the aged, the blind, the feeble minded, the crippled, the widows and the orphans a living - a full and happy living -

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: - but I believe that to every able bodied physically fit person the state owes the opportunity to provide the necessities for a full and happy life.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear: hear.

MR. McDONALD: I think that can be accomplished, and we can still retain our democracy. Democracy: Why have we democracy? It has been said that the reason is that we think differently. If we all thought alike, a dictatorship would be the perfect form of government, but being that we do not think alike, we have democracy, where the majority rules. I agree that it is a good thing that we do not all think alike. That reminds me of what an old Indian said one time that he was glad all men did not think alike, because if they did, they would all be wanting his squaw.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have very much more to say. I do think that now is the time to prepare for the future.

As far as foreign trade is concerned, the present system of production may carry on very well for a few years for at the present time we are carrying on the greatest campaign of destruction which was ever known in the history of the world, and naturally there will have to be construction and reconstruction, and such a system may and probably will carry on fairly satisfactory for a few years, but when this era of construction is over, we will probably be back where we were in 1929, and if we go back as a nation to 1929, and the future does not look any brighter than it did from 1930 to 1939, I am afraid that the

democracy will not survive.

And the time has come when we should study this question to see if we cannot arrive at some plan that will retain all the liberties we have under democracy, and be able to enjoy the fruits of our labours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I am through. I thank you.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Jolliffe that the debate be adjourned. Shall the motion carry.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the adjournment of the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister moves the adjournment of the house. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The house adjourned at 4.20 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Speaker: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Thursday, February 24, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY TORONTO FEB 25 1944 RECEIVED

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any petitions?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Petition from the Corporation of the City of Brantford praying that an act may pass to provide for election of members of the Brantford public utilities commission annually, one from each of the five wards in the municipality, and the mayor ex officio.

Of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass empowering the said Corporation to lease, option, sell or exchange lands acquired at tax sales and providing for the election of members of the Board of Parks Management.

Of L'Union St. Joseph du Canada, praying that an Act may pass bringing the petitioner under the terms of the Ontario Insurance Act as it applies to fraternal societies.

Of the Township of Anson, Hindon and Minden, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the amalgamation of the said Townships into one Township.

Of the Corporation of the County of Essex, praying that an Act may pass to validate by-law No. 924 of the said Corporation, fixing the equalization of assessment in the said County.

Of the Board of Regents of Victoria University, praying that an Act may pass to redefine the rights and powers of the various governing bodies of the University.

Of the Corporation of the County of York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the payment of remuneration to members of the Toronto and York Roads Commission.

Of Victor Roets, Constantin Van Gool and Leopold Constandt, praying that an Act may pass constituting a corporate body to be known as Capuchin Fathers of the Belgian Province of Canada.

Of the Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to establish a contributory retiring annuity plan for Ministers, Missionaries and Employees of the said Convention.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the said Corporation to fix the manner of electing the Town Council.

Of the Corporation of the Township of York, praying that an Act may pass to provide for the erection of the Township into a City and to prohibit the annexation of any part of the Township to any other Municipality for a period of five years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reports of Committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister) Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that Mr. Patterson, member for Grey North, be appointed chairman of the committee of the whole house for the present session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Kennedy:

Ordered, That a Select Committee of eleven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Messrs. Anderson, Belanger, Kelly, McLeod, McPhee, Miller, Murdoch, Porter, Robinson (Waterloo South), Stewart (Kingston) and Strange.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Why eleven? Last year there were nine.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is a motion before the house.

Moved by the Prime Minister, and seconded by Mr. Kennedy.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of eleven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to

compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Messrs. Anderson, Belanger, Kelly, McLeod, McPhee, Miller, Murdoch, Porter, Robinson (Waterloo South), Stewart (Kingston) and Strange.

The quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

Shall the motion carry?

HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) In answer to the question which has just been asked, the reason for appointing eleven members happens to be because it is a convenient number on the basis of the representation in the House. There is no fixed number and that is the number we found convenient.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost.

Ordered, That during the present Session of the Legislative Assembly provision be made for the taking of stenographic reports of debates and speeches, and to that end that the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to employ the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him, copies of the said stenographic reports to be supplied to the leaders of the various parties represented in the House, to the Clerk of the House and to the Legislative Library.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether copies will also be made available, at their own expense, to other members of the House.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) I think that in view of some discussion there has been about this already, perhaps I might explain the suggestion conveyed by the resolution. If the reporting is done by a court reporter, from the practical point of view, seven or eight copies can be run off at one time, and it can be arranged so that they can be delivered, probably by the next day before the session opens, or at the latest, some time during the next day. Then, if each of the leaders of groups in the House has a copy, ~~I think~~ of that, he can run

off as many copies as he sees fit for his own requirements. It seems to me, since no one can gauge what particular thing will be of particular interest, or what particular thing will need to be repeated, this will be the simplest process. If, for any reason, any member of the house wishes to have copies run off of any particular address, it will be a simple arrangement to make directly with the reporters, who will be court reporters, and consequently in the habit of running off extra copies for that purpose.

There is no thought of establishing by this resolution what has become to be known as "Hansard" in its printed form. This will offer a record of the debates in this house so that for any purpose all debates will be available. At the moment there seems to be no requirements for going beyond that simple point of supplying each of the parties, and the Clerk, for the purpose of record, and the library, for the purposes of the future, with copies of the speeches that are made.

This is a departure from practice in this Legislature, but I believe it is one that is desirable, and it is one we have advocated before, and it does not involve a very heavy expense, which would be created by attempting to print large numbers of copies in the form of the ordinary Hansard, without being able to anticipate in advance the number that would be required.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think the proposal made by the Prime Minister is to be commended, and it will be of considerable value, I think, to those represented in the house, to have a report of what is said.

At the same time, I should like to be assured that the report will be a full report, that is to say, that "hand-outs" by hon. members will not be accepted in lieu of an accurate transcript of what is said in the house.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): I assure you that is my desire, and hope that it will be an accurate transcript of what is said in the house in detail.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: May I say, Mr. Speaker, the proposal is entirely acceptable to us. It is not entirely new. To some extent, it is

an extension of the practice that obtained for a number of years, of having a court reporter report the speeches of the leaders, and the financial critics on the budget debate. Copies of these were furnished to the leaders, and other members, who desired them.

I doubt very much the advisability of attempting to extend it to a regular Hansard, as we understand it, at Ottawa, where they have a circulation built up with a big subscription list, and so on, but I think this extension of the practice that has been followed before in this Legislature is acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

HON. Mr. BLACKWELL: I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that these be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act", and that the same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves, seconded by Mr. Frost, that a bill be introduced intituled "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act". First reading of the bill.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Will the hon. the attorney general indicate the purpose of it? Is he going to fire all the old justices?

HON. MR BLACKWELL: In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the intention of this bill is just contrary to the practice in the past. The purpose of the bill is to establish a minimum basis of qualifications for those people who take informations with respect to other people, and sometimes have to sit on minor offences.

HON. Mr. DUNBAR: I move, seconded by Mr. Vivien, that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled: "The Wartime Housing Act", and that now be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Dunbar, seconded by Mr. Vivien that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled "The Wartime Housing Act"

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "The Wartime Housing Act", First reading of the bill.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Explain please. Will the hon. member indicate the purpose.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: This is in order to make it possible for municipalities to collect the minimum amount agreed upon between the municipalities and the wartime housing board, that is $24.00 for two months. It is up to the municipality to make the best bargain they can, but up to now it was impossible for the municipality to collect any of that money legally.

HON. MR. VIVIAN: I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Nurses' Registration Act", and that the same may be read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Vivian, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act". First reading of the bill.

MR. OLIVER: Would my hon. friend indicate what he proposes?

HON. R.P. VIVIAN: To extend the provisions of the Department of Health to provide nurses with post-graduate training in the Province, in the same manner as that formerly extended to nurses registered in the Province.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act" and that same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Doucett, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Bill entituled "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act"; first reading of the bill.

MR. BELANGER: May I ask some explanation of that?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: This is a bill to clarify certain parts of the present act, to extend the organization of certain portions of material to provide some changes in the subsidies.

MR. BELANGER: I am afraid that is not very clear -- is it?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: That is the explanation very briefly. I hope we will have an opportunity of going into this in detail. It is quite a lengthy bill. That is my explanation at the present time.

HON. MR BLACKWELL: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill entituled, "An Act to amend The Legitimation Act", and that same be now read the first time.

MR. Speaker: Moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill entituled "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a bill entituled, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act". First reading of the bill.

MR. WISMER: May we have an explanation?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: The explanation of that bill, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of mothers inheriting the property of illegimate children, or vice versa, we are still back in the mediaeval ages in this province. The object of the bill is to permit the mother of an illegimate child to inherit the property of that child, and vice versa.

HON. MR. THOMPSON: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Vivien, that leave be given to introduce a bill entituled: "An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act", and that same be now read the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Vivien, that leave be given to introduce a bill entituled: "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act", First reading of the bill.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Will the hon. minister be good enough to indicate what the bill is all about?

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Clause 1, the new section, provides an appropirate penalty against the holder of a license under the Crown Timber Act, who removes timber before the required returns have been made, and section 2 provides penalties against the licensee who fails to make the required return.

HON. MR BLACKWELL: Moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Law Society Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by Mr. Frost that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Law Society Act". First reading of the bill.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Will the honourable, the attorney general indicate the nature of the bill?

HON. MR BLACKWELL: A brief explanation of the bill is that it simply permits the benchers of the law society to extend the provisions of the benevolent fund to barristers and solicitors and their dependents.

HON. MR. THOMPSON: I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Thlmpson, seconded by Mr. Dunbar that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act". First reading of the bill.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Trustee Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by Mr. Frost that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Trustee Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act". First reading of the bill.

HON. MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Surveys Act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "An Act to amend the Surveys Act". First reading of the bill.

HON. MR. THOMPSON: I move, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A bill intituled "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act". First reading of the bill.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Is this a major amendment?

HON. MR. THOMPSON: No.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Simply a minor amendment.

HON. MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944" and that same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by Mr. Frost that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A Bill intituled "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944". First reading of theBill.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Is this an extension, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: The usual extension.

I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A Bill intituled, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944". First reading of the Bill.

MR. WISMER: Has the hon. minister the explanation of the nature of the bill?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, this is an extension of the previous moratorium bill. Briefly, the object of the previous bill, which is now the object of the present bill, was to prevent that vast property being sold under the hammer, and the result of the moratorium has been that instead of the bond holders getting about thirty-six cents on the dollar, they now appear to be likely to receive on hundred cents on the dollar, as conditions would seem to warrant, and the Government hope to bring about the re-organization of that property, as the result of the past and present moratorium bills.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that

leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Doucett, seconded by Mr. Challies that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Holland Marsh Roads Act", 1944". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A Bill intituled "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944". First reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Before the orders of the day, I believe it is only proper that I extend one welcome, which I was unable to extend the other day, owing to the absence of the hon. member, who was not with us on that occasion. We have the pleasure of having had all the past premiers with us, except one, and we were sorry that the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Mitchell Hepburn) was not here, and so on behalf of myself and the other members, I wish to welcome him back, and to express our pleasure at seeing him himself again.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): First order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order, a resumption of addresses in reply to the speech to the throne.

(Page 21 follows)

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

SPEAKER: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Thursday, February 24, 1944.

- - - - - - - - -

Petitions

Notices of Motions

Resolutions

Presentment of Bills

Orders of the Day

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
FEB 25 1944
RECEIVED

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: My colleagues and myself are fully conscious of the responsibility we have accepted from the electors in becoming members of the 21st Legislative Assembly of Ontario. We have the privilege of serving under unusual circumstances and at a time when there is a great opportunity for service.

May I first, Mr. Speaker, tender to you our congratulations on your election to the high office you now occupy, and may I express our hope that it will be a relatively tranquil task. It has not escaped notice that this is the 21st parliament of this province, and it can, therefore, be said to have come of age, and I hope and trust that the experience of the Speaker of the 21st Parliament will be that its behaviour shall be consonant with its having attained its majority.

We should also like, Mr. Speaker, to extend the congratulations to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) who moved the address in reply yesterday, for the eloquence with which he expressed his points of view, and also for the fact that, at least from where I sat, every word he said was audible, which I understand has not always been the case in this or other Houses, when the address in reply was moved by a member, speaking in the House for the first time. He spoke with some eloquence and with considerable force, and we listened to him with a great deal of interest.

May I also say to the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) in seconding the reply spoke not only with clarity but also made a number of points of real substance, to which we all listened with the greatest interest. It is not often that we hear so much territory covered in one comparatively brief speech, and stated, if I may say so, with so much candour and sincerity.

I would also like to take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make reference to one feature of this house to which I think reference has not been made before and that is for the first time in the history of the Legislature of Ontario, in a House which is highly representative in that it includes people drawn from all walks of life, we have for the first time two hon. members who are — how shall I put it? — not of the male sex.

I refer to the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) and the hon. member for Bracondale (Mrs. R. M. Luckock).

The party with whom I am associated has never been afraid to shatter precedents, at least none we thought ought to be shattered. We are, therefore, not ashamed, but are rather proud that we have sitting with us the two hon. members to which I have referred.

I also want to say that the hon. member from East York (Miss Macphail) has won for herself a double distinction which I think is without parallel anywhere in the world. She was, as this house knows, the first member of the House of Commons of Canada who was a woman, and she was, I believe, the first of her sex to take her seat in this house, and that is a distinction of which she may well be proud, and I do not hesitate to make reference to that unusual distinction, even if she is obliged to sit beside me on my right.

The hon. member for Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock) has a very real stake in the future of this country, because, although it may be difficult to believe by looking at her, she has a grandchild, and she has also a very real stake in the present generation, for she has a son serving overseas at the present time in the great war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that there are, as we all know, a great many newcomers in this house — I believe sixty-six newcomers. But we also have some who have been here for some time. I believe that we have in this House not a member who sat in the fourteenth Legislative Assembly, elected in 1914. But, If I am not mistaken, there are two members who sat in the fifteenth Legislative Assembly, elected in 1919. They are the hon. the minister of agriculture (Hon. T. L. Kennedy) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) the leader of the Liberal party. The Minister of Agriculture has not had an unbroken tenancy —

HON. MR. KENNEDY: That is not my fault.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: — but the hon. member for Brant, who came here at the same time, twenty-four years ago, has been here ever since, and they are to be congratulated for having out-lived and out-lasted so many others through, if I may say so, no fault of ours. I think possibly it might be of interest to members of this House if they would take time upon an appropriate occasion and tell us how they did it because that would be a subject in which some members would be greatly interested.

All the CCF members of this House are newcomers - and I am not going to make any apologies for our late arrival. That, again, was through no fault of ours, and we should have been glad to come earlier - even a year earlier - if we had been given the opportunity. However, that was not to be, and it is certainly better to be late than never. I think it proper to point out, however, that we did send an advance party to this House in the person of Mr. Sam Lawrence, who represented Hamilton East from 1934 to 1937.

Mr. Lawrence will be remembered by many of the older members of the House, as the well beloved president of the Ontario party to which I have the honour to belong, and was recently elected mayor of that great city of Hamilton by a handsome majority, so that his services are still very much in demand by his own community.

A large group of newcomers elected to this House at any time would be expected to take their duties seriously. Our duties and responsibilities, however, are much greater than in any ordinary times. We have never agreed with the view that the Legislative Assembly could be forgotten -- or almost forgotten for the duration of the war. It is true, of course, that the war has over-shadowed all other issues for the past four-and-one-half years. It is true that the conduct of the war effort lies with the Dominion Government and with Parliament. It is also true that under the War Measures Act the Dominion has assumed many provincial functions, for the time being. It is also true, and we recognize it, that a lasting solution for the problems of post-war reconstruction can only be found fully on a national scale.

We hold, however, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibilities of the Government, and of this House, are not less, but greater, because of the war and the aftermath to war to come. The war effort itself can be materially assisted by constructive provincial measures, particularly with respect to our natural resources and also our human resources on the home front. We do not believe that any real solution will be found for post-war problems unless this province adopts, and actually implements, the same bold and progressive policies as are required at Ottawa. No member of the Government or of this House is going to escape the problems which will

be presented to us during the next five years - not even an early general election would provide any escape from these problems. They will have to be met, and woe betide the people of Ontario if their elected representatives do not recognize the magnitude and the scope of these problems.

I am not going to hazard any guesses about the duration of the war, because it is not a proper subject for idle speculation. But I do say this; that whether the end comes this year, or next year, or the year after, there is no time to be lost in preparing for the aftermath. The end will mean victory over the military power of Hitler and the Japanese war lords. It will not necessarily mean victory over the root causes of this war, or over what may be the root causes of the next war thereafter. In the struggle to establish freedom and security for those who return from this war, and for their fellow-citizens and their children, we believe the Government and Legislative Assembly of Ontario will have an important part to play.

We can begin to do our part now. I venture to say that if in this session of the 21st Legislature, if we fail, it will be because we failed to recognize that at the end of this session the Province must find itself better prepared for things to come than we are prepared to-day.

One thing is perfectly clear to all of us. The overwhelming majority of the people of Ontario have already decided that existing legislation is not adequate to meet either the present need, or the future needs. That decision was made manifest on the 4th day of August, 1943. In reality, the question put to the people of Ontario was this: "Do you wish a change as represented by the Progressive Conservative Party and its 22 point programme, or do you wish a change as represented by the CCF and its 15 point programme, or do you wish to continue as is". Whatever may be thought about the results of that election, Mr. Speaker, one thing is obvious - most of the electors did not wish to continue"as is."

In recognition of that demand for a change, the speech from the throne, among a great many other things contains the promise of considerable progressive legislation. With respect to most of it we reserve judgment; it would be impossible to form a conclusion until we see the legislation itself. In general, however, it is possible, and I think desirable for me, as leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House, to indicate

our attitude to the measures contemplated by the Government. Indeed, we think it necessary to make it perfectly clear what our attitude is to proposals of the kind outlined in the 22 points and in the speech from the throne.

To the extent that forthcoming legislation actually does represent progress and reform, we shall support it, we shall welcome it. And we shall not be afraid to give the Government credit for such measures, although we shall also take some credit unto ourselves - for we couldn't help but notice, Mr. Speaker, that many of these measures appear in the CCF election program of 1937, at which time neither of the old parties showed xxxthe slightest interest in them - not the slightest. At long last, when we became a powerful political force in this province, some of them suddenly appeared in the Progressive Conservative election platform. That was no coincidence! But the real credit must go of course to the electors, who have repeatedly demonstrated during the past three years, whenever they had the opportunity, their desire for a change.

It is only natural that we should support progressive legislation, and support it from whatever source it comes, because we have been advocating such measures since the inception of our movement. In the same way and for the same reasons, if we had been here in earlier years, we would have supported such measures as the Workmen's Compensation Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the Mothers' Allowance Act, the School Attendance Act, the Old Age Pensions Act, and the legislation establishing the Hydro Electric Power Commission and the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway. It was not an old-party Government, but the Farmer Government of 1919-23 which put more of such measures on the statute book than any previous government since Confederation. We would have favoured such measures, and we still favour them, notwithstanding the fact that many of their benefits have been lost in their administration and there is still much room for improvement in the legislation itself. They all represent definite steps, however imperfect they may be, towards a more civilized organization of our affairs.

None of these steps, however, put an end to the fundamental evils in our society. They did not prevent the wasting away of our natural

resources or the exploitation of large numbers of our people by growing monopoly enterprise or the irresponsible exercise of money power over democratic processes. When the Great Depression struck in 1929, it was of little avail that we had some worthy social legislation upon our statute books. All the measures to which I have referred, the social legislation initiated by previous governments and particularly the Farmer Government between 1919 and 1923, were good in themselves, and I do not think any party now would even consider their repeal. But of course they were utterly inadequate to meet the crisis which had come upon us, a crisis which is certain to recur upon a much larger and more devastating scale unless the people of this Dominion and particularly of this province determine to master their own social and economic destiny.

There are those who think that the next crisis can be met by another installment of social legislation. A few admirable reforms here and there, the removal of some obvious injustices, the establishment of more hospitals and more beds for the care of the sick and wounded, the correction of inequities in taxation, improvements in administration with a dash of more social insurance thrown in, and the theory is that the public will be satisfied because, after all, these are progressive measures and they do help, in a small way but they do help to soften the blow when the blow falls. That is the theory and there are some wishful thinkers who imagine that legislation of that kind is going to solve the huge and complex problems of our time. If ever there was a pipe-dream, this is it.

Generally speaking, the measures described in the 22 points and in the speech from the throne fall, as His Honour read on Tuesday, into precisely the same category as the worthy social legislation of former years, now on our statute books. For what they are worth, we commend them and if they are brought into this house in satisfactory form we shall co-operate in making them law. We commend them for what they are worth, but we also see clearly how much further it will be necessary for this province to go in the next 10 years in Ontario, and that will be very much further than any Liberal or Conservative Government is willing to go or free to go.

Now of course we recognize that the Progressive Conservative Party and the leaders and members of the Government accepted office with a

mandate to carry out the Progressive-Conservative program, not our program. It would be too much to expect them to adopt all that part of our program which is concerned with fundamentals. They have adopted a number of proposals, made by us for years past, which are essentially of an ameliorative character, which, as I have indicated, are very necessary and desirable, but do not represent a solution of the fundamental problem.

Now as to that part of our program which appeared in the 22 points last summer and which made it possible for the present administration to take office, we do expect the Government and the Progressive Conservative Party to keep their promises. If they do not, we shallwant to know the reason why, and so will the electors of Ontario. Perhaps it is just as well, after all, that the Government does not enjoy a large and comfortable majority. As things now stand, if the Government should fail to implement the program as promised, certain consequences will inevitably follow. As someone has said, there are 34 reasons why the Government should keep the promises that were made, or, to put it in a better way, several hundred thousand reasons.

In this connection, I cannot fail to point out that some of the 22 points could have been implemented by executive action. They did not need to await the meeting of this House. We were prepared to allow the Government a reasonable length of time in which to make good its undertakings. However, it must be a reasonable length of time and not an indefinite period. The Old Age Pensioners, for example, or those of them who contrived to live through the summer and into the winter, are still wondering why it took so many months to arrange the increases promised to them, and I hope the opportunity will arise for the hon. minister of welfare to tell us why. Those who received no increase at all, and there are many, are now entitled to ask when the Progressive Conservative Party is going to honour the pledge made last summer in point number 18 of the 22 points. It is not my intention to dwell at any great length upon the Government's election promises, with which most of the Province is familiar, but the Government must very clearly understand that if matters of this kind continue to drift on for month after month, the people of Ontario will hear about it, and hear about it every day until they next go to the polls.

We are now entering the session, the first session which, so far as we are concerned, the Government will have full opportunity to implement its program. We are prepared to consider legislation on its merits, whether it comes from the Government or from a private member, and we hope that hon. members who do not sit with us will take the same position. The primary responsibility, however, is that of the Government. Following the general election, it appeared that the Progressive Conservative Party commanded more seats in this House then any other party, although a minority, and the Prime Minister was therefore very properly called upon to form a government, which he did. When the Prime Minister and his colleagues accepted office, they took the responsibility, not only of administration, but the responsibility of submitting to this House legislation in keeping with the program they had offered to the electors. Notwithstanding the fact, and it is an important fact, that their supporters at the polls and their supporters in this House are a minority, we believe that they have a continuing responsibility to implement their program so long as they hold the seals of office. We also believe that they are entitled to a reasonable period of time, not only in administration, but also in this House, to fulfill their pledges. What may be a reasonable period of time will appear from the circumstances as they develop, and of that the members of this House, belonging to several different parties, will have to be the judges.

4:00 o'clock p.m.

Now the Prime Minister has indicated on more than one occasion that his Government does hope to implement its program, and he has gone further. He has said in effect as I understand it that the program will be introduced exactly as though the Government enjoyed a large majority; in other words, without regard for the fact that the Government does not have a majority, and that it will stand or fall by the result. If the Prime Minister means that he and his colleagues are going to keep their promises, come what may, that is all very well and his statement is not objectionable. But if he means that the Government intends to present us with a batch of legislation and a "take-it-or-leave-it"; if his position is that the executive is to have the first and last word about all legislation, or

that the members of this House have no contribution to make, or that our views or suggestions are to be entirely disregarded, or if he means that the Government will continue to hold office only on condition that we say "Yes, Yes" to any and every proposal - if that is what the Prime Minister meant, then I say his statement was an improper one and smells very strongly of dictatorship than of British democracy.

Whatever he meant -- and I trust he will tell us what he meant -- I suggest to the Prime Minister on behalf of the Opposition that he would do well to remember what has happened: on August 4th of last year almost as many electors gave their support to the CCF as to the Progressive Conservative Party and there are almost as many CCF members as there are Progressive Conservatives. It would be entirely inconsistent with democratic principles to ignore the realities of the situation because those are the realities. We do not ask the Government to accept any direction or dictation from any other group; we do suggest it would be common-sense democracy to pay some attention to the views of opposition members and to pay more respect to legislative processes and the importance of this House. If there is one thing democracy cannot survive, it is a quiescent and unassertive legislature. After all, what is a dictatorship? A "dictatorship" is government by the executive without reference to elected representatives of the people.

(Page 11 follows)

If you have elected representatives who are consulted only in form or as a formality, while the executive exercises all the functions of government and then goes its own way about everything, then you have a dictatorship in practice even though the legislature may continue as a matter of form. We intend to resist the tendency toward executive monopoly and so far as we are concerned, this House is going to function. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister, who has recently been loud in his denunciation of the foreign varieties of dictatorship, ought to welcome a revival of activity in this institution. If we sat where the members of the Administration sit, we should welcome renewed activity on the part of the Legislative Assembly. That is democracy at work, and there is nothing in that for members of the Government to worry about -- at least there is nothing in it for them to worry about if they really believe in democracy.

I have said that we propose to consider legislation on its merits. I have said also that we do not believe legislation should be presented to us like an ultimatum with a "take-it-or-leave-it" attitude. I also said that the Government should have the fullest opportunity to implement its program, if that is the intention. In view of all these considerations we take the position, and I am authorized to state on behalf of the CCF Opposition members, that if, on any division in this House at this session, the Government fails to receive a majority, the result will not, so far as we are concerned, constitute a vote of no confidence in the administration, unless it is stated on our behalf, prior to such division, that, so far as we are concerned, the question is one of confidence or no confidence.

And I hereby invite the Prime Minister, when he speaks in this debate, as I trust he will, to state on behalf of his Government what circumstances would be interpreted by him as giving rise to a question of confidence or no confidence.

I point out that he is not the first Prime Minister to find himself in this position, that of a somewhat similar predicament of the Rt. hon. A. J. Balfour, in 1905, then Prime Minister, later Lord Balfour who made a lengthy statement on the subject to members of the British House of Commons, and that position was also stated

by the late Ramsay McDonald when he headed a minority government in 1924.

If the Prime Minister refuses or neglects to make such a statement, if he insists on reserving to himself the right to interpret the conduct of his House after the event rather than before, if he signifies that he wishes to keep members in the dark on the subject, then Mr. Speaker, we shall be obliged to conclude that he is not so much interested in stable government in this province as he is in pulling an elector or rabbit out of the hat.

Now we have all had some experience with electoral rabbits. The Prime Minister and myself were very indignant on or about the 27th day of January, 1940, and for some time thereafter, when one of the fastest rabbits in electoral history was produced at Ottawa. We were equally indignant on the 30th day of June, last year, when another rabbit, a rather poor specimen this time, was produced in this province, and an election campaign was fought on the shortest possible notice, with the election machinery utterly unprepared and, inadequate to meet the needs of the situation as the experience proved, utterly inadequate to meet the most elementary democratic requirements with respect to both the civilian vote and the military vote.

The Prime Minister has it in his power to put an end to the rumours which have circulated ever since last summer that his Government plans a snap election at the earliest possible opportunity. Personally, I have not been as disturbed by such rumours as some other people. In any event, whatever the truth of it may be we are prepared to fight elections whenever they are brought about by other groups, and we shall have no regrets, because we believe it is urgently necessary that our own program should be implemented as soon as possible. However, there are limits to the number of rabbits the public will tolerate and I question the desirability, from any point of view, of holding elections every few months while we are engaged in the present war. This is no time for fast plays and smart political tricks; indeed there is not any time for these tactics, certainly not at a moment like this.

I think the electors of this province, who have had more than their share of electoral rabbits, would be more favourably impressed by the candour and honesty of the present government of New Zealand.

In the Spring of 1943, that government introduced a resolution in the New Zealand House declaring that it was in the public interest -- or that it would be in the public interest to hold a general election in the autumn of the same year -- approximately six months later. That enabled the whole matter to be considered in the open. Having regard to the war, having regard to the problem of taking the soldiers' vote, having regard to the whole democratic philosophy which is held and firmly practised by the Labour Party in New Zealand, as it is by the CCF in Canada, the Government of that Dominion believed there should be nothing in the nature of a snap election on a surprise in war-time. The resolution was adopted, it was made known to the whole country, after being debated it was approved and a general election was duly held six months later. A people's government, which is willing to take the electors into its confidence in that way, a government which relies on solid achievement, and not on smart tricks, has nothing to fear at the polls and it is no wonder that the present government of New Zealand, first elected in 1935, was returned to office in 1938, and again returned to office in 1943, without any difficulty, and with a very large majority of the soldiers vote. I do not know -- or at least I do not yet know -- of any government in Canada which is capable of such honesty and candour in the matter of taking the electors into their confidence when holding an election, but if there were such a government, I think the public would be well pleased.

The movement for which I speak is thoroughly democratic both in theory and practice. We have been faithful to democratic principles in the organization and in the policy-making of our own party from its inception, and shall continue to be.

We have placed our program before the people of Canada and this province for the past twelve years without any reservations, and our proposals can be ascertained at any time by referring to the policy resolutions passed at our conventions, which are themselves democratically constituted in every way. In our program we have never departed one iota from the democratic philosophy, and as some hon. members know, we have frequently gone to the defense of civil liberties in danger in this country.

As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister will not mind being

reminded of the time when a foolish and ill-considered prosecution was launched against him not many months ago, when there was some fear that he might find himself in durance vile--

HON. GEORGE A DREW (PRIME MINISTER): There was never any fear of that.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: -for having expressed an opinion which was not pleasing to the administration, and we were among the first to protest against that arbitrary prosecution, and I hereby warn the hon. the Attorney General that if he ever undertakes to prosecute the Prime Minister in such a case, we shall be the first again to go to the Prime Minister's defence.

We propose, when we receive the support of the majority of the electors, to carry out fundamental and necessary changes in the economic structure and we are determined to do so democratically, whatever may be the intention of our opposition. Those who have no real faith in democracy do not believe it can be done. As far as we are concerned, we do believe in democracy, and we know it can be done.

In the meantime, we shall do our utmost to make democracy work under present conditions, and particularly in this house. It is for other parties to prove that they are prepared to do the same. As a matter of fact, a serious application of democratic principles would mean some great changes in this province.

I am not going to exhaust the house by relating the long record of dictatorial and oppressive acts by a previous administration. However, I must refer to the wide spread political regimentations which still exist throughout Ontario. It takes many different forms, and some the most guilty are the same big business men who shout most loudly about freedom of enterprise and freedom of the individual. Time and again members of our party have been dismissed from their employment, or otherwise discriminated against, because of their political views, or opinions, or because of their activity in union work.

The administration itself is still indulging in a particularly obnoxious form of regimentation which is undemocratic, and unsound from first to last. Our party undertook to abolish a patronage system in this province. The progressive conservative party took office six months ago and the patronage system has not been abolished, although we all know very well how it is regarded by the public. I will give the

government credit for this, that the advent of this administration has not been followed by some of the disgraceful scenes which followed the taking office by the previous administration.

I have before me the London Free Press for Friday, the 21st day of January, 1944, an excellent newspaper which is not unfriendly to the government. I quote from the concluding paragraph of a report of a speech to the progressive conservative organization in London, by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor).

> "The speaker ended by urging that party workers be recognized by being given jobs wherever possible. We must have a certain amount of change in jobs", he declared, "in repayment to these workers for their long hours of work. You are right to expect an honest change. In Huron we asked for nine and we have already had eight. The ninth was something new, and that hasn't been decided yet."

Is that what the Progressive Conservatives were elected to do? If not, the government ought to repudiate the statement of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor).

The Opposition is not here for the purpose of opposing or criticising every step taken by the Government. We shall not hesitate to criticize whatever we believe to be wrong, and in common with most of the electors, we believe the patronage system to be wrong. However, we shall co-operate in every constructive and progressive measure.

In this connection, we were pleased to see some months ago that the government had appointed an agricultural commission to inquire into agriculture, to which reference was made in the speech from the throne, a commission which, with very few exceptions, is a representative commission, for the purpose of investigating the condition of agriculture in this province and making recommendations. We believe that much useful work is being done by this commission. We look forward to their recommendations with a great deal of interest. We shall also look forward with interest to the action, if any, taken by the government with respect to the recommendations, whatever they may be.

This is still a great agricultural province, and must continue to be, and the subject is therefore one of very great importance. The trials and tribulations through which the farmers of Ontario have passed in recent years cannot continue indefinitely. We are all well aware that the root causes of

the plight of agriculture go very deep, so deep that Dominion action is required, as well as provincial action.

I suggest to the Government that there are certain fundamentals on which there is general agreement among representative farmers, and almost all authorities on the problems of agriculture today.

(Page 17 follows)

These fundamental problems, I suggest, should govern any attempt to bring about joint action by the province and Dominion to restore the prosperity of agriculture. The five most important points of necessity in agricultural policy today are as follows: I suggest.

FIRST - a floor under prices, which must be not merely a floor, but a floor based on the cost of production. We simply cannot expect farmers to continue producing certain products at a loss and dismiss the matter by explaining, as the Dominion Minister of Agriculture has done, that after all certain other products are not soldat a loss, and after all are bringing higher prices than they did five years ago. We believe that food production should be governed by human need and farmers must be paid equitable prices which will enable them to meet the need.

SECONDLY - it is urgently desirable that farm mortgages should be refinanced at low rates of interest. I know that some half-hearted attempts have been made in this direction for years gone by in this direction some of which have worked very well and there has been some lowering in interest rates generally as the result of the decline in outlets for profitable investment which was to be expected with the breakdown of the present economic system. However, I venture to say that the farmer has benefited much less from the decline in interest rates than industry, and much less than was necessary.

Of course, if we are doomed to live in a scarcity economy with food rotting in the warehouses and millions of people undernourished, if we are to have these conditions, farm mortgages will not be a satisfactory investment for anybody, or any institution or any government and no government could successfully underwrite them. However, there is no reason why we should resign ourselves to that fate and it would be suicidal to require the farmer to go on paying high rates of interest for the privilege of going broke. In fact, for the privilege of having his farm legally taken away from him.

THIRDLY - agriculture needs a national marketing act with appropriate machinery. It should be provided that if, as and when the majority of the farmers wish it to be applied, all those interested will be bound by the will of the majority. That is already recognized in connection with a number of marketing Boards and enterprises. We believe also that provision should be made for handling exports through an export board rather than by speculators or monopolists. We have

favoured the management of international trade by export and import boards for the past 12 years, and now we find, somewhat to our amusement, that the principle is being generally accepted. In Britain, for example, not only the British Labour Party, but also the influential agricultural committee of the Conservative Party are committed to the principle of export and import boards in post-war trade.

I find in the speech from the throne that a reference is made in connection with Ontario House. The reference is made, "as soon as trading between nations returns to a normal basis". I suggest that the government reconsiders whether trade between nations ever again will return to what is called a "normal basis".

A Canadian export board, acting in collaboration with the Dominion Government and Provincial Government as well as with international organizations, such as the united nations relief and rehabilitation commission, must be concerned not only with prices and markets in the old sense -- they must also be concerned with nutritional standards. Surely, Mr. Speaker, all members of the house will agree with me when I say that nutritional standards for the masses of the people here in Canada as well as in other countries ought to be raised. It would be fantastic and absurd if a great food producing country like ours continued to show such a deplorable record of undernourishment and malnutrition as we have seen revealed during recent years.

And we cannot, and must not, forget the terrible conditions which now exist and will for sometime continue to exist in a large part of the world laid waste by war and by the systematic plundering done by the Axis forces. In the occupied countries particularly, foodstuffs will have to be distributed on a gigantic scale for years to come, and basic stocks will have to be replenished so that they can resume production themselves. The war and lend-lease have proved the necessity of international action, to meet such problems in the handling of foodstuffs.

And, fourthly, therefore, international arrangements for the distribution of foodstuffs must be undertaken in keeping with the spirit of the declaration by the Hot Springs Conference. The responsibility, I know, is that of Ottawa, but Ottawa cannot deliver the goods unless they are produced, and I hope the Ontario producer is not going to be overlooked as he has been so often in the past.

Fifthly, I suggest there is general agreement among representative

farmers and authorities on agriculture, that there should be more tangible encouragement of cooperative organization, both among producers and consumers. There are those who have taken advantage and enjoyed the benefits of the existing legislation with respect to cooperatives, but we may as well recognize that some other provinces have made more progress than we have. Certainly, in Nova Scotia, and in Saskatchewan, the government has given far more definite encouragement to cooperatives than is the case in Ontario.

Now, I do not speak as a farmer, even though I am the grandson of an Ontario farmer, and I am glad that there are a number of members ih this house who can do so. I am not dealing with the question in detail because our views with respect to agriculture will be put forward by the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) and by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Lockhart) who has had a long experience in both farming and cooperation.

And I wish to say that it is encouraging, for what it is worth, to see a more general realization of the importance of agriculture in the life of Ontario, and in particular, more general recognition that the farmer and his family must share in the amenities of modern civilization, at a much higher standard of life and that if they are not permitted to do so by the present economic system, we have no right to expect them to continue on the land, and no right to expect them to continue to support the present economic system.

The other great group in our population, the working people in industry and commerce, make the same claim to their rightful share in the amenities of modern civilization, and a higher standard of life. This subject also will be discussed by others among my colleagues, who are better qualified to do so than I am.

Some reference has been made to pressure groups seeking to obtain benefits at the expense of others. It is not very appropriate, in my mind -- not very appropriate -- to think of organized farmers or of organized labour as pressure groups in view of the fact that the farmers and the workers comprise the vast majority of our people -- and that it is a fact which is too often forgotten by the so-called leaders in business and in public affairs. If the interests of the majority cannot be served by the existing economic system, and if they can be better served by a different economic system, then we say the interests

of the majority must prevail. At least, that would be the democratic conclusion.

It is not a question of one pressure group robbing another pressure group, not a question of competition between pressure group. That is a superstition belonging to the economy of scarcity. The only question is how much more can be produced and equitably distributed amongst all our people to meet human need. That is the question, and probably the most important question of post-war economics.

The war has shown that this country can produce far more than was ever produced in pre-war years. We share the opinion, recently expressed by the Governor of the Bank of Canada, which is a publicly owned bank, that whatever it is physically possible to produce, it is financially possible to produce.

The farmers and the workers do not want to live at the expense of the state or at the expense of other groups. What they do want is an opportunity to continue producing more and more year by year and to share in the benefits of that increasing production which modern technological advances have made possible. We do not care how much money is spent or how much effort is wasted in an attempt to invest free enterprise with a magical or mystical significance. Unless the existing economic system can do a better job for our people than it did in the 10 years prior to this war, it is going to be decisively and finally rejected, and I think hon. members of this house might well consider that probability. There is an animal which is known as the Segongw, and I have no doubt that its skin if properly advertised and publicized would rise to great heights, even comparable with Russian sable. The fact is that the plain word for that animal is skunk" and it is no better by one name than it is by the other.

Now, people are entitled to reject something that won't work, and in doing so they show much more wisdom than the people who want to cling to it do.

The most immediate problem of labour in this province as any among other provinces, is that of organization. The free enterprisers have placed every possible obstacle in the way of free trade union organization in this country, and they are still fighting the same fight which the free enterprisers fought and lost many years ago in Britain, in Australia and in New Zealand, and in this connection, I may say they

have nothing to learn about regimentation, because many of them have been practising it so long, that they know all its angles.

It is only recently that Government has intervened. The Collective Bargaining Act of 1943, in Ontario, aroused high hopes that at last the workers here were going to be emancipated from the fear of intimidation and discrimination, and that employers with a feudalistic outlook would be brought up to date in their policy by the requirement of the law. As many of us anticipated, there was a long, long gap between the original promise of compulsory collective bargaining and the legislation which went into effect last June. I hope we do not find a similar lengthy gap between some of the promises we have more recently heard and their eventual result in legislation.

Now, for the umpteenth time in recent months, the law with respect to relations between employers and employees is changed once again. I am reserving comment on the latest change or on what is proposed by the government here until we know more about it. I do say, however, that it is hardly reasonable for the government or for employers to expect labour relations to be stable and calm when labour legislation, government policy and the administration thereof are all in such a chaotic condition. It all springs from the fact that the Government of Canada lacked a democratic war policy at the beginning of this war, and had no idea how to enlist our people, or to enlist our human resources in a democratic way, for the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of the home front.

I would like to suggest that at some time during this debate, and as soon as possible, the Prime Minister or the Minister of Labour indicate the attitude of their government toward employers in this province who are already using the new Dominion order-in-council -- order-in-council 1003 -- with respect to collective bargaining as a pretext for further delay in negotiations, even in cases where certifications have already been granted by the Ontario labour court, in spite of the fact that the Dominion order-in-council, to the best of my knowledge, is not yet in force and effect, for it is not to become effective until some later date, when it is to be proclaimed by another order-in-council.

I want to say further that notwithstanding bitter and unscrupulous opposition there are far more workers in the ranks of organized labour

today than there ever were before.

I am, therefore, proud of the fact that in this opposition group a representative number drawn from many different walks of life, there are no less than 19 trade unionists, and that labour has come from what was probably an all-time low to a new high in this House.

One of the many benefits which I believe may result from having a number of experienced labour men in this House is that it will help to dispel some of the mythology and the absurd superstitions which have grown up in certain quarters regarding organized labour and labour leaders and I made the remark earlier that as far as my eye-sight tells me, there are no hon. members in this house who have beards, as there were in the first Parliament of Ontario, and I take the opportunity of calling the attention of the Prime Minister and the Attorney-General, and the Minister of Labour, that amongst all these trade unionists who sit in opposition in this house, they cannot possibly discover one who has sprouted horns, they carry no bombs, and I defy the Attorney-General to find them carrying any heavy artillery.

Organized labour, and organized agriculture as well, are going to play a part of increasing importance in the public affairs of this country, as they do in others, and I think the contribution they can make here should be more generally and more clearly understood, and I hope it will be by the end of this session.

Now, according to published reports, my old friend the Attorney-General has been going about making speeches in which he refers to good unions and bad unions. I wonder if the Attorney-General has thought his way through all the implications of that distinction. I hope I will find out. If, as he is reported to say, there are good unions and bad unions, and this is to have a bearing on the Government's labour policy, who is going to decide which are the good unions and which are the bad unions? The Attorney-General?

Several hon. members: The employees themselves.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: All I can gather from his reported remarks -- and I know he can explain himself very well -- is that the old and well established union which has won recognition and therefore no longer need to struggle for it, are on the whole, good unions,

while on the other hand the new unions, which stand for the old unions of thirty or fourty years ago, the aggressive union, which must of necessity be aggressive in their activity, because they have not yet won recognition, and because of the nature of the opposition to them, or are still in the process of getting it -- those new unions being opposed by the most powerful industrialists in Canada -- and I gather they are bad unions, and are frowned upon by the administration of which the Attorney-General is a member. Now, I hope the Attorney-General will demonstrate that I am wrong, but the distinction implies that the workers are not competent to exercise freedom of choice in the matter, and that the democratic processes in industry cannot be trusted to produce the right result. If we can have some assurance from the honourable the Attorney-General that it is the workers and the workers alone who will exercise that freedom of choice, then I am quite prepared to let him retain his own views about which are the good unions and which are the bad ones.

(Page 46 follows)

While the results may not be always satisfactory to the Government and the defenders of the status quo, I wish to say here and now that it is not for the hon. attorney general to decide what unions are good for the workers; it is for the workers alone to decide. If the Government is going to pick and choose, as I hope and trust they will not, as between unions, then democracy here is in danger, because that is the exact formula adopted by all dictatorships in dealing with labour organizations. I was even more surprised by a number of references to the labour movement in a speech at Windsor made by the national leader of the progressive-conservative party, the hon. John Bracken, on July 11th, when he was introduced by the hon. the Minister of labour, who sits opposite us in this House, and of all his surprising statements I mention one, because I honestly believe that it betokens such abysmal ignorance of what the labour movement is all about, that it should be apparent not only to the general public, but to the progressive-conservative party themselves. Mr. Bracken is reported as saying that the trade unions of Italy and Germany entrusted their fate to what they believed would be a benevolent dictatorship.

The facts are, as everybody ought to know, that the trade unions of Italy and Germany never at any time gave any support to Mussolini or to Hitler. They opposed Fascism and Nazism first, last and all the time. They did not wait until 1939 to discover the meaning of Fascism. They opposed Hitler before he took power, and supported their own political party, and not Hitler's party. His support came not from the unions or from labour, but from the leaders of industry and finance, the manufacturers, the champagne makers and so forth --

AN HON. MEMBER: And bankers.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Yes, and the bankers, the people who had too much cash and not enough sense, and also, of course, a number of others who are not connected with the labour movement and who were deceived by expensive propaganda and by appeals to racial prejudice and nationalistic fanaticism. And, of course, when Hitler did take power, one of his first acts was to crush the unions. He seized their funds,

he imprisoned and murdered many of their leaders, and he knew what he was doing, for they were his strongest opposition in Germany.

Of all this apparently the national leader of the progressive-conservative party, with all due respect to him, and his labour experts, with all due respect to them, are not aware, and I suggest it is about time that the progressive-conservative party found out where the trade union movement stands, and always has stood, with respect to the great struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

May I say also that there are many workers throughout this province who have bitter memories of acts done by the attorney general's department in previous administrations. I will not recite them, but I say that it is for the hon. the attorney general to prove by a different type of administration that his government has nothing in common with those of certain reactionary people. We cannot think of labour without remembering the years between 1929 and 1939, when a large part, sometimes a major part of the working people in our cities and towns were on relief. That experience is not to be forgotten when we consider the question of immigration. During his recent visit to Britain the Prime Minister was reported to have discussed this question on more than one occasion. I will not quote him. He can tell us for himself what he said. We gather, however, from the reports that he is highly optomistic about the prospects for immigration from the British Isles to Ontario on a large scale after the war. If he said, as some accounts have it, that "Canada offers you jobs and homes after the war", I hope he is right, and I hope his optomism is fully justified, because we recognize that there ought to be room in this country for many new-comers. But it all depends on our ability to organize this country for full production and full employment, and our ability to plan for healthy growth and a healthy expansion.

And what does the record show? What is the experience we have had with the so-called free enterprise system and with the conservative party? I find that in 1931, when a conservative government was in power at Ottawa and free enterprise was spreading all its blessings throughout the land, there were 6,097 persons deported from Canada by command of that government,

of the whom the majority, 3,844, were deported from Canada to the British Isles. In the next year there were no less than 3,982 — nearly 4,000 people deported to the British isles, and again a majority of all those deported, and in 1933, 2,614, again the majority of those deported. The overwhelming majority of these people were deported from Canada not because of criminal acts or misconduct, but were deported because in official language — how well it sounds — "They had become public charges", in other words, they had lost their jobs. For them Canada was not a land of opportunity or of progress; it was a land of frustration and misery — and I do not want the Prime Minister to forget it — and the manner in which they were deported was often so heartless that the name of Canada — and I know whereof I speak because I was there at the time — sank very low in many of the cities and towns of the old country, and it deserved it. It is all on the record as hon. members can see for themselves by looking at sessional paper number 149A of the Dominion House of Commons, dated February 23rd, 1937, a return to a motion moved by Mr. M. J. Coldwell.

I am not going to discuss at the moment the Government's decision to re-open Ontario House in London, because first I think we are entitled to hear more about it. I suggest that the Prime Minister should explain precisely what functions are proposed to be exercised by Ontario House, and what can be expected in the way of real service, constructive service, to producers in this Province, to our men overseas, and to our friends and cousins in the British Isles.

We also learn through published reports that while he was in London, the Prime Minister spoke to members of the House of Commons, and, I believe, also of the House of Lords under the auspices of the Empire Parliamentary Association. Now I suppose we shall be told that it was all "off the record", but the difficulty with such speakers is they are not really "off the record" at all, for the simple reason that they are heard by so many people and they tell so many other people. In the case of Field Marshall Smuts, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, who made a speech not long ago to the same people under the same auspices, it turned out that he had made some very important suggestions with respect to Empire

relations which were published throughout the whole world. In all the circumstances, I think we are entitled to know whether the Prime Minister was speaking for a majority opinions in the Province of Ontario to the British parliamentarians, or for the progressive-conservative party, which is a minority party in this province, or strictly for himself as a visiting parliamentarian. And I also think we are entitled to know what he said, if he presumed to speak for the people of Ontario, or the majority of them.

We also understand from the press that there may be -- there may be -- a dominion-provincial conference some time in the near future. We believe in the necessity of such a conference, and we have for some time. We believe that the Dominion and all the provinces must face now the staggering constitutional and financial difficulties with which we shall be confronted as soon as the war ends or very soon thereafter. The commonwealth of Australia has already held such a conference, and I understand on the whole , a very successful conference, and we regret it has not been possible hitherto for the various governments to meet and to adopt a constructive approach to these problems at this time, and before it is too late.

I think the Prime Minister should tell us during this debate what his government has in mind with respect to adjustments and readjustments, if any, between the province and the dominion.

Of course, the problems raised at that conference, and at any subsequent conferences, which will no doubt be a part only of a much larger program. The government must know that the present financial position of Ontario is abnormal. Revenues are much greater than they were a few years ago because of the volume of production and trade arising from war conditions, and, in any event, a large part of these revenues have been guaranteed by the Dominion. On the other hand the responsibility for social services, in particular for unemployment relief, is very different from what it was before the war.

When the war ends and when, as I understand it, both the government at Ottawa and the government here, propose to restore free enterprise as soon as possible, in all its glory, and when we again enjoy declining revenues, large numbers of unemployment and increasing burdens, we want

to know exactly what are the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government proposing to do about it, or at least what does the present government propose to do, if anything, about that. We shall be very interested to hear the Prime Minister and other members of the Government discuss the worthy measures outlined in the speech from the Throne. We shall be even more interested to hear them discussed the larger problems to which I refer, because, of course, even the most advanced and elaborate social services and the most desirable forms of social insurance can only be supported upon a healthy economic base, and upon an active and functioning productive system.

The cost of all such measures is borne in the final analysis, by the production of the goods and services which constitute real wealth. We may as well be realistic. Without full production and full employment after this war the Dominion, including its wealthiest province, will head straight for bankruptcy, both moral and financial. Why not face it now? We shall be interested to hear what plans, if any, have been formulated by the Government with respect to this fundamental problem, bearing in mind that the problem is bound up with production and with employment. Our view is that the Government will not get anywhere near the causes of low production and unemployment until they are prepared to deal with the processes of production upon which employment depends, productive enterprises, private enterprises, except when they could be subsidized by some government and particularly those of monopolistic character, and particularly also with new capital developments, which in recent years has not been undertaken by private enterprise, except when they could be subsidized by some government, in other words, subsidized by the tax payers -- the general public.

We noticed the speech from the Throne promises the creation of a new department of planning and development. That is all to the good, and I have no doubt the department will produce some useful plan. The vital question is whether those plans will ever be carried out, and, if so, by whom.

Most of our people, Mr. Speaker, are interested, of course, not only in employment and in their jobs, but in their homes and in the cost of maintaining them. One of the most striking of the 22 points was Number 9:

"To encourage home ownership and home improvement by sweeping revision of real estate taxes, commencing with the assumption by the government of fifty per cent of the present cost of education."

We note that in the speech from the throne the matter is referred to in these words: "The most difficult single educational problem requiring solution is the expensive system of financing the maintenance of the schools of t the province. Intensive study has been given to this subject, and the results of the enquiries which have been made will be reported to the Legislature where the subject will be fully discussed."

5:00 O'clock

The contrast between what was said in the 22 points and what is said in the speech from the throne will provide much food for thought among municipal councillors and others who are concerned with municipal finances, and also among those who voted Progressive-Conservative last summer under the impression that the taxes on their homes were about to be cut in half.

We are pleased to learn that the results of the enquiries which have been made will be reported to the Legislature and I am sure the Government will find that the discussion will not only be full but also very interesting. In this connection I take some pride in pointing out that the party with which I am associated has been advocating, not for eight months but for eith eight years or more, that the province should assume a much larger share of the costs of education, - in our view at least 50 per cent of the cost throughout the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up much time in this debate today, in dealing with what has been said during the heat of an election, and what some people have continued to say since the election, with respect to the programme of my own party. There are, however, some comments which I am obliged to make on some of the statements which have been made, and, first of all, I say this - and I say it not only nor solely to members of this house, but even more to people outside this house - I say that democracy itself is in danger, when a large part of the political propoganda andpublicity being carried on through-out the country, does not issue from responsible political leaders, who are willing to subject themselves to a decision at the polls by thepeople, but emerge from people who are not willing to submit their qualifications, which will not bear examination at the polls, but whose sole claim to a hearing is that they have some millions of dollars with which to obtain that hearing.

And let me sound a note of warning for the benefit of those who are inclined to take seriously the activities of Mr. W. E. Gladstone Murray, a man whoserecord is too wellknown for me to go into any detail, a man who was a complete failure as a public servant, and who left the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation soon after a parliamentary committee, after exhaustive enquiries, had recommended his removal from office.

Let me say to any one who may be tempted to take the advice of Mr. Murray, that they examine with care his qualifications to speak in defence of freedom, or defence of democracy. Who was responsible? It will take too much time to list them all. But notably amongst those who sponsored him, this "Great Friend of Democracy", and British systems, Mr. Arthur Schmon, president of the Ontario Paper Company, one of the chief instruments of money-making in this country and the United States, a publisher who produced so many pro-Fascist pronouncements before Pearl Harbour that his name stank in the nostrils of decent American citizens.

Mr. Schmon is ..

..

AA amongst Mr. Gladstone Murray's sponsors.

Another is Lord Barmby, and who is Lord Barmby, may I ask? Lord Barmby, before he became a peer was a member of the British House of Commons -- a conservative member, of course -- and in the years between 1937 and 1939, was one of the principal sponsors of the Anglo-German fellowship, which spread Nazi propaganda throughout the length and breadth of the British Isles, a fellowship whose only purpose was to ~~permit~~ promote closer co-operation between the British democracy and Hitler bestiality, an organization which was in part responsible for Munich. He was one of the principal sponsors of that organization, and also turns up as sponsor for Mr. W.E. Gladstone Murray.

And in defence of free enterprise, and as a champion of freedom, we notice such mighty men as the president of the Massey Harris Company, in whom the farmers should be interested, and the president of the Imperial Oil Company, and the president of the Imperial Tobacco Company, in whom other farmers should also be very much interested. And too a number of others of the same stripe, who are now self-sacrificially devoting their time and their money to the defence of individualism, the individualism which has been trodden under foot for these many years by the great corporations they control.

I notice references, frequently made not only by Major Murray, but also by members of the Progressive Conservative Party, to the question of state socialism -- whatever that may be. I think, Mr. Speaker, that members of the administration are feeling it duty bound to relieve some people in this province of the anxiety in which they are being placed, by a great deal of propaganda they have heard. They should, for example, relieve them of the anxiety that a conservative administration may introduce this monstrous thing known as, "state socialism", because I hold in my hand a conservative publication issued and used during the election of 1934, in which it is stated at page 9:

> " It is a remarkable fact that Ontario under a conservative administration has enacted some of

BB

the most advanced social legislation in the world, leading all the countries in the socialization of a public utility. It is an equally remarkable fact that enactment in Canada of its ank of anada act and its mortgage act, has placed Canada on a par with Russia in state socialism".

Now, if that was said in 1934 I think the prime minister should relieve the people who are frightened by it now, of their anxieties. Of course, the only possible explanation is that what they said in 1934 they did not seriously mean, any more than they mean what they say today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it still appears to be one of the favorite things to be spread throughout the land with respect to the movement I represent, and for which I speak in this house, and that is this talk about taking away the farm from the farmers, confiscating the farms and the homes, and many other things which have been mentioned.

I wish to take this opportunity of stating that in no time in the history of the C.C.F. has the party, or any responsible spokesman thereof, suggested that the Ontario farmer should have his farm taken away from him, but, Mr. Speaker, I raise the point because I know the administration should relieve the people of this province of the anxiety, some of them hold, that their own Government is going to take the farmer's farms away from them.

Very recently a representative of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission approached the Griffith family, who operated a farm near the city of St. Catharines, and told them they must sell their farm as it was needed for the purposes of the Decew Power Development. The members of this Griffith family had operated that farm, and lived in the same home for one hundred and ten years. They were willing to sell whatever was actually requiredby the Commission, but they were anxious to retain the old family home and five acres with it, because of its long associations with the family, and they had the right to expect that to be arranged. They also wished to retain the barn, and I would like to say for the benefit for the hon.

BB

minister of agriculture -- because they had stock which supplied livelihood to Mr. Alfred Griffith, a member of the family, which he derived entirely from that enterprise. He is fifty-eight years of age, and has never done anything but farm, and it was impossible to find any other accommodations for the stock in his barn, and although repeated assurances were given by the representative of the commission to the Griffith family that if they conveyed that whole property to the commission they would be given the first opportunity to buy back any part of it not actually required for the purposes of the commission, but despite of that, the Griffith family have been repeatedly denied the right of retaining the old family home.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): May I ask, just to keep the record straight, when that approach was made by the Hydro-Commission.

MR. E. B. Jolliffe: I will be glad to clear up that point. I appreciate that approach was made by the Hydro-Electric to the Griffith family at the time when the present administration was still not in office. The present administration was not in office. It was some eighteen months ago, and if the hon. minister who answers to this house for hydro affairs will be patient, I will deal with this point. Although repeated assurances were given, they have been denied what was their right. Now, that home is not required for the purposes of the commission, and is not required for any necessary purpose by the government. On the contrary, when the Decew falls development was opened, on or about the fifteenth of October, it was announced by the prime minister himself or by one of his associates that the old home would be converted into a museum. In the meantime, the family were allowed to remain in possession as lessees, because they had been persuaded to convey it to the commission, and they were allowed to remain in as lessees until January 15th of this year, when they were evicted by a sheriff's officer, and their livestock, consisting of eighteen head of cattle, four horses and nearly two hundred

BB hens were disposed of by forced sale held on the fifteenth of January of this year, while the present administration was in office, and even if the administration persisted in the democratic idea of creating another museum for after the war, there was no need to evict that family in January, or sell their stock at a loss, or to treat them as if they belonged in a totalitarian state.

Oh, I know the Government will say, "these people were paid". Of course they were paid. That is not an answer to the cruel injustice which has been done in that case. The fact is that if the Progressive Conservative administration, acting on a course started by a previous administration, have taken away the Griffith family's farm, not for any necessary purpose, but merely to gratify some beaurocratic passions for another antique show place in the peninsula.

And they not only took away the farm, but refused to return it, but they broke up the home after more than a century's occupation by the family, and they deprived Mr. Alfred Griffith of his livestock at the age of fifty-eight, and removed another man from farm production.

I would like to hear what the minister of agriculture has to say about that contribution to food production.

Not long ago, the Progressive Conservative members at Ottawa made a great noise and a great fuss because Mr. R.B. Hanson could not get his registration certificate from the beaurocratic administration, when he was deprived of his registration certificate. I want to know from the Government when the Griffith family is going to get their farm and their five acres back, which is so badly needed by them, and not by the Government, their home, their farm, and their five acres, not needed by the Government, but needed by them, and not needed by the hydro. And I am warning the Government that unless this injustice is righted, the farmers of Ontario will hear about it from me from now until the next day the votes are counted. Judging by the Griffith case, there is not a farm in this province, not a home in this province, which is safe from arbitrary seizure by some power-drunk beaurocrat, and I do

not want to hear of any more "buck-passing" between the Government and the Hydro Commission, as I heard when I called up the hon. the minister who answers for hydro affairs, the minister without portfolio, and as I stated, I do not want to hear anymore "buck-passing" between the Government and the commission, because if the Government has power to intervene in the Hydro-Electric rights, they can intervene in this case, and I may say that as a result of my intercession, the unfortunate Griffith family received their eviction notice within three days afterwards.

HON. G.H. CHALLIES: The whole thing is wrong.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: The honourable minister will have an opportunity to make his point, and I will be pleased to hear it at the proper time, but the point is that descent people can very well be evicted from homes they have occuppied possibly for one hundred years.

We want to hear less talk about free enterprise and more about actual provisions for the protection of ordinary people throughout this province.

The trouble with the Griffith family was that they had no power of wealth or political influence, and that is the trouble with a great majority of people throughout the province.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, in this house to do work for the people of Ontario, not only for the present generation, but also for the future generations - for the next generation. In our view, these are times without a precedent, and will require policies without precedent. We believe these policies must be determined by reference to the social needs and social necessities, and that the political and economic shiboleths of the last century must go. We will welcome all constructive and progressive measures which may be introduced by the present Covernment, but we shall not forget their limitations. We hope and believe it is not too late for this province to undertake real changes, and perform with a vision and courage that which will be worthy of the sacrifices now being made overseas by so many brave men and brave women in the cause of freedom and social justice.

CC Mr. SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, we are very happy to see you here and to realize that you are interested enough to come to this house, but I must say that according to the rules of the house there is to be no applause from the galleries. I know that you will co-operate to that extent, and there will be no further need for me to refer to it again. Of course, if you do not co-operate, then the chair will be forced to exercise such authority as it has.

I am sure, however, that we will have your co-operation in this regard.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Mr. Speaker, most of the members of this Legislature must have been amazed the day before yesterday when on his first appearance in this Legislature we found a brand new convert to the ideas of Mr. Arthur Meighen, in the person of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), but conversion cannot be anything that compared with the enthusiasm with which he has placed before us this extraordinary Griffith case, and has indicated that the reason these people were evicted was because they did not have money to fight their case.

Now, the fact is, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I am sure knows perfectly well, that these people received nineteen thousand dollars for a small farm, nearly a year ago, and signed an agreement to get off the property, and the use of that building had nothing in the world to do with the need of their getting off, because it is in the middle of an area that is to be flooded, and actually the house itself must not be kept in this present relationship to the farm. These people had ample time to decide before they signed that deed, and when the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) gave this "beautiful" picture of the people who were denied the right of livelihood, I feel I should, right at the outset of my remarks, say that is exactly in keeping with the sort of thing which does call for the very sort of criticism to which he objects, because the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) if he has followed this through at all knows perfectly well that for a very much less sum than they received for the farm, they were able to buy a

farm just down the road, and had that farm to operate on, and so no farm was put out of production by the action that was taken.

Another thing perhaps which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) might have spoken of, is the fact that there was a fire in that property, and in order to preserve the property it was very necessary that they be got out of there -- I hope the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has seen it -- have you?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I have been there.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): You knew there was a fire there then? You know this place is right in the middle of the development, and it will also be a very useful thing instead of leaving the house vacant, to afford the opportunity of providing accommodation for many of the historic relics in that area, and, as far as I am concerned, I make no appology whatever for making use of a place which otherwise would have been standing completely idle.

As for the purpose of the removal of the people, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knew perfectly well when he made this statement that it had nothing to do with it. That is typical of the remarks that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has been making all afternoon. There was no suggestion of flooding of the house, and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows it. However, it is typical of the sort of remarks that are made all afternoon, together with the suggestion with regard to things which have never happened, and his warning of what will happen if he is not pleased with the outcome.

--the fact that they have been advocating these things for a long time and that these things that we promised suddenly emerged. It would have been well if perhaps he had been actually following the proceedings in this Legislature because the fact is that they were matters introduced into this Legislature at one time or another and were things that were supported by the party to which I belong. Now, this suggestion that he never before heard of anything --to use his own expression, until the last 8 months, I am just going to read a quotation which will show the exact type of thing that it is open to the Leader of the Opposition to criticize at all times. I am just going to quote in relation to that to show how far it is from the facts. These are my own words printed, which were available to him and which were as a matter of fact available in record and I will quote. This is dated November 19, 1938. It was a speech I made over the Ontario radio stations of the radio net work of this province on November 19, 1938. So that I was not saying this somewhere quietly in order to hide from the Leader of the Opposition what my opinions were:

"There are many ways in which the problem of unemployment may be faced and the time for action in that respect is long overdue. Widespread unemployment today is resulting in something far more serious even that loss of vitality and despair of those who are unemployed. It is also destroying the confidence of young men and women in their own future. When they see so many others, with years of training and experience, who are unable to get work, they become more and more fearful of what the future may bring for them. At the very time when they should have complete faith in their country and in themselves, fear is being instilled by what they see happening to the older generation. And nothing destroys either a nation or an individual so effectively as fear.

That fear can be removed. It must be removed if democracy is to survive. I do not believe there is any country

in the world where the youth have as much reason for faith in their future as in Canada. It is your job and my job to find a way in which our mighty resources may be put to work to provide for the employment and security of all those in this country who are prepared to play their part.

I do not believe in any reckless programme of public works but there are many things which can be done to create employment under an intelligent long range plan of development which will make use of the mighty resources which nature has placed at our disposal.

We are told these things will cost us money we cannot afford to spend. That is something we must not ignore. But we have spent hundreds of millions for relief and have nothing to show for it but the despair of those who have received the money.

Debt incurred in creating productive assets is not necessarily a burden. Every successful private enterprise once started with a similar debt when it borrowed its capital from shareholders who had faith in the future of the enterprise. That is the kind of debt which built Canada from a wilderness. Debt which creates no balancing asset is the kind of debt we must not incur. But debt incurred to give work and at the same time build assets for the future is the kind of debt we must be prepared to face."

Now, those were statements I made on November 19, 1938- not 8 months ago and it was said on very many other occasions and the Leader of the Opposition was in a position to know exactly what had been said.

Mr. Speaker, I propose today to deal with a number of matters that are before this Legislature. First of all I do want to say this: There is some talk about this being a minority government. This government is the government which has been called to give executive direction to the affairs of this Legislature and I think that it may be a very healthy thing to see members free to express their own opinions and to vote in accordance with their own views. This is not, cannot be a minority government. You have got the power to show that the contrary is the case by

to accept as an issue. If it is ~~xxx~~ a fact that we have not the confidence of the Legislture then the ordinary democratic proceeding is followed. But if, on the other hand, that is not done then do not suggest that this a minority Government because by your conduct you must imply , if you believe in the democratic process, that you have confidence in the continuance of our work as the Government of this Province.

As for the terms upon which we will govern there are no terms. There is no suggestion of dictatorship and even the hint of such a suggestion is rather a reflection on the man who made it, because if ever there were less suggestion of a dictatorship it is when we meet here with at least four colors on the plan of this building indicating four at least, and I am not/sure at all that if the thing were carried still further in its refinement that the colors might not even be increased. So that we are actually in a position where we must depend entirely upon the extent to which you are prepared to support what we do as being in the interests of the Province of Ontario. What I said and what I repeat is this: That we do not intend to govern in any spirit of fear. We admot the responsibility of government; we will carry it on and just as soon as you feel that you wish to demonstrate that we have not the confidence, the democratic test is there and we will face that test. On the other hand, while the Leader of the Opposition may have felt impelled to make some of those rather assiduous remarks I am quite inclined to agree with him that there are no reasons why a very wide measure of co-operation may not be established between all members of this house who really believe in the welfare of the Province of Ontario and are prepared to forget party expediciency and support what they believe is right. I assure you that I personally--and in this I can speak for all those of my associates I am sure-- that we will welcome the support for the measures that we propose to introduce on the widest possible basis and when there is any suggestion that an opportunity is not going to be given to discuss matters in this Legislature, may I merely

merely the first instalment of a number of bills that are going to go through the democratic mill of this Legislature where everyone has an opportunity to examine them, to express his ~~xxx~~ or her opinion and upon the basis of the vote following that expression of opinion to decide whether the Bill shall become law.

Today we have introduced a Bill which I believe is one of considerable importance. We have given notice of a Bill to create the Department of Planning and Development and I will take only a short time to explain the reason for creating this department and the need which it serves. ~~xxxxhe~~ In the first place, it should be understood that a great deal has already been done. Preparatory spade work has been completed by several departments of Government, and by a much greater number of municipal, labour, industrial, and other organizations then is generally known. On nearly every large question, considerable data is already available. But there is no co-ordination between these plans and no central driving force to bring them together.

In most fields of activity, existing departments have the facilities to put plans into operation when those plans are accepted as a matter of policy and the time comes to put them into effect.

In fact, a very considerable part of whatever plans are made by anybody can, under the existing machinery of this department be done either by the Department of Highways or by the Department of Public Works.

It is necessary to see these plans in the wide dimensions of our future growth/ are ready when the time comes. With our vast resources, development can proceed beyond the present limits of/~~xxx~~ most people's imagination.

When we speak of employment, many people are speaking in terms of our present levels of employment. But the truth is that the lands, the forests, the mines, and the manufacturing industries, are capable of very greatly expanded production. We have the raw materials, we have the industrial skill, and the world is going to need the things that we can make. To take advantage of that s ituation, our plans for the future must be brought

n5

together, and it will be the first function of this new department to co-ordinate the many planning agencies now looking to the future, and also to stimulate new planning in directions which have not yet been explored by any organized effort.

I shall go on at the invitation of the Leader of the Opposition to indicate some of the very type of things that that department will deal with. Let me take merely as an illustration the development of the St.Lawrence River for hydro-electric power. That will result in the flooding of a large area as has already been pointed out. The plans prepared for that development will show the likely area of flooding. Three departments are immediately involved by this fact. The Department of Highways already has a complete four-year plan covering the whole Province. I doubt very much if the Dominion Government or any province has as complete, as comprehensive and as workable plans as the department now has in complete form ready to use at any time under the leadership of the present Minister of Highwqys.

Now, obviously, of necessity its contemplated highways and other constructions in that area would require to be adjusted, in accordance with the plans of the St. Lawrence development. Hydro-electric power lines would also require to be replaced and installed further back. The Department of Municipal Affairs would be faced with problems connected with the reallocation of municipal areas and the rebuilding of communities affected. This is merely one example of the sort of co-ordination which is necessary and the kind of central direction which must be given if the plans of the various departments and other organizations are to be part of an integrated whole and ready to be put into action when the time comes.

Let me give an example of the sort of thing that may well be done outside of the scope of anything that we have done in the past.

For years there has been talk of the great clay belt

in the North. Exact figures are not available ~~xxxxxx~~ but many reliable experts have placed the arable area in that great clay belt at somewhere between 12 and 20,000,000 acres of rich soil. Now, even taking the lowest estimate we have there is in that area a tremendous opportunity for development. Not in the way it was attempted before, where individual settlers were called upon to go in and try to make their way into the primeval forest but this can be done, properly planned by bringing together the various agencies of Government, bringing together those who would wish to go there and under integrated plans opening that area up with bulldozers, cutting machines and other equipment that would not be available to the ordinary settlers.

Those are the sort of things that would be explored by committee publicly set up by such a department as this. There are many things of that kind outside of the present activities of many departments but, as I said before, any of those measures, once the plans are conceived, can almost in every case be then placed under the direction of an existing department so long as there is this central guiding department.

The bill creating this department will, I hope, be passed next week, and steps will then be taken to create the small but expert staff necessary to begin this tremendously important work.

Closely associated with planning and development is the subject of research. Research in all fields of production is our most serious weakspot at the present time. We have an Ontario Research Foundation. It has done splendid work. Quietly and without publicity, it has given enormous help in the development of our war production. But its activities are limited by the size of its staff and the amount of money available for its work. Research must cover a wide field. We need research not only in indistrial production but just as much in the production of the products of the farms, the forests, the mines and the streams.

With that thought in mind, and recognizing the

tremendous contributions they have already made, the Government has made grants to the three great Provincial Universities--Toronto, Queen's , and Western. With the idea of stimulating research not only in the scientific field but also in the social and economic field, special grants have been given as follows: To Toronto University $400,000; to Queen's and Western Universities $250,000.00 each. It is the hope of the Government that by these contributions research can be stimulated in all essential fields. By that also we hope that greater interest will be aroused on the part of the staff and the students and encouragement given to private financial support which was never more necessary than it is today for these great institutions.

One thing that it is necessary for us to realize is that the magnificent production of our industrial plants has depended, to a very large degree, upon blue prints which came ready made to us from outside of Canada. We lack industrial designers in sufficient numbers for the period of conversion. We have produced many good designers, many magnificent designers during the war.

I recall, as the member from Fort William will recall himself, just one example of the sort of achievement that has come out of this war where in the plant at Fort William of the company making the Curtiss Hell-Diver a very able young woman had become the chief draughtsman in that plant and this very attractive young girl was playing her part in designing these badly needed machines of war, which in turn will take their place amongst the air forces in the United Nations in destroying our common enemy, but, as he will remember, the designing and draughting room in that large plant is/a relatively small part of that plant and the reason for that is--and I will only take this as an example, which he will recall--the reason for that is that the designs for the Curitss machine come to us ready-made from the United States. And so it is in the mighty Lancasters, magnificent machines that are being produced here by the skilled hands of Canadian workmen just outside of Toronto. Again in that

n8

case only a limited need for designing skill, draughting skill, because the plans of the Lancaster have already been worked out in the great plants of Britain where the original designs appeared. So it is with the Mosquito. So it is with the other aircraft which we have made. So it is with the guns and engines of war which have come to us largely prepared in advance by others.

Now, recognizing as we do the great skill of those who have taken their part in the designing of such things as we are saying, that is one place where we must tackle the job of creating the designing staff and designing team that will be needed for the new production in the turn over to peace. And one thing which all of us must recognize is that you cannot create a great designing team simply by putting a lot of good individual draughtsmen and designers together. They must work together for sometime; must have known the experience of seeing production grow from the first lines on a draughting board and must have a background of actual contact with these in industrial production, which gives them the confidence which comes from seeing blue prints take form in action.

By effective collaboration between our research organizations and the new Department of Development and Planning, it will be possible to measure the requirements in this field and to take immediate steps towards the assurance of the numbers we will require for the new types of production which will develop after the war.

The Leader of the Opposition has said, and in that I think that all will agree with him, that plans by themselves mean nothing. It is only when those plans take effect in actual form that they become a matter of practical use to our people. Now, that is exactly the purposes of this Department to see that the plans take form and really produce results.

While I am speaking of Research in connection with that I would like to place on record in this Legislature at least a brief summary of the achievements of our own Ontario Research Foundation because

Ontario Research Foundation because, as I have already said, quietly, without advertising, they have gone ahead and done a splendid job and that has tied right in with our own work.

At the commencement of the war there were few facilities in Canada which could quickly be placed at the disposal of the Government for the solution of technical problems concerning munitions production and the control of precision measurements required in the manufacture of shells, arms and other ordnance.

The initial opportunity for the Foundation to serve in this way was afforded by the British Supply Board, on whose request the Foundation immediately made available several of its laborities.

The first project was the establishment of a laboratory for checking the accuracy of the official gauges used by Government inspectors in munition plants. This project has developed to a point where about thirty-five trained people are employed.

The British Supply Board also required facilities for the analysis of alloys and for the testing of shell paints and other protective coatings. Additional staff and equipment was provided and thousands of analyses and determinations have been conducted. The original British Supply Board work was later taken over by the Inspection Board of United Kingdom and Canada, and the Foundation's analytical laboratory has for several years now been regarded as an official referee laboratory for that Board.

In 1941 the Department of Minitions and Supply asked the Foundation to establish a shop in which faulty munition gauges could be quickly rectified and put back into use. Space was immediately devoted to that purpose and equipment installed. The shop is still performing its functions to the satisfaction of the Government authorities for which it is operated.

The manufacture of armour plate in Canada for the first

time gave rise to serious difficulties. One of these was the welding of armour plate on military reconnaissance vehicles. Ordinary welding methods did not satisfy the inspection authorities, and in co-operation with the firms involved, the Foundation developed and established in production an improved welding process which afforded the required quality at substantially reduced costs.

Another problem was the development of adequate protective qualities in heavy armour plate. The metallurgical staff of the Foundation examined this type of plate and made recommendations which have resulted in greatly improved properties.

The production of armour piercing shot was another entirely new venture in Canadian manufacturing and as a result of a lengthy research programe improvements have resulted.

Then the necessity for synthetic rubber production became apparent, the Foundation collaborated with the Dominion Government Committee on Synthetc Rubber, as did other scientific organizations, with a view to finding desired improvements in the Buna-S formula, which would produce a better rubber. The Foundation has conducted experimental work in its laboratories for over two years, all of which results have been made available to the Rubber Committee.

About two years ago the Textile Department of the Foundation was asked to assist in the critical examination of all of the protective flying clothing used by the R.C.A.F. It was felt that such clothing as it then existed was inadequate in certain respects from the standpoint of the comfort, safety and effectiveness of our airmen. The facilities of the Foundation were made available for this project, on which reports were made to the Committee on Aviation Medicine of the National Research Council. Every garment of protective clothing is inspected from the standpoint of its adequacy, construction and conditions of use. The results of the work have been sufficiently appreciated that in the Autumn of 1943

the Foundation was asked to assist in similar work under the auspices of the Joint Service Committee. Additional staff has been devoted to the work, and as results ~~were~~ are obtained, they are reported to the respective service authorities in order that they may be incorporated into clothing supplies being manufactured.

As the Foundation has a fully equipped leather laboratory and ~~exp~~experienced personnel it has acted as consultant to the military authorities in respect to leather requirements. This consultation continues to proceed, especially in reference to the protective clothing investigation outlined in the preceding paragraph.

When the shortage situation in edible vegetable oils became acute, the Foundation was asked to conduct an investigation into the utilization of linseed oil for edible purposes. The project is in collaboration with the National Research Council, and while a great deal of work has been done, the problem has not yet been fully solved. Efforts are still proceeding in the hope that this domestic oil may be made to serve a broader industrial field.

The military authorities have been experiencing considerable trouble in the manufacture of steel tank treads in Canada. The Metallurgical staff of the Foundation has been able to make a contribution to both the design and manufacture of tank treads, with a view to prolonging their wear, improving their quality and reducing their cost of production. This work is being done not only for the military authorities, but also for producers of tank treads.

A contribution has been made to aircraft production by an arrangement with a manufacturer of aircraft instruments to demagnetize the cases and shields incorporated in such instruments. The Foundation installed special heat-treating equipment for this purpose, which has resulted in enabling steel to be used where the more critical materials of brass and aluminum were employed before shortages developed.

The foregoing are the highlights of the war work done by the Foundation. In addition to the projects named, there have been hundreds of shorter term investigations of problems relating to wartime production. Most of these have been brought to the Foundation by manufacturers, and after study ranging from a few days to a few weeks, satisfactory solutions have been reached.

(page 72 follows)

I have read this only because of the fact that I believe this work is too little known and that the work of the Foundation has been of enormous importance in the war effort in this Province, but that what has been accomplished there merely points the way to our vital need of the future- and was tied in with planning, with development, and essentially to planning of development, in any field is research and quite apart from research of the universities and the research which will be conducted by the Foundation, it is the purpose of this Government to support research in every aspect and to open the result of the inquiry.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition has spoken of the fact that there was some suggestion of a conference between the Dominion and the Provinces in regard to matters to take place in the future. Now, may I place myself on record with this Legislature, for whom, after all, in that respect, with their support I must be taken to speak, I have asked, just as he has suggested, that there should be a conference and on January 6th last I wrote the following letter to Mr. King:

"Dear Mr. King:

Since returning to my office I have had an opportunity a number of speeches made by Dominion Cabinet Ministers referring to plans that are being made for post-war employment and re-construction. I find in most cases they refer to fields of activity which would ordinarily be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial governments.

I need not say that we are most anxious to co-operate in every practical measure which will assure effective post-war planning and the prompt rehabilitation of the members of our armed forces. I believe it is extremely important, however, that where it will be necessary to obtain the agreement of the Provincial Government in regard to joint occupation of fields of legislation ordinarily under their exclusive jurisdiction, there should be previous discussion so that any measures introduced will be on a basis agreed upon in advance.

At present there are a number of [illegible]

and education awaiting adjustment between the Dominion and provincial governments. I believe it is very difficult to deal with this or with any other similar agreements until we have reached some understanding in regard to the present and future constitutional relationship of the various governments.

I would, therefore, urge that ~~thm~~ a Dominion-Provincial Conference be called at the earliest possible date to consider the broad question of post-war planning and reconstruction. Not only is this necessary for the purpose of determining the basis upon which the Dominion and provincial governments will co-operate but it is also necessary for the purpose of considering the subject of taxation in relation to these measures.

I believe it is of the utmost importance that such a conference be held before any measures are introduced either in the Dominion Parliament or the Provincial Legislature which call for ultimate agreement between the Dominion and Provincial Government. We will be prepared to send representatives to a conference of this nature at such times as will be convenient to you but I do urge that the conference be held at the earliest possible date.

Yours sincerely"

That was dated January 6th and on January 13th I received the following reply:

"My dear Premier:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of January 6th regarding a call to Dominion-Provincial conference to consider questions of post-war employment, reconstruction and the financial relationship between the Dominion and the provinces.

At the close of the Dominion-Provincial Conference on January 15, 1941, I indicated that my colleagues and I would be ready to meet the provincial governments at any time they were generally agreed that a further conference would be in the national interest.

"I am pleased to note from your letter that the Province of Ontario is prepared to take part in such a conference at the earliest possible date. By direction of the Government the Clerk of the Privy Council is today sending copy of your communication to the premiers of the other provinces with request to the early expression of their views as to holding of Dominion-Provincial Conference.

Yours sincerely"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that we have taken the only course open to us to call for such a conference; we have indicated our desire to go ahead with it. We are most anxious that it proceed immediately and I hope in this case the Leader of the Opposition did notice I have indicated my desire on a number of times since then that it proceed as soon as possible. This conference is extremely necessary because I do not think there was ever a time when it was so vitally important that we should know exactly what the functions of the different governments are going to be in tackling the problems of the future.

I am going to have something important to say on that later on as the experience of the Government of Ontario--not the present Government--in regard to some of the difficulties in making some of the agreements stand, but one thing I do wish to make abundantly clear that in this matter, as in the early case, when it was at my invitation on behalf of the Government that conference was called to deal with labour matters that equally press for full understanding between the Dominion and the Province so that any confusion of authority might be avoided. That is our desire but at the same time, Mr. Speaker and members of this Legislature, I feel that the time has come when either this Government must assert its position or there is a great danger that this Government and this Parliament will drift into a position where they will not know what their constitutional authority is and when peace came utter chaos might result because

of a set-up which had no relation to our actual constitutionnl authority.

HON. GEORGE A DREW (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, it being now 6 o'clock I do move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Is the debate adjourned to be resumed on Tuesday?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister) Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Hon. Mr. Drew, seconded by Mr. Nixon that the House do now adjourn. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Speaker: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Friday, February 25, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
FEB 26 1944
RECEIVED

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any petitions?

NIL.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports of committees.

NIL.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Moves by myself, seconded by Mr. Kennedy THAT a Select Committee be appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum set apart in the Estimates for Art purposes, such Committee to be composed as follows:

Messrs. Duckworth, (Chairman), Begin, Casselman, Hepburn, (Prince Edward-Lennox), Oliver, Robson, Salsberg, Taylor, (Huron), Warren.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves, seconded by Mr. Kennedy THAT a Select Committee be appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum set apart in the Estimates for Art purposes, such Committee to be composed as follows:

Messrs. Duckworth, (Chairman), Begin, Casselman, Hepburn, (Prince Edward-Lennox), Oliver, Robson, Salsberg, Taylor, (Huron), Warren.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

Shall the motion carry.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A DREW (Prime Minister): Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library, such Committee to be composed as follows:-

Messrs. Arnott (Chairman), Hanna, Laurier, MacLeod, McEwing,

Overall, Reynolds, Robertson and Scott.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library, such Committee to be composed as follows:-

Messrs. Arnott, (Chairman), Hanna, Laurier, MacLeod, McEwing, Overall, Reynolds, Robertson and Scott.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of three members.

Shall the motion carry.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Presentation of bills.

NIL.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, just before the orders of the day, I would wish to make a comment about a matter that has been brought to my attention. In the press yesterday some prominence was given to a report presented to the Commons' reconstruction committee by Dr. Weir, and from that report the statement is made as to jobs to be provided by the various employing bodies in the country, and I read that the provincial government have estimated a total of 77274 employment opportunities. It goes on to say Quebec has the largest total with 22595, Ontario is second with 17668, and then it goes on to an estimate of the other provinces.

I think I should say most emphatically that this government is not aware of the source of these figures, and that this government has not been asked to provide any figures; in fact, it is perfectly obvious that the plan already under way contemplates figures far beyond those given. I think it would be most unfortunate if any statement of prospective employment of this kind were given by any branch of the Dominion Government without full facts. I wish to say quite definitely, that this government did not supply those figures, and they are wholly inconsistent with the figures we would expect to have available, even on the basis of the plans now prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Second order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order; second reading of bill No. 23, "an act to amend the weed control act".

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill might I explain that some years ago it was thought wise that every thresher should be registered to prevent the spread of weed seeds. This meant that 100 per cent of the threshers had to pay one dollar a year, but the fact of the matter was that only one-half of one per cent of the threshers carry weed seed, and therefore it was felt wise that the ninety-nine and one-half per cent should not be punished for the deeds of the other one-half per cent, which can be taken care of in other ways.

Therefore, I move the second reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kennedy moves the second reading of bill No. 23 "an act to amend the weed control act". Shall the motion carry.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order 3.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order; second reading of bill No. 24, "an act to amend the justices of the peace act".

Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of an act to amend the justices of the peace act, I wish to first call the attention of the house to the old provision and the new provision, which I shall read.

The old provision of section 2 provided:

" 2. The Lieutenant-Governor by commission under the great seal in pursuance of an order-in-council, whenever he thinks fit, may appoint justices of the peace in and for the Province of Ontario, or any part thereof".

Now, the first amendment to the provision is that section 2 shall now be made subject to section 2-A, and section 2-A is a comparatively brief, and contains within the scope of that section the principle of the amending bill, and I will read the proposed new section 2-A. It is as follows:

"2-A: Any person other than a barrister or solicitor, desirous of being appointed a justice of the peace shall be subject to examination in regard to his qualifications for the office by the judge of the county or district court of the county or district in which he resides, or by such other

person as may be appointed in that behalf by the Lieutenant-Governor, and no such person shall be appointed a Justice of the Peacd without a certificate from such judge or other person that he has examined the applicant and finds him qualified for the office, and that, in his opinion, a justice of the peace is needed for the public convenience, in matters pertaining to the administration of justice.

Regarding the principle: I would remind the House that the Act has permitted, and the practice heretofore has beenm to appoint whatever numbers of Justicesof the Peace might have seemed desirable for political purposes, as opposed to being desirable to assist in the administration of justice. This amendment is a simple one, and in its phraseology it follows precisely - with one exception which I will mention, the terminology already found in the Notary Publics' Act.

There are two factors involved. First, a judge before whom an applicant for Justice of the Peace will come, will assure himself that the applicant to be a Justice of the Peace has these minimum qualificatins - this minimum knowledge - under the Code, which will enable him to exercise some reasonable discretion as to whether or not he shouldswear out an Information against an accused person, and, secondly, if he be called upon to fulfill his functions under the Justice of the Peace Act, with another justice, to try offences, that heis reasonably qualified to do so.

The second factor that the judge would be asked to certify to, is this; that there is in the area, a public necessity and convenience for an additional Justice of the Peace. That provision is there for the purpose of checking the practice of appointing any number of Justice of the Peace upon whom these powers are conferred, just as a matter of small, and petty political honour, regardless of the effect that it may have on the rights and interests of the public in the locality where appointed.

Now, for the sake of clarity, I want to point out the one distinctio n in the drafting of this section, as compared with the Notaries' Act, and that is the mere addition of these

words, "In matters pertaining to the administration of justice". That ensures that in considering an applicant's qualifications, and also the matter of "public necessity and convenience", the mind of the judge will be directed to public necessity and convenience only in relation to participation in the administration of justice.

Mr. Speaker, these are the purposes, and these are the objects of this amending Bill, and I have pleasure in moving its second reading.

MR. ROLAND PATTERSON (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, is it the intention to require men presently officiating as Justices of the Peace to submit to this examination?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question; the provisions of this Act are not retroactive, and do not apply to existing Justices of the Peace, and so that my answer to the question may be a frank one, may I say that until such an amending Act would come into force, the old system, of course, will prevail, where these appointments are made and revoked on "whim".

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister if any appointments have been made since the first of July of this last year, that is, has any one "got in under the repes", before the examinations were laid down?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I hardly like the way the question is put and perhaps I might raise the question that it should go on the order paper, but I do not wish to avail myself of that privilege. No appointments were made for the purpose of putting them, as the hon. member for St. Davids (Mr. Dennison) expressed it, to get them "under the wire". A number of appointments were made principally upon the requests of the municipalities, and in most instances upon the certification by the clerk of the municipality, regardless of the political side of the question.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS: Mr. Speaker, would this eliminate all those without legal training - in those choices?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: The answer to that is "No" and I might point out that the proposed new Section 2-A, on its

surface indicates that any who already have legal training may be appointed without these qualification examinations, and the section contemplates the appointment of those who are not qualified as barristers and solicitors.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves this second reading of bill No. 24, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. 5.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth order; second reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act". Mr. Vivian.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN: Mr. Speaker, this bill is one to amend the Nurses' Registration Act, and provides for section 3 of the Nurses' Registration Act being repealed. Section 3 provides, in a general way, for the making of regulations, the appointment of officers, and prescribing of other duties, and is re-cast in two sections, so as to be as specifically authorized with the making of regulations or adopting regulations for the administration of the Act, and provides for the holding of post-graduate courses of instructions for nurses. It is a simple thing, which simply makes provision for the extension of the supervision of the Department of Health over the post-graduate training for registered nurses, which now come into operation within the Province.

The effect of this amendment to the Act would be simply to create a more uniform standard of training, particularly in the field of public health nursing, and in connection with those nurses who are taking courses in administration.

I am moving this be read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Vivian moves the second reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The second reading of the bill.

HONOURABLE GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. 7.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh order; second reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Tax". Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in moving that the bill to amend the Legitimation Act be read the second time, I feel I can add very little to the explanation I gave at the time of moving it be read for the first time.

I will repeat what I said on that occasion.

Hitherto, in the Province of Ontario, under the existing Legitimation Act, we have had a barbarous and mediaeval situation, that the mother of an illegitimate child, having no legitimate children, could not inherit the property of her illegitimate child, and that was so, notwithstanding the fact that that mother might have brought up that child, nurtured it, educated it, and put it in the way of being a useful citizen, and her reward for that effort heretofor has been that if the child failed to make a will and died intestate, then under those circumstances the Crown, in the right of the Province of Ontario, stepped in and took the property of such illegitimate child by escheat.

I feel in this more civilized and enlightened time, it is high time that that situation be remedied, and that in the case of such a child, failing to make a will, and in the absence of legitimate issue, to inherit in intestacy, certainly the mother should be able to inherit the property rather than have this escheated to the Crown in the right of the Province.

The second sub-section is merely the reverse of that situation, that where the mother of an illegitimate child has failed to make a will, and has no legitimate issue, certainly in this civilized age in which we live, it seems reasonable and apparent that in that case the illegitimate child of the intestate should be able to inherit the mother's property.

May I direct to the minds of the members of the House the fact that this bill is only operative under two instances; the first of these instances is the case where the mother or the child, as the case may be, fails to make a will by which the property descends according to their will or desire. The second case in which it is operative is only in case there are no legitimate children to inherit. That is the full explanation of the bill, and that is

my advocacy in support of it, and Mr. Speaker, I move that the Act to amend the Legitimation Act be now read for the second time.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I confess to no particular knowledge of the subject that is under discussion, legally or otherwise, but I am wondering if the hon. minister could not enlighten us on a question that arises in my mind after his explanation, namely that if there is no legitimate issue, as he terms it, at the death of either the illegitimate child that became an adult or the mother of an illegitimate child — if there is no legitimate issue then they shall be entitled to the inheritance. What then happens in view of the attempt of the hon. minister to improve the Act to the illegitimate issue, if such were to exist? I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my question is not too complicated, but it seems to me that it still leaves an unsolved problem. It seems to be solved only in the first case but not in the second. It appears to be an attempt to satisfy the civilized requirements, as the hon. minister said of the illegitimate issue, but if the illegitimate issue has illegitimate issue, you still leave him unprotected, according to the explanation.

Now, I confess, as I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, to no particular knowledge, but it does seem to be insufficient, and I would like an explanation from the hon. minister.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Andrew, (Mr. Salsberg) has raised a point that it is well to bring before the house for its consideration at this particular time.

I feel I understand his question, but its force and effect is simply this; why should the bill — the provisions of the bill — not go farther than they do, and why should the provisions of the bill not make it possible, if there was no will, under either instance we have referred to, then the mother of an illegitimate child in the case of legitimate issue would participate under the ordinary rule of intestacy?

The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker is that that consideration received the very careful attention and consideration of the Government and under some circumstances that might exist, under this statute amended as proposed, it might be felt in this civilized age such illegitimate children might be permitted to inherit. But this question, however, intrudes itself,

the question of public policy in the case of such a statute raises its head. Here is the situation. If an illegitimate child were permitted to come into Court and claim a part of the inheritance where there are legitimate children, and where such a child has not been legitimized, under the provisions of the existing statute, which can be done if the parents so desire, it would open the law to this abuse, that there would be all sorts of people intruding themselves into the affairs of a particular estate, alleging that father had made better use of his evenings out than mother had thought, and submit the executors for the next of kin and the widows of deceased parties, to endless blackmailing proceedings, and it was under these circumstances that the Government with some reluctance felt that they could go no further than they proposed to go in relation to this amendment.

I hope this explanation will satisfy the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I would think this is a Bill which deserves to receive support from all parts of the house, because the intention is, as I understand it, to do away with a form of discrimination as between one group of peopld and another group of people, a form of discrimination for which the only basis is the condition for which one group had no responsibility whatever, in the first place.

I was interested to hear the hon. the attorney General's explanation of the reason for not going further, and I think personally there is substance in it, but it does unfortunately perpetuate the discrimination in cases where there are both legitimate and illegitimate children. I am not sure that the difficulty raised by the hon. the attorney general can be overcome. I wish it could be.

The only other point to which I wish to refer is that the Adoption Act, or one sub-section of it, is involved in this Bill, and I would like to have heard from the hon. the attorney general, the explanation as to what bearing this bill has upon the sub-section of the Adoption Act.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, may I defer answering that question until I have a copy of the Adoption Act before me?

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves the second reading of Bill No. 28, an Act to amend the Legitimation Act. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. 9.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth order. Second reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act", Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out at the first reading of the bill, being an Act to amend the Law Society Act, it is a very simple bill, upon which I will not now take up unduly the time of the house. It is purely a matter of interior economy with the Law Society. This amendment arose by request of the Law Society, with reference to their benevolent fund, and so the house may appreciate in the simplest way the nature of the amendment, I will read the class of persons that were within the scope of the benevolent fund, under the Act as is, and under the proposed amended sections.

The class of persons that now may take the benefit of the benevolent fund of the law society are "widows, orphans of barristers and solicitors". It is proposed to extend that benefit so that the class of persons who will take the benefit of the provisions of the benevolent fund, under the control of the Benchers of the Law Society shall be, "Barristers and solicitors, their widows, orphans, or dependents", and then it goes a little further, and says, "And the terms of subscription and appropriation thereof, and the conditions under which such barristers and solicitors, their widows, orphans or dependents shall be entitled to share in this fund".

I will conclude what I have to say about this matter by reminding the house that the Law Society is an incorporated body, governed in a democractic fashion by its members, through elected representatives, called "benchers", and a matter of this sort, which is one concerns merely the internal administration of their own benevolent fund, and the Government has introduced this bill in response to a request of the society.

I, therefore, move that the bill, being an act to amend the Law Society Act, be now read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves, seconded reading of Bill No. 30,

"An Act to amend the Law Society Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. Eleven.

CLERK OF THE HouSE: Eleveneth order; second reading of bill No. 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act". Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in moving that the bill, being an Act to amend the Trustee's Act be read a second time, I draw the attention of the house to the fact that the proposed amendments are by way of additions to existing section 48 of the Trustee's Act. I will, therefore, read to the house section 48 as it is at the present time, and the proposed amendment.

"48: On the administration of an estate of a deceased person, in the case of a deficiency of assets, debts due to the Crown and to personal representatives of the deceased person, and debts to others, including therein debts by judgment or order, and other debts of record, debts by specialty, simple contract debts, such claims for damages as are payable in like order of administration as simple contract debts shall be paid pari passu, and without any preference or priority of debts of one rank or nature with those of another; but nothing herein shall prejudice any lien existing during the lifetime of the debtor on any of his property"

Now, as a practical matter in the administration of the estate, perhaps I should state the position occupied in law by a personal representative, be that personal representative an executor or an administrator. That legal position may be summarized in this fashion, that the primary duty or function of such a personal representative is to act in the first instance as a trustee for the creditors of the estate. In other words, such personal representatives mustdischarge in full, according to law, all debts before such personal representatives may give any effect to a state taxation, or to the interest of beneficiaries in the estate.

1. Now, under those circumstances there are two exceptions which have always been bug-bears to personal representatives in giving anestate good administration. They have been placed, in these two instances, in rather an impossible situation. The first example I wish to give is this; that the legal decision of the administration of estates hold that if an executor pays or settles any debt of an estate, the mere fact that he deals with or settles that debt, is construed in the law to be an admission by that executor, trustee or administrator, that he has adequate assets in hand to meet all debts.

Now, under this circumstance, where there is any doubt, the executors are forced into a course of conduct of undue caution which in many cases is detrimental to the interests of the creditors and the other parties interested in the estate.

This amendment, in the first place, proposes a change of the law to this extent, and this extent only, that if an executor pays a single debt or a number of debts of an estate, and it turns out that in the overall liability there was not enough assets for which the personal representative is responsible to satisfy all debts, then all he is responsible for to the remaining creditors is the mere over-payment to the creditors that he has paid in full. In other words, the amendment imposes no injuyr on any creditor who may not have been paid in the first instance, and enables the executor to proceed without that sword hanging over his head, that the assets may turn out to be not sufficient to satisfy all the creditors.

Now, the second proposal is this; those in this house who have had experience with the administration of estates, either in the capacity of solicitor or in the capacity of personal representative, will appreciate that in estates where the assets are frozen, where it is difficult to realize on those assets for the purpose of paying creditors and for the dealing with the other interests as they follow on, and that there are many charges that are running and continuing that must be paid and must be paid promptly if the assets of the estate are not to be permitted to go by default to those who hold liens and charges, and the second proposed amendment to this section of the statute

merely accomplishes this, that a personal representative may make these payments subject to the supervision of the court as to the integrity of this conduct, as set forth in this section.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the advocacy I have to give on what I regard to be a very important bill and important administration concerning estates, and I now move that the act to amend the trustees act be read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves the second reading of bill no. 32, "An act to amend the trustees' act".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): Order no. 14.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteen order; second reading of bill no. 35, "The Mortgagors' and purchasers' relief act, 1944". Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in moving that an act, being the mortgagors' and purchasers' relief act, 1944, be read the second time, I consider it quite unnecessary to take up the time of the house with any explanation other than I made upon introducing the bill.

This simply extends the provisions of the original mortgagor and purchasers' relief act of 1933, as it has been so often extended before, and I will move that this act, being an act to amend the mortgagors' and purchasers' relief act of 1944 be now read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves second reading of bill no. 35, the mortgagors' and purchasers' relief act 1944.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Order no. 15.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth order; second reading of bill no. 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944." Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move the second

1. reading of the Abitiyi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act of 1944, and in moving the second reading, I do not propose to enter into a dissertation upon the act of 1941. The principles of this bill are precisely the same in principle as the mortgagor and purchasers' relief act. It merely extends the moratorium, which prevents the bond holders foreclosing for a period of a further year.

I, therefore, move the second reading of the bill, being the Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, of 1944.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the 1942 act, which was in effect extended further by this bill, there was a provision that the operation of the act could be terminated at any time by order in council. I would appreciate hearing from the hon. the attorney general a fuller explanation of this bill and what the intention is with respect to its possible termination at a time when this house is not sitting.

Is it proposed that the Government shall continue to have that power? Is it proposed, in other words, that the moratorium can be brought to an end at any time by order in council.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I might explain this, because this came up before the present attorney general was in the Legislature.

The effect of that was only to make it possible to terminate the moratorium if a settlement had been reached. The situation in this case is that our largest pulp and paper company has for years been in receivership. The Government has indicated its desire to have it taken out of receivership so that it can operate in a normal way and enter into general contracts without any of the limitations which receivership imposes. It is extremely important in the general interests of everybody in this industry that there should be full opportunity now to prepare for the future expansion of the forest products industry generally. As members of the Legislature are aware, a committee has been working in an effort to find some solution of the legal problem which has been

involved, in a hope that a voluntary arrangement might be made between the various parties interested. There is no intention whatever of exercising the power given to suspend the operation of this act by order in council unless a settlement is reached, which makes it possible for the company to operate outside of the limitations of receivership.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves the second reading of bill no. 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act, 1944".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed.to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): There being no further business I do move the house adjourne.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the adjournment of the house. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This house stands adjourned until three o'clock Monday afternoon.

The house rose at 3.40 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Speaker: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Monday, February 28th, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY TORONTO FEB 29 1944 RECEIVED

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any reports by committees?

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An amendment to the Rural Power District Services Charge Act", and I move the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Challies, seconded by Mr. Blackwell that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled, "An amendment to Rural Power District Services Charge Act", and that the Bill be now read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An amendment to the Rural Power District Services Charge Act"; first reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development", and that the Bill be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves, seconded by Mr. Frost that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development", and that the Bill be now read for the first time.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a bill intituled "An Act

respecting the Department of Planning and Development"; first reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) Moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Frost that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An amendment to the Executive Council Act", and that the bill be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An amendment to the Executive Council Act", and that the bill be read now for the first time.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a bill intituled "An amendment to the Executive Council Act"; first reading of the bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I might explain that this is merely a supplement to the other bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting of motions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I believe that there is correspondence which I should place before this Legislature. I need hardly say that one of the problems of greatest concern to this, and to every other Government in Canada -- and perhaps elsewhere -- is dealing with the sale and general handling of alcoholic beverages. We have had that subject under consideration, as was indicated in the speech from the throne, and we now are in a position where we have, through recent change of events, a new chief commissioner of the liquor control board, and we have indicated already that it is our intention to divorce the licensing processes from the general business administration.

This brings the whole matter before us, and consequently a week ago saturday, February 19th, I wrote to the Prime Minister of Canada, as follows:

"Toronto 2, February 19, 1944.

Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,

"House of Commons,

OTTAWA, Ontario.

Dear Mr. King:

At the time that the agreement for a wartime readjustment of taxing powers was under consideration early in 1942, the Premier of Ontario at that time raised a specific point which he obviously wished to have settled definitely, before committing his Government to the proposed agreement. He asked the Minister of Finance if there was any thought of the Dominion Government entering the field of control over the supply of alcoholic beverages. It is unnecessary to quote the complete correspondence because the Minister of Finance summed up the effect of the understanding very clearly in these words in his letter of January 31st, 1942.

> "While I gave no specific assurance in the conference with the representatives of the province of Ontario to which you refer, I fully confirm your view that it was understood that it was not the intention of the Dominion to embark on the regulation of the sale of alcoholic beverages.
>
> After consulting with my colleagues, I can advise you that the Government's position has not changed in this regard. It is not the intention of the Dominion Government to enter the field of regulation of the sale of alcoholice beverages or treat it as other than one belonging entirely to the Provinces."

In presenting the agreement to the Legislature for approval, the Premier explained that he had obtained this assurance. Nevertheless, in December 1942, steps were taken to curtail the quantity of alcohol, beer and wine which could be sold by any province. This was done

without at any time consulting or seeking the opinion of the Ontario Government or the Liquor Control Board of Ontario in regard to the effect of these regulations.

It has become increasingly difficult to maintain proper control over the distribution of beverages, because of the situation created by these restrictions. The people of Ontario will, I know, be ready to accept any restrictions which are really necessary to assure our full requirements of commercial alcohol for war purpose. But it is not possible to state that the present restrictions are necessary for that reason.

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario has on hand large reserves of different kings of spirituous liquors. It could obtain more wine without limiting any phase of the Canadian war effort. The supply of beer could be increased considerably. We are therefore unable to assure the people of Ontario that the limitations imposed by the Dominion Government are called for by any circumstances connected with the prosecution of the war.

One thing which is impossible for us to explain satisfactorily, and which causes a great deal of criticism, is that the Liquor Control Board of Ontario has found it necessary to restrict the individual purchaser to twenty-six ounces of liquor a month so that it may comply with the order of the Dominion Government in regard to total quantity, while at the same time the Quebec Liquor Commission, which is under the same regulations, allows eighty ounces a month to individual purchasers in that province. Presumably, there is some explanation for this, but when people from Ontario who visit the Province of Quebec find that they can buy a larger quantity in that province they naturally become extremely critical of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario

for imposing more severe restrictions than are apparently found necessary in another province. No matter what explanation may be offered for this rather striking fact, the contrast in quantities available is a subject of critical comment throughout the whole province of Ontario.

I have mentioned these facts to illustrate some of the difficulties which arise when the Provincial Government is responsible for distribution and cannot give a satisfactory explanation of the restrictions imposed by the Dominion Government.

As the Ontario Government has this whole question under consideration, it would be of considerable assistance to us if we knew the constitutional grounds upon which the Dominion Government imposed these restrictions which are contrary to the definite statement contained in Mr. Ilsley's letter of January 31st, 1942. I would be grateful if you would let me have this information as your early convenience.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) George A. Drew.

(Page 96 follows)

I have received a letter, dated February 24th, from the prime minister, addressed as follows:

"My dear premier"

"I duly received your letter of the 18th instant, regarding the effect upon the provincial government of the operations of the Wartime Alcoholic Beverages Order.

I have carefully reviewed the correspondence between the then Premier of Ontario and the Minister of Finance, culminating in Mr. Ilsley's letter of January 31, 1942, from which you quote an extract in your letter."

The extract from Mr. Ilsley's letter is as follows:

"As stated above, what was tentatively arranged between the province and the dominion was based upon the belief of my colleagues and myself that the province would retain without interference from the dominion the entire field of alcoholic beverages, and I must advise you that the arrangement aforesaid between the dominion and this province cannot be formally consummated and put into effect until I have received from you assurances that the Dominion Government will not in any way attempt to enter this field, but will treat it as one belonging entirely to the province".

Then Mr. King's letter goes on as follows:

"This correspondence related solely to the financial arrangements between the Dominion and the Province of Ontario, and, in that context, it was clear that your predecessor was concerned to safeguard the revenues of the province.

At the time the wartime alcoholic beverages order was being drafted, this correspondence was very carefully considered by the government. It was felt that the enactment of the order could not be regarded as a breach of any undertaking since the assurance given by the Minister of Finance had relation only to the safeguarding of the revenues of the provinces, and since the federal government proposed to indicate its readiness, on certain terms, to compensate the provinces for any financial loss occasioned to their treasuries by the incidence of the order.

"In reaching that conclusion, the government was influenced to some degree by a statement made in a speech at Oshawa on October 30, 1942, by your predecessor, Honourable Gordon D. Conant. At that time, there were already widespread rumours that the Federal government proposed to enter the field of control over the supply of alcoholic beverages. Mr. Conant is reported to have said on that occasion:

> 'The question of curtailment in the quantity of liquor or the hours of sale is a matter over which the Dominion Government may exercise jurisdiction in a war emergency. If, as a war measure, they find it necessary to curtail quantities or period of sale, all jurisdictions involved will have to accept it as part of our war progress.'

"In the light of Mr. Conant's statement and of the Federal government's decision to safeguard the revenues of the provinces against loss resulting from the policy of curtailment, it was felt that no question of a lack of good faith could arise and no such question did, in fact, arise.

"It might be added that the Minister of Finance, in the letter you have quoted, was careful merely to give a statement of intention and not a definite undertaking. At the same time, my colleagues and I were aware that the financial policies of some of the provinces were influenced by that statement of intention and that the provinces might, therefore, feel reasonably entitled to some compensation for any losses which might result from the change in the policy of the Federal government.

"For obvious reasons it would have been difficult to consult the provinces in advance of a decision of policy without occasioning rumours throughout the country which would probably have caused serious embarrassment to the provincial liquor administrations. The Liquor Commissioners of all the provinces were, however, advised of the Government's policy just prior to the public announcement in order to enable them to take such administrative measures as they might deem appropriate.

"As you are no doubt aware, the Federal government merely curtailed the supply of alcoholic beverages released to the

"several provinces and made no attempt to interfere in any way with their retail sale and distribution beyond making an appeal for a limitation in the hours of sale. Each province has made its own arrangements for distribution, and it would be hardly appropriate for the Federal government to attempt to explain why one province has acted in one way and another province in a different way. All the provinces are entitled to obtain 90% of the beer, 80% wine and 70% spirits released for sale in the province in the base period. I can assure you that this particular method of curtailment imposes no greater restriction upon Ontario than upon any other province.

"As to the reasons why the curtailment was undertaken, the Wartime Alcoholic Beverages Order is, of course, enacted under authority of the War Measures Act. The preamble to the order cites these reasons in the following words:

'Whereas it is deemed expedient to curtail non-essential civilian activities so that manpower and material resources may be released and made available to satisfy the growing requirements of the armed forces, war industry and essential civilian activity;

'And whereas it is deemed desirable to control and restrict the use of alcoholic beverages in time of war;

'And whereas as a means toward accomplishing the aforesaid purposes, it is desirable to prohibit the advertising of spirits, wine and beer and to limit the production and importation thereof for consumption in Canada.'

"In the opinion of the government, there has been no fundamental change in the circumstances which impelled the government to enact the Order in December of 1942."

Mr. Speaker, I have read that correspondence for two reasons. First of all, there is the fact that from many of the hon. members of the Legislature I have received enquiries as to the situation, and what could be done about it. Many of the hon.

44

members, including the members from each of the three largest groups represented, have indicated their wish that some steps should be taken to meet the situation which has arisen.

But there is a more important reason why I read that correspondence today, as a matter of record.

We have under contemplation at the present time a number of agreements which it is proposed should be signed between the Dominion and the Provincial governments, in regard to various aspects of our affairs. As Is already intimated by the correspondence, the letter which I have read in the Legislature, requesting the prime minister of Canada to call a conference to deal with the particular basis upon which we could plan for the post war period, it is absolutely essential, in our opinion, that agreements of various kinds be entered into, and, secondly, it is a matter of very considerable importance to us as to the terms upon which agreements of that nature are to be carried out.

Now, I cannot quite agree with the statement as to the effect of that undertaking, because actually Mr. Ilsley's letter, in which he made it clear that he had consulted his colleagues, and was making a definite statement as to what was contemplated, was in reply to a letter of January 5, 1942, which put in the clearest possible terms the statement that such an assurance must be a condition precedent to the placing, by the Legislature of Ontario, of an agreement which was then proposed, and which is still in operation in regard to the re-allocation of taxing powers, as between the Dominion and the Provincial governments, and the position taken by the then premier of Ontario, at that time, is clearly set out in the one paragraph of his letter of January 15th to Mr. Ilsley, which I shall quote:

> "As stated above, what was tentatively arranged between the province and the dominion was based upon the belief of my colleagues and myself that the province would retain without any interference from the dominion the entire field of alcoholic beverages, and I must advise you that the arrangement aforesaid between the dominion and this province cannot be formally consummated and put into effect until I have received from you assur-

A5 ances that the Dominion government will not in any way attempt to enter this field, but will treat it as being one belonging entirely to the province."

Now, what Mr. Ilsley indicated in his letter of January 31st must be read in the light of the letter to which that was the reply, and in that letter it was clearly stated that the condition of consummation of the agreement which was then tentative -- which agreement involved consummation of the agreement of this Legislature -- were dependent upon the assurances being given.

I do not intend today to embark upon any discussion of the many and difficult problems connected with this age-old question of the handling of alcoholic beverages. I am raising the point which has been indicated by this correspondence to show that there is a situation which will call for a very clear understanding, and which calls for a Dominion-Provincial conference at the earliest possible date, because this government of Ontario has shown in many practical ways its desire to co-operate to the very limit in every measure designed to increase the effective prosecution of the war, but it must be clear that if agreements, as now proposed, and if agreements that will be proposed, are to have any value and any effectiveness at all then undertakings given in relation to these agreements must be preserved by both parties to the agreement, and must be equally binding upon all concerned, and without, as I say, embarking upon a discussion of the particular problem referred to here, but simply referring to the very important question of the extent to which the province of Ontario can go in these agreements.

I can only say that this correspondence makes me repeat my request that we have a conference, and that we need one, and need it as soon as possible, so that a basis of understanding may be reached, so that we will know when agreements are binding and when they are not.

This province will co-operate to the very limit, and also I feel sure I would be speaking for the Legislature generally if I say that within our constitutional limitation this Legislature and the Government must know whether agreements, and every condition prior to this agreement, which becomes a part of them, are to be observed or are not to be observed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Order No. 2 - before we come to that order, may I present a motion. I move that the speaker do now leave the chair, and the house resolve itself into a committee as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the speaker do now leave the chair and the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker having left the chair, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rowland Patterson (Gray North).

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): Order No. 2.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order; the house in committee on Bill 23 "An Act to amend the Weed Control Act". Mr. Kennedy.

CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 23 "An Act to amend the Weed Control Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill? (Motion agreed to)

CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

(Motion agreed to)

CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

(Motion agreed to)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. 3.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The House in committee on Bill No. 24, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act". Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 24 "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act". Shall Section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order No. 4

THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Fourth Order; the House in committee on Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses Registration Act". Mr. Vivian.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses Registration Act". Shall clause 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 3 of section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 4 of section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I am really speaking more for the purpose of getting information than for or against section 4.

I notice that paragraph "E" of section 4, empowers the Lieutenant Governor in Council to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "Council of Nurses Education", and prescribes the powers and duties of the Council.

Would the Hon. the Minister of Welfare (Hon. Mr. Vivian)

be good enough to indicate whether it will be possible for such a Council to have some jurisdiction over the working conditions of student nurses? That is a question which seems to me has received much less attention than it deserved in the past, speaking from my own slight knowledge of it, but I would say that there are few workers who are more sweated than some of these student nurses, and I hope the honourable Minister (Hon. Mr. Vivian) agrees with me.

Now, if it is contemplated that the Council will interest itself not only in standards of examination and in courses, and also - if I may put it this way - in the health and welfare of the "victims" who toil for such long hours in our hospitals, I would feel much happier about the situation.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN: I am glad that point was raised by the member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe). Certainly the conditions under which nurses have been working in this Province in the past have not been good. Some hours of work are long, and frequently their pay is inadequate.

MISS MacPHAIL: (York East) Some of the pay is absent, not only inadequate. Part of the time they do not get any.

HON. R. P. VIVIAN: That is one of the reasons for attempting a clarification of this particular point.

MR. EDWARD. B. JOLLIFFE: That is one of the reasons?

HON. R. P. VIVIAN: That is one of the reasons, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 4 of section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 5.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order; House in committee on Bill number 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act", Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest, is the hon. the Attorney General able now to give us some explanation of the link between this section and the Adoption Act. I think that was mentioned the other day.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the question was "Would I give this explanation if I was able". May I say that I am able and willing, and I will.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Sub-section 2of the proposed section, for those who care to follow the Bill, reads as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of sub-section 8 of section 6 of the Adoption Act, where an illegitimate child, not being legitimated by this Act, dies intestate in respect of all or any of his real personal property, his mother, if surviving, shall be entitled to take any interest therein to which she would have been entitled if the child had been born legitimate and she had been the only surviving parent."

Sub-section 8 of section 6 of the Adoption Act reads:

"If the adopted child dies intestate, his property, acquired by himself, or by gift or inheritance from the adopting parent or from the kindred of such a parent, shall be distributed as though he had been born in lawful wedlock to his adopting parents and the property acquired from his natural parents, or kindred, shall descend as if no adopting order had been made.

The reason the proposed sub-section is made subject to sub-section 8 of section 6 of the Adoption Act is that in reading the concluding part of sub-section 8 of section 6 of the Adoption Act, it should be borne in mind that the section covers legitimate children as well as illegitimate children who have been adopted.

MR. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew) Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Attorney General in introducing this Bill spoke of certain

features of the present Act as being reminiscent of laws prevailing in the Middle Ages, I think. My attention has been drawn to a rather objectionable feature of the present Act, which would stand amending, if my information is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order in raising another objectionable feature of the Act which is being amended now. If not, I shall be glad to be corrected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is not really in order, but if it is satisfactoryto the hon. the Attorney General, it is alright with the Chair.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would encourage the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to state his point. While it is true that it is not quite in order, I, as Attorney General, am interested in any submission he cares to make about the Act.

MR. SALSBERG: Thank you. My attention has been drawn to the fact which I have not had the time to verify, but it is that under the present Act an illegitimate child, a child born to parents who have not performed the necessary ceremony, is listed and registered as "illegitimate", and that on the Birth Certificate of such a child the term "illegitimate" is added. Since the hon. the Attorney General is dealing with this problem - and I want to congratulate him for his efforts to change and eliminate those objectionable features from the Bill which are long in need of elimination - would it not be proper to do a more thorough job, and if my information is correct, if the Birth Certificates of children born under these circumstances are marked and stamped as "illegitimate", then I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is high time that this Legislature now, since it has touched the Legitimation Act, broaden its efforts and eliminate all objectionable features as well.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I would welcome an expression of opinion from the hon. the Attorney General on this matter.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I may say that this is not a question for the Legitimation Act. It has to do with the

registration by vital statistics, but I am sure he will be glad, as will other members of this House, to know that the problem he mentioned has already received the attention of my Department, and the Department of the Provincial Secretary, and we are hopeful that we will be able to cure the situation he describes without having to have enabling legislation to do so.

MR. EDWARD. B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, if I may add one word to that, I am pleased to hear this is being looked into, because in the last three or four years it has come up in a way that is painful in connection with certificates of birth for men volunteering for active service, particularly in the Air Force. It has come up a good many times, and in some cases consequences have been rather unpleasant. I am glad to hear it is being looked into.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: I would like to add to what the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said. I do not want to leave the matter with the inference that it is simply being "looked into". I believe I quite plainly stated to this house that not only was the matter being looked into, but the Government believed it could be fixed without legislation.

(Page 107 follows)

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: All the better.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: That is being attended to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order six.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth order. House in committee on Bill number 30 "An Act to amend the Law Society Act". Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 30, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act". Shall section 1 form part of the bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, it may seem like a small point, but I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. the attorney general what I think is a slight defect in the section.

In this province, technically at least, there is still a distinction between the two professions of barrister and solicitor. We do not, of course, have the same situation in Toronto as existed in England, but the two professions are governed by separate legislation, and the Law Society has jurisdiction over both, for many purposes.

What I want to draw to the attention of the hon. the attorney general is that there have been -- and I believe still are -- persons who are barristers but not solicitors, and persons who are solicitors but not barristers; in fact I believe that for a good many years one of the most eminent counsel in the province was a barrister, but not a solicitor, and took great pride in that fact, because, amongst other things, he did not have to take such an active part in litigation.

As the section stands, I take it that the dependent, or the beneficiary, would have to be the dependent of one who was both a barrister and solicitor, and I am asking if the hon. the attorney general would not consider, since this, I gather is not being referred to the Bills Committee or anything of that kind -- if he would consider changing the

word "and" to "or", in the appropriate places, because there are a few cases where individuals concerned belong to one profession but not to the other. I know of several cases myself.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, it is quite true that the professions of barrister and the profession of solicitor is distinct under our Act, but it is also true that they are usually combined in the same person. It is also true that in the Province of Ontario there are occasionally those who are solicitors but not barristers, or who are barristers but not solicitors, but there is no suggestion in the drafting of this section that in order to have the benefits of the terms of the Act, the widow or other dependent would have to be the widow or other dependent of a person who is both a barrister and solicitor, for example. It means just what it says, "barrister and solicitor".

Unless the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) feels there is some grave doubt about this question, I would be put into the embarrassing position of having to refer the Bill back to the bill committee, that august body of the Benchers of the Law Society, who actually did the drafting of it, and it must be presumed knew what they wanted. I would have to say that at the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, I am pleased to send it back to them for this amendment.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I know full well I had a great deal of temerity in raising the point, which must have had the attention of the most learned gentlemen in the province, but, at the same time, after thinking it over, I cannot see that the phruse as it now stands is free from doubt, particularly when you observe it is followed by the expression, "their widows, orphans, or dependents" which in itself sets up the distinction between the use of the word "and" and the use of the word "or".

Now, I do not suppose that difficulty will ever arise, but I would not like to see the point come up at some time in the future. I would not like to see a power of the society to provide for the dependent of some deceased lawyer taken away, because it said "and" instead of "or", but in view of the fact that lawyers will be concerned, it is quite possible

the point might be raised.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: I have made my point clear. If the leader of the opposition wishes to have the Bill deferred, and have it referred back to the Law Society, I am quite prepared to accept that and say there is another further amendment necessary. What do you want?

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether they will agree or disagree, but I think on the whole it should be re-considered, because I am certain there is some substance in it. I do wish not to embarrass the hon. the attorney general, who is not only a lawyer, but a very learned lawyer, and I do not want to embarrass the Benchers either, but I think there is some substance in it. After all, more than one case has turned on the use of the word "and" or "or".

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: As far as I am concerned, and the officers of my department are concerned, the section is quite clear but not wishing to be dogmatic, I have indicated if the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wishes it referred back, I am pleased to accept that reference.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Thank you. I am afraid that is my wish.

MR. SALSBERG:(St. Andrew) Would a member of this Legislature be justified in considering this a precedent that would enable a member, if labour legislation arose, to ask that it be referred to the trade union before it is received and passed on by this House? I would be quite satisfied with such a ruling. I am just wondering whether we should consider the Law Society as the union of the legal profession, and the trade unions as the unions of the employees, and remember it when we come to consider legislation affecting labour.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can decide that matter if and when we come to it.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: May I answer the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: I simply cannot see why some of my hon. friends in opposition pounded their desks in approval without appreciating

what the point is. May I say to the member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) if a labour union had a benevolent fund and requested this legislation in respect to it, as a matter of following the ordinary amenities, it would certainly be referred back to such labour unions, under such circumstances as it is referred back in this case to the Law Society, in relation only to the benevolent fund.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Seventh order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh order; the House in committee on Bill number 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act". Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill Number 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime Minister) Order number 8.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth order; the House in committee on order number 35, "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944". Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill 35, "The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 9.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth order; the House in committee. Bill number 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company, Limited Moratorium Act, 1944". Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company, Limited Moratorium Act, 1944". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think it was indicated when this Bill received first reading, that none of us were, to the best of my knowledge, opposed to the principle of the thing, but I do wish to raise, in connection with section 1, the main point about which I asked a question the other day.

In the Act of 1941, it was provided that, by section 4, that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may at any time terminate the operation of this Act, and subject to the operation of Order in Council terminating its operation, then the Act shall remain in force until the 31st day of December, A.D. 1942.

A similar section appeared in the Act of 1942. It was section 3 in that Act.

Last year the Act was further extended for one year by the statute law amendment Act, and we now have before us a Bill which appears to be much the same as the Act of 1942.

Assuming that it is desirable — and I think it is — for the moratorium to be continued, and assuming that the Government in the meantime will continue its effort to bring about the voluntary settlement as between the interested parties, the question I want to raise is this, that not only the bond holders and share holders and creditors are interested in this great property, but the public is also interested. The whole industry is very much involved, and it would not be too much to say that the interests of the whole province are very much involved.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Government will forget all about the public interests, but what I am raising as a matter of discussion is this, that I would like more information about the nature of the plans, if there are any plans, for reorganizing this company.

I say that since the bond holders and the creditors are not the only parties interested, and since the public is interested, it would be proper for the hon. the Prime Minister to indicate the kind of settlement the Government would like to see arranged, and I suggest further that we would better know where we stand if this Bill were given third

reading after we hear from the Government regarding its Forestry Resources Commission, and so forth, rather than before.

I do not think this project and its main problems can be divorced from the future of forestry and the pulp and paper industry in this province.

Before we give the Government, what, after all, will be a blank cheque, to sponsor a voluntary settlement, and before this enterprise is reorganized, would it not be only fair for the Government to tell us more about their plans in connection with forestry, and with conservation and reforestation,

(Page 113 follows)

and some of the other problems connected with this one.

For example, some of us are very greatly concerned that an enterprise of this kind should not become the exclusive property of some great foreign newspaper chain. That, I suggest, would not be in the best interest of the people immediately concerned, or of the general public. Now, some hon. members of this house represent constituencies in which this is a very live issue indeed. The livelihood of a great many workers is involved; their future is at stake. As I have already indicated, our forest resources are very much involved. I do not want anybody to think I am opposing the Bill. I am not. I think the extension should be made, but what I am saying is that before it is extended I think we are entitled to hear more of what the government has in mind with respect to the reorganization of this enterprise, in relation to the whole forestry problem.

This afternoon, another Bill was introduced which probably has a bearing on it, and that is, regarding the Department of Planning and Development, and no doubt at the proper time we will hear more about the nature of this work. I suggest that this Bill should not become law until we have had more discussion and more information about matters of this kind.

Now, I suppose for the purposes of discussion some hon. member will deem it advisable to suggest an amendment of this section by accepting section 4 of 1941 and section 3 of 1942, and if we can have a discussion about the matter without an amendment at this time, that might serve the same purpose. I am suggesting in all seriousness that either at this stage or perhaps on a third reading we should have a fuller indication of what the government plans are. I am sure the hon. prime minister knows what I am referring to, there have been references from time to time about the efforts of the government to bring about a settlement. There was a committee, I believe, appointed as long ago as last summer or last fall, a committee headed by Mr. F.J. Hughes, which I understand was going to report and advise the government on the whole question. I do not know that the committee has reported. I understand it may not be able to report for some time, but in due course I think the recommendations of such a committee

CC2

would contain information that might properly be put before this house, because, after all, we represent people who are just as interested in the future of this property as the bond holders or the share holders or the creditors, even though their interest may be more indirect.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I am afraid I cannot agree with the remarks of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) as being directly in point on this Bill. If he agrees with the Bill, I fail to see the point raised.

The point here is an extremely simple one, and if the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) had read from time to time the statement with regard to this, he would know our whole support of this moratorium was based on the public interest, and was, in fact, strongly opposed by the bond holders and others concerned. In support of the moratorium, which was not introduced by us, but by the preceding government, on behalf of the opposition at that time I supported it on the grounds that it was definitely in the public interest that the bond holders should not be permitted to foreclose this property under the special situation which existed at that time, and while the gist of our argument in supporting the Bill was that of essential importance to the whole province, that this great industry should be protected from the possible effects of the largest single unit of that industry going under the hammer in this way.

The results of that moratorium have been extremely beneficial, not only to the security holders, but very much more beneficial to those engaged in the industry itself, because at the time these proceedings were instituted, it appeared all too likely they would go under in a way similar to that in which other concerns have gone. The fact is the company is in a much sounder position, but unfortunately is unable to enter into any voluntary agreements of various kinds which are essential for the coming period. But thishas nothing to do with what our plans are for for estry, or anything of that kind; it simply has to do with a moratorium which will prevent a forced sale of this property. That is the only issue in the Bill before the house today. There will be plenty of time to discuss the general question of forestry

03 practice, and so on. That does not enter into it. The thing that is important is that this business should not be sold. If this moratorium bill lapses, even at this stage the bond holders could proceed immediately to have a forced sale of the property, and we must pass this, if we are to prevent that happening.

(Page 116 follows)

Therefore, I think it is essential that the amendment pass as it stands; it is merely a continuation of the Act which has protected this property for the public for some years.

Insofar as the committee which was named is concerned, while it has nothing to do with this Bill before you now, I have no reason to withold from you all the details with regard to that. This Government is not anxious to be in a position of becoming a judicial body in the sense of determining the rights between individuals, where they can be settled by voluntary arrangement. A committee was appointed which was not empowered to do anything but attempt to bring together the people of various interests, and seek to find a solution, and they have been meeting from time to time every party interested and I am still hopeful that a voluntary settlement of this matter will work out which will not in any way affect the principle of public interests, with which we are primarily concerned. In opposition, and now in the Government, my position is the same, and that of those associated with me is the same, that it is dominant public domain, that the interests of the public must be recognized, and it was to the interests of the public that was protected by the original moratorium, and is being protected by extending it by way of this legislation, and still trying, by means of the interim committee, to bring these conflicting interests together, so that voluntarily they may bring the Company out of that legal impasse so that it may once again resume direction of its affairs, and also that we, as a Government, or the officials of the Department may continue to retain their power of supervision over the affairs of that Company as they have always done in the past.

I would ask that this Moratorium Bill be proceeded with.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I rise not to disagree with what was said. I agree with much of it. I agree that it was important to protect the public interest in the first

place. I understand that all very clearly, and we are not opposed to it.

But it has a great deal to do with section 1 of the Bill, because by section 1, the Government is not only asking for the moratorium to be further extended - with which we agree - but the Government is also asking to have the power to terminate the moratorium at some time during the next year, which is a different matter, and which is very much involved in section 1 of the Bill. That is the point to which I was addressing myself.

It was precisely because of the public interest that the Act was passed in the first place, and it is precisely because of that same public interest that I am now pointing out that we are asked to empower the Government to terminate the moratorium at any time the Government sees fit. I see the difficulty. I am not going to make an issue of it of the Government having such power if such an arrangement can be arrived at. Then, no doubt, the moratorium should be terminated. But the point I have endeavoured to make is that we are entitled to know more than we do, or have been informed about the kind of an arrangement which the Government would consider a satisfactory arrangement, as the result of which they would terminate the operation of the moratorium, and that is where the public interest comes in.

Now, I do not wonder that the hon. Prime Minister would like the section to pass as is, because I can see his difficulty. The Government should be in a position to sponsor or approve a satisfactory re-organization, if it can be worked out, but I do say we should not be asked to give the Government a blank cheque without more information, to sponsor such a re-organization at some time during the coming months.

I would point out again that this is very early in the session, and it may be that we shall know a lot more

about the matter during the next month, and we might then be able to vote on the question or to support it unanimously with a clear conscience.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) There is no desire to press these matters unnecessarily, but on the other hand there is a desire to get ahead with the Bills which were apparently non-contentious, and you will notice the Bills introduced at the outset were presented with that thought in mind.

There is a perfectly obvious reason for the retention of this power for dealing with the moratorium by Order-in-Council, and that is, if any satisfactory arrangement is made, which makes it appear that this Company can go ahead and direct its own affairs in the proper way, then it may be absolutely essential to a solution of that problem that the moratorium then be suspended, if an arrangement can be worked out. What that arrangement will be, I am not in a position to say today, because I do not know any more than the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) does, if he has been reading the press carefully, as I feel sure he has, because this was discussed very fully in the press. All that is holding this thing up at the present moment is the issue between groups of shareholders in regard to their conflicting rights, and there are three main groups of shareholders. It does not subject the creditors to any serious difficulty, because the Company is in an extremely sound financial position, and it is entirely now a question of legal rights, and that is something we do not want to be put in a position of arbitrarily deciding upon, if we can have a voluntary solution, because if they find a voluntary solution, and that has no effect on the public, as long as this Company will continue to operate on a sound basis. The main thing is that the people are now reasonably close together, and if they find a solution upon which they can put this Company back as a going concern, then I think the full duty of this Government, or any other Government,

should be to say, "Very well, we will permit you to do it on terms you yourselves have arranged".

Now, to get back in relation to this committee you mentioned; we have not imposed any provisions or conditions, because we thought that was something we should not do. They are only empowered to bring together the conflicting interests, and I do not think this has any bearing whatever upon the forestry problem or the general control of the forests, or any of the details at all, because at the moment everyone who reads the papers has as much knowledge as anybody else of the actual situation. Apparently there is very little difference between them, except the fact that the preferred shareholders and bondholders have not agreed upon some basis of settlement for their outside interest.

MR. GEORGE I. HARVEY: (Sault Ste. Marie) Mr. Chairman, having worked for many years with the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, I want to express the reaction of the people working for that Company when such legislation is brought down.

We remember when the Moratorium Act was introduced, we, in the industry, welcomed it. It provided a temporary cessation of operations, which meant that we would not continue to earn money. We thought at that time the then Government had to perform a duty, and we felt that it did protect the interests of the bondholders and the shareholders, and the employees of the industry. But listening to this debate, it seems to me that consideration is given first to the bondholders. We must not forget the importance of this industry, and that part of the industry which is the Abitibi Power and Paper Company plays in the economic life of this Province. Let us remember that the pulp and paper industry in Canada establishes foreign credit to the amount of one quarter of a billion dollars, and thirty-one percent of that is contributed by the pulp and paper industry in Ontario. There is enormous wealth

under the control of this Company's hands, and I would suggest to the Government that if any satisfactory solution to this problem is submitted to them by the bondholders association and the shareholders that they first think in terms of the future of our employees in the industry and the communities in which these mills are situated, and of our foreign wealth or the perpetuation of that forest wealth.

We all realize it is an important issue, and for that reason I would suggest that the Government be very careful about the proposals brought in to them by the bondholders associations, whoever they be, with respect to the recommendations to the Government regarding the conclusion of this Moratorium Act. I do not want to see this Act wiped out, as it were, without full recognition of the employees in the industry.

'clock p.m. HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) That, I may explain to the hon. member for Sault Ste Marie (Mr. Harvey) is exactly what our position was. I may tell him that at the time we took the course we did, there was very strong opposition from the bondholders, and our position in the matters was entirely based on the future interest of those engaged in this industry. I do not want to expand the argument we made at that time, but we pointed out that one of the things we must prevent was not merely a consideration of the financial interest, but that our primary concern to the real problem was a social concern, as to what might happen to the industry as a whole, as you can easily find from referring to the records at the time the debate took place regarding the stand we took, first, the welfare of the great industry with its large amount of employment, and secondly, the forestry problem which provided employment, not only for this Company, but for other companies, and we are pursuing that course just as strongly now as we did before when the moratorium was first proposed. If the moratorium would lapse, the

bondholders could then force a sale, and the only question which arises in connection with this is the question of the right to terminate by Order-in-Council, and that right we believe is essential to the working out of any legal solution of this problem, and I can assure the hon. member who has raised this point (Mr. Harvey), that we stand where we did before, that our main interest is to continue the industry and preserve the forest as a source of employment, and we will not agree to any proposal - and we have no formal one before us now - that does not assure the continuation of the industry and the preservation of the forest upon a proper basis.

Page 122 follows.

KE 1

May I go a step further, and say this? Insofar as this whole industry is concerned, what we were particularly anxious about was that this company shall be brought out of receivership so that not only the Abitibi Company, but all the pulp and paper companies, may be free to move along and to prepare for the future with whatever expansion or movement there can be through new devices and the new uses of wood. Having the largest company in the country in receivership, it is undoubtedly unfair not only that the affairs of that company, but the affairs of the other companies operating in the same field should not be interferred with. I do not want to confuse the two things. We are only dealing now with the Bill to continue the moratorium which prevented the forced sale by the bond holders, and the only feature which could raise any question at all is the provision by which it may be suspended by order in council, and I can only give assurance that the same idea will continue, the continuation of employment and the preservation of that industry, and it is felt we should be in a position, without waiting for a calling of a session, to have whatever plan may be worked out to continue this industry on a sound basis, approved.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I do not know whether any of my colleagues wish to speak on this, but I may say that as far as the hon. the prime minister has said, that is the thing that we are really concerned about. I understood him to say that the consideration of public interest and employment, and the continuation of the operation of the operation of the industry, and forestry conservation will be borne in mind by the government when the time comes for a reorganization, and that is really what we wanted to know.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): There is no question about that being borne in mind. All I say is that the details of forestry products do not enter into this discussion, which is purely a legal question on the moratorium.

MR. ARTHUR A. CASSELMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to say a word, I would like the government to know that the Abitibi Power and Paper Company is looked upon up in Northern Ontario, as a very major industry, and I think the hon. the prime minister is very much aware of that. I do not know whether there

E 2. was any great harm in it being in receivership, because they seem to have done fairly well, but, of course, as our leader has stated, we want the moratorium to continue. We are very much interested in the terms on which the moratorium might be cancelled, for many reasons. I have one reason which has not yet been stated specifically, and that is in connection with one of the plants which I believe belongs to this company, namely, the plant at Sturgeon Falls. I believe it was about twelve years ago -- possibly a little longer; fourteen or fifteen years ago -- that this plant at Sturgeon Falls was bought by the Abitibi Company, and immediately, or very shortly after it was bought, it was closed down.

Now, at Sturgeon Falls is a plant which cost millions of dollars to be put into operation. They had, I believe, some twenty-five hundred square miles of timber limits, and according to my information this plant never operated at a loss. But after being bought by the Abitibi Company it was closed down, which threw the town of Sturgeon Falls on relief, and I think our past governments know something about the relief situation in Sturgeon Falls.

Now, maybe this is not all pertaining to this exact clause under discussion, but you are possibly aware that we have to bring these things up where it seems fitting, and expect you to call us to order if we are wrong.

I would like to ask the government if they would be interested in the Abitibi Company to the extent that they would even study it from the point of view of the people of Sturgeon Falls? There is a plant at Sturgeon Falls, which possibly you have seen, Mr. Prime Minister, --

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Yes, I have.

MR. CASSELMAN: I would not estimate the cost, but it must have cost many millions of dollars; it must cost thousands of dollars to keep the lights on and keep a watchman there looking after it, and it is absolutely idle, while the people of the town are on relief, or were, as now to a great extent they have moved away. A house there which was built at a cost of from four thousand to ten thousand dollars is selling for much less than a

ge 3 couple of years taxes.

That is just one angle which I wanted to bring up at this time, and I am very glad to see that the hon. the prime minister stated that they were interested in the social side of the people living in these communities, and the people of Northern Ontario generally, who are supporters of and interested in this great company.

(page 125 follows)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I might explain, as the member from Nipissing (Mr. Cassselman) has pointed out, that naturally this is a matter of major concern, such a situation as that which existed at Sturgeon Falls, and I am not in any way divorcing the discussion from the point he has brought up, but I would emphasize that does not go into the legal aspect of this matter. I would agree with all that he has already said, and I may tell him that we are greatly concerned about the situation at Sturgeon Falls, and if he cares to have it I will be glad to send him a copy of the report which was prepared in regard to that whole development up there, and the necessity of exploring every possibility of using new methods to stimulate the industry in areas of that kind, where through improper cutting, the use of wood became difficult in certain areas. This province has suffered enormously through the failure to impose proper cuttings timber and have created circumstances such as you describe, where the company may have made money for years, and have cut back away from the mill area, and then find themselves in a position where the available wood is so far back that they find it has passed the point where they can economically carry on.

Now, there are methods which can emerge out of scientific developments of this war and otherwise, where new methods of production can perhaps meet such a situation as that, and it is with the hope of meeting a situation of that kind that we propose to expand the activities with regard to lands and forests, and create a lands and forests commission, which will not only administer detailed instructions as to cutting methods and so on, but which will see they are carried out, and also seek to find a solution of the problem such as exists at Sturgeon Falls. And a problem you raised only accentuates the necessity of passing this Act with the amendment.

MR. CASSELMAN: I would be glad if the hon. Prime Minister would send me that report.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I will be glad to. It will simply indicate a general point of view with regard to this, and having

appointed a committee already, who will submit its report in the Legislature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will section 1 form part of the Bill?

The motion agreed to.

Shall section 2 form part of the Bill.

The motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I move that the committee rise and report several Bills without amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Drew moves that the committee now rise and report several bills without amendment. Shall the motion pass.

Motion agreed to.

The committee rose and the House resumed. Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. PATTERSON: (Chairman of committee of the whole) Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole house begs to report that certain Bills without amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The chairman of the committee of the whole House reports certain bills without amendment. Shall the report carry?

Report agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 10.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth order, Bill number 25, "The Wartime Housing Act". Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: I beg to move the second reading of Bill number 25, "An Act intitulated "The Wartime Housing Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunbar moves second reading of Bill number 25, "The Wartime Housing Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion carried.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Will the provincial secretary (Mr. Dunbar) be kind enough to tell us what this is all about.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: As things stand now in the province, there are about nine thousand, three hundred houses built by wartime housing, and

they have never arrived at a satisfactory arrangement with the municipalities, that is to say, at the beginning, there was an Act passed by this Legislature last year, and that was a statute law amendment, and that was where the municipalities had the power to assess and tax and collect from the tenants, which the municipalities were not satisfied with. They could fore-see several difficulties where tenants would move out without notice, and they would be the losers.

They thought at that time it would be much more satisfactory if they made an agreement -- the municipalities with the wartime housing -- where in lieu of taxes they would pay a lump sum. The municipalities agreed with the wartime housing upon a minimum of twenty-four and thirty, twenty-four for two rooms and thirty for three rooms. That is rent, and that has to be distributed in the same proportion that it would be, that is, with the school and the county with the full assessment and the total taxes as would be collected by the municipality.

HON. HARRY C. NIXON: Does that arrangement apply in all cases, notwithstanding what the municipality tax rate may be? Does it.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, that is the starting point. It is up to the individual municipalities; if they feel that it is not sufficient, they can go to the wartime housing and make their own separate agreement, which some of them are making at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Next order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 11.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The eleventh order, second reading of the Bill number 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act". Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to clarify the Highway Improvement Act without invalidating the three former acts, known as "The Ontario Highway Act", "The Ontario Provincial Act", and "The Highway Improvement Act".

Since the consolidation, which took place in 1926, the same process has gone on; amendments were added from year to year, as policies were adopted to meet the needs of the various situations which arose and

developed in the extension of the various highway systems, both municipal and provincial, occasioned by the increasing use of the highways by motor transports of all kinds.

Besides these revisions, there are other sections of the highway improvement Act. The Bill contains the following new provisions:

"Extension of payments of subsidies be given on bridges pursuant to section 466 of the Municipal Act".

The present Act provides for payment of subsidies on bridges not included in the county road system, and which are not county, but, by reason of the fact that they are located on the boundary lines, have been declared county bridges by orders of a judge.

I would move second reading of the Bill.

MR SPEAKER: Mr. Doucett moves second reading of Bill number 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".

Shall the motion carry?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON: (St. Davis) I would like to ask the hon. minister if the new section he brings in to this Bill will eliminate the difficulty which has been experienced in recent years by the local york roads commission, where the representatives of the city here have been forced — or as they said they have been forced — to pay for roadwayw through various other cities. They do not mind paying for them in the county, but they object to having to pay for twenty-five per cent of roadways through other cities. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any change in that respect. I believe the city has made some representations to him.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: In reply to the hon. member for St. Davids (Mr. Dennison) I might say there are changes in the Act dealing with suburbs, and we are not making the change you have suggested, because, after all, the only way you could make that would be to affect the entire province of Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. minister noticed it or not — he probably did not, but in the

explanatory note printed with the Bill there is a phrase which appears to me to have some sense of humour about it. We are told that the Bill is introduced with a view to clarification, and it reads:

"Section 18 is rewritten as sections 18 and 19 to render it consistent with the established practice of the department".

I do not know that that is a very good reason for introducing legislation, "to render it consistent with the established practice of a department of the civil service".

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: I might say, in reply to the hon. leader of the opposition,(Mr. Jolliffe) that this Government, I think, have agreed on regularity.

MR. DENNISON: (St. Davids) May I ask the hon. minister if he has received any representation on behalf of the mayor or the board of control of this city requesting a change in section 36 of this Act.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not think I received any definite request for a change. I did have a deputation from the city of Toronto to wait on me, and, of course, I replied that they were in a very impossible position in asking for a change of that section of the Act, which really affected the province of Ontario as a whole, as well as the city of Toronto.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I want to say a word about that. I doubt very much if you have brought about any change in the suburban road regulations. We in the eastern part of this province, especially in the city of Ottawa, have a lot to thank the suburban road commission for, and we do not object to spending money in the —

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, that is not before us. I am sorry. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

(Page 130 follows)

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 12.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, second reading of Bill number 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act". Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, this is an addition to section 3 of the Crown Timber Act. Section 3 A is added:

"Section 3 A is added to section 3 of the Crown Timber Act to provide that timber must be scaled before it is moved from the property, and also provides the penalties and the manner of their collection".

Under section 19, sub-section 2, a definite penalty is now provided for failure to make returns, and these are recoverable under the Summary Convictions Act.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves the second reading of Bill 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 13.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order; second reading of Bill number 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act". Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Land Tax Act is an act to provide taxation on unorganized real estate. The interest rates for penalties and unpaid balances are found to be excessive, and is being lowered from ten per cent to six per cent, to give property owners more fairness in payment of overdue taxes. The new rate of six per cent will be more in keeping with the municipal tax.

I now move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves second reading of Bill number 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 14.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order; second reading of Bill number 33, "An Act to amend the Survey Act". Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker the Survey Act is the act by which the surveys of the province of Ontario are carried out. The amendment is to clarify the procedure of the survey. The reason for the new sub-section is to clarify some technical matters in surveying, and-prescribe to the recognized procedure.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves the second reading of Bill number 33, "An Act to amend the Survey Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 15.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order; second reading of Bill number 34, "An Act to amend the Public Land Act". Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, under section 13 of the Public Land Act, the question has arisen that the Lieutenant Governor may not have the power to fix the rate of interest to be charged. He can now fix sale prices and terms and conditions of sale. Thus the change

is simply to make clear that the rate of interest can be fixed by the Lieutenant Government-in-Council.

Section 24 is amended by changing the dates from 1890 to 1942. Land up to 1942 was sold on a partial payment basis. The Minister now has power to reduce the price of land and interest on land sold prior to 1890. No power existed on land sold after 1890. This interest charge of six per cent on unpaid balances in the year 1891 and in 1944 amounted to three hundred and eighteen per cent. After 1942, the lands were sold outright. Power is now requested to change the date from 1890 to 1942, so that interest may be adjusted on a more equitable basis.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves the second reading of Bill number 34, "An Act to amend the Public Land Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 16.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 16, second reading of Bill number 37, "The Holland Marsh Road Act, 1944". Mr.Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to make it possible for the municipality in the Holland Marsh area to set up a highway area by petition of two-thirds of the property owners, but such petition must consist of fifty percent of the value of the property within that area. There is nothing compulsory about it. It is optional for the property owners in the area to petition. I might say this has been solicited by them. I move second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Doucett moves second reading of Bill number 37, "The Holland Marsh Road Act, 1944".

MR. G. H. MITCHELL: (York North) May I ask the hon. Minister what passing of this Bill would entail? Would the groups involved be able to deal directly with the Provincial Government regarding the subsidy, rather than through their respective townships?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: I do not just "get" that.

MR. G. H. MITCHELL: May I ask the hon. Minister whether the passing of this Bill would enable the groups involved to deal directly with the Provincial Government with regard to subsidy, rather than through their respective townships?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Oh no, Mr. Speaker, I must inform the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mitchell) that it must be done through the municipalities because they would be levied by the petition.

HON. HARRY C. NIXON: May I ask my hon. friend, (Mr. Doucett) is this legislation applying generally, or does it apply only to the Holland Marsh area?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Just the three municipalities I mentioned.

HON. MR. NIXON: Does that make it applicable elsewhere?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Frost moves that the House do now adjourn. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 3.00 o'clock.

The House rose at 4.40 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Speaker: The Honourable William J.Stewart.

Tuesday,February 29th,1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

Mr.SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr.SPEAKER: Reading and receiving of petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Corporation of the Township of Scarborough, praying that an Act may pass prohibiting the annexation of any part of the Township to any other municipality for a term of five years.

Of the Corporation of the Town of New Toronto, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Ontario Municipal Board to raise the Town to the status of a City.

Of the Corporation of the Township of North York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to alter the boundaries of school areas, to establish a transportation area and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of Welland, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the City to grant the sum of $50,000.00 to the Welland-Crowland Health and Recreational Centre towards the cost of construction of an Arena.

Of the City of Ottawa Public School Board, praying that an Act may pass to provide for the election of the members of the said Board every two years at the same time and places as the election of members of the Ottawa City Council.

Mr.SPEAKER: Presenting the reports of committees.

Mr.H.A.STEWART: (Kingston) Mr.Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of your select committee appointed to strike the standing committees ordered by the House, and beg leave to present the following as their first report:

"Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committee

on Standing Orders be composed as follows:

The Honourable Mr.Drew, Messrs. Acres, Alles Anderson, Belanger, Blackwell, Carlin, Connor,Doucett, Duckworth, Frost, Grummett, Hall, Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox), Kelly, Laurier, Lockhart, Luckock, MacLeod, Millard, Miller, Murdoch, McDonald, McPhee, Nixon, Oliver, Overall, Patterson, Porter, Reynolds, Riggs, Robertson, Robson, Scott, Smith, Steel, Stewart, (Kingston), Strange, Taylor (Huron) and Warren,40.

The quorum of thesaid committee to consist of five members.

All of which is respectfully submitted."

I move the adoption of the report.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr.Stewart (Kingston) moves the adoption of the first report of the committee. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr.SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr.SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON.LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr.Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be granted to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for Central Filing of Publications and Regulations", and the same be now read for the first time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr.Blackwell moved, seconded by Mr.Frost, that leave be granted to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations", and that the same be now read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations". First reading of the Bill.

HON.GEORGE H.CHALLIES: Mr.Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr.Doucett that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled,"An Act to amend

the Power Commission Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. Challies moves, seconded by Mr.Doucett that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act", that the same be read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act". First reading of the Bill.

HON. HARRY C. NIXON: Would the hon.minister tell us what he proposes to do with this amendment.

HON.GEORGE H.CHALLIES: The principal feature of this amendment is to provide for the setting up of an advisory committee, with a membership of five, representing the larger classes of users, as well as the hydro electric power commissions of the municipalities, to advise the commission on any matters relating to the operation of its system. Then there are a few other minor amendments which do not change the principles of the power commission Act, but makes some corrections. The main part of the principle of the Act is the establishment of an advisory committee.

Mr.SPEAKER; Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) Third reading.

HON.CHARLES DALEY: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr.Thompson that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr.Daley moves, seconded by Mr.Thompson, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act", and that the same be read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

MR.CHARLES H.MILLARD;: (York West) I would ask the hon.minister of labour (Mr.Daley) what his intentions -

HON.CHARLES DALEY: Mr.Speaker, in answer to the member's request,

I may say that the purpose of this Bill is the extension of the scope of the powers of the industrial board to include various types of industry such as are now enjoyed by firemen, boilermen, and others who upon passing certain requirements and obtaining certain qualifications are given a certificate. This amendment was brought about due to the application of a very large group representing a certain industry, bothethe management and the employees, and in this particular case supported by the unions, to have this petition carried forth into particular lines of endeavour.

It is felt that it would be a benefit to the workers and to the proprietors, and to the public in this particular line, because, to the workers, when they acquired a certain amount of knowledge, when they master their vocations, they receive certificates that qualifies them; to employers, because when they employ a man holding a certificate such as is supposed to be issued, he knows he is getting a man who has some qualifications, and to the public likewise, when they are paying for a man to do a certain job for them, they know that man, if he holds a certificate, has the qualifications to do the work for which they are paying. It is simply extending the authority to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to pass regulations in regard to any particular line of endeavour, if sufficient representation both of management and employees request that same should be granted.

MR.SALSBERG: Mr.Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon.minister of labour (Mr.Daley) if he is, in this amendment, also providing the additional protection as far as hours of labour and renumeration are concerned for those apprentices, or is it his intention to deal with that problem separately.

Mr.SPEAKER; I might say that all this discussion that has taken place should have taken place on the second reading. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the

Apprenticeship Act"; first reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON.GEROGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) Third reading.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading, order number 1,"An Act to amend the Weed Control Act", Mr.Kennedy.

HON.GEORGE H.CHALLIES: In the absence of Mr.Kennedy, Mr.Speaker, I move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr.Challies moves Bill number 23, "An Act to amend the Weed Control Act" be given third reading. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act", Mr.Blackwell.

HON LESLIE E.BLACKWELL: I move third reading of the Bill, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act".

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr.Blackwell moves third reading of the Bill, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act". Shall the motion carry?

MR. JOHN J.KEHOE: Mr.Speaker, I wish to rise to make a few brief remarks in reference to Bill number 24, with respect to the appointment of Justices of the Peace.

Mr.SPEAKER; Mr.Kehoe, there is not discussion on the third reading. You had your opportunity to discuss it on the second reading. If the hon.member (Mr.Kehoe) wishes a further discussion on the Bill, it will require a motion that the Bill be not now adopted, but referred back for further discussion. That is for the House to decide.

Mr. KEHOE; Mr.Speaker, I move the Bill be referred back to the House for further discussion.

HON.GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) Might I ask before we deal with that motion, are these to be lengthy observations?

Mr.KEHOE; No, hon.Prime Minister, just one little observation.

HON.GEORGE A DREW; (Prime Minister) Why I am raising the point is this, if it were, it is obvious, having regard to the general procedure to-day, that we could not go ahead with it. But if it is simply a comment, I would not raise the objection to having it re-opened for the purpose of some observation.

Mr.SPEAKER; I want to say to hon.members of the House, that this will not be considered as a precedent in procedure. We will permit a brief discussion at this time, but I hope the other hon.members will not consider it a precedent, and endeavour to follow suit.

HON.LESLIE E.BLACKWELL; May I ask my hon.friend (Mr.Kehoe) if he can put his observations in the form of a question, if possible.

Mr.SPEAKER; Proceed, Mr.Kehoe.

MR. JOHN J.KEHOE: Mr.Speaker, just in reference to the reading of the provisions of the Bill, I do not wish to have my remarks misinterpreted as being, in any way, disparaging with regard to members of the legal profession, but I do feel as if the provisions of the Bill, as it now stands, could be amended very simply, and require that all who may be aspiring to become justices of the peace, to appear before a judge.

As the Bill now stands, the provision exempts barristers and solicitors from appearing before a judge, and I fell in due justice to all others who may be proposed as applicants for appointments as justices of the peace, that no one should be left out from the requirements of appearing before a judge, before the appointment is approved. That is the only reference I wish to make with regard to this Bill.

I trust also that I may be excused for not having raised this point when it was up before the House for second reading. I may say that things were moving so rapidly, and being a new member of this Legislature, I found myself somewhat behind the parade when it came time to speak, so I trust you will excuse me on this occasion. In the future, I will set my speedometer to keep pace with the speed at which things are moving along here, but I suggest that this Bill be amended by striking out the words, "other than barristers and solicitors", and I would so move.

HON.LESLIE E.BLACKWELL; Mr.Speaker, obviously that motion cannot be made on the third reading. If am amendment was to be moved to refer the Bill back, it might be considered, but I feel without wasting too much of the time of the House, that I might persuade the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr.Kehoe) that he may not wish to have that reconsidered, because, after all, there is a very simple principle involved, if that amendment were to be made, for the very simple reason that we go back to a precedent for this, namely, that contained in the Notaries' Act.

It is not a question of discriminating against general members of the public, and for the benefit of the legal profession.

The point is a very plain and obvious one. Members of the legal profession have already taken examinations that have qualified them far beyond the very modest requirements of the provisions of either the Notaries' Act or the Justices' of the Peace Act, and having taken those qualifying examinations, on a much higher standard than the very minimum standard requirements under this Act, I would be amazed if the hon. member (Mr.Kehoe) insisted on an amendment.

MR.KEHOE; In reply to the hon.member opposite (Mr.Blackwell), I do not doubt that members of the legal profession are highly qualified in their profession, but at the same time there may be some members who would not make desirable justices of the peace. For that reason I feel as if every applicant should appear before a judge, and have his qualifications confirmed by the judge, before his appointment is approved.

The members of the legal profession are undoubtedly very well qualified from a legal point of view, but there may be other circumstances which might be taken into consideration by a judge, and for that reason I feel as if my suggested amendments is purely not very controversial, and in no way a reflection upon the qualifications and qualities of a member of the legal profession.

HON.LESLIE E.BLACKWELL; I presume it is a motion not to amend, but a motion to refer back?

Mr.SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr.Kehoe, but we cannot hold the House

much longer.

Mr.KEHOE: Well, I do not wish to.

Mr.SPEAKER: You are really out of order, my friend, because I was very tolerant in the whole discussion. If you have a motion to refer it back, you may make it, but if not, we will have to proceed.

Mr. KEHOE: I will withdraw the amendment altogether.

Mr.SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE; Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill number 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act", Mr.Vivian.

HON.R.P.VIVIAN: I move third reading of Bill number 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act".

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. Vivian moves third reading of Bill number 26, "An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill number 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act", Mr.Blackwell.

HON.LESLIE E.BLACKWELL; I move the Act, being a Bill to amend the Legitimation Act be now read for the third time.

Mr.SPEAKER; Mr.Blackwell moves third reading of Bill number 28, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill number 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act", Mr.Blackwell.

HON LESLIE E.BLACKWELL; I move that a Bill intituled, "A Bill to amend the Trustee Act", be now read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER; Mr. Blackwell moves the third meading of Bill number 32, "An Act to amend the Trustee Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill number 35, "An Act to amend the Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944", Mr.Blackwell.

HON LESLIE E.BLACKWELL: I move Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mortagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act,1944", be now read for the third time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves third reading of Bill intituled, "The Mortagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act,1944". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill number 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act,1944", Mr.Blackwell.

HON.LESLIE E.BLACKWELL: I now move that Bill number 36, being a Bill intituled, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act,1944", be now read for the third time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves third reading of Bill number 36, "The Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited Moratorium Act,1944". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr.SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

Orders of the day:

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr.Speaker, in resuming

the debate on the speech from the Throne, I wish to make a certain observation which I deferred in view of the fact that I came on very late in the afternoon, when my time came in this debate last week.

This session of the Legislature meets on the eve of the most serious period in the nations's history. It is true that the very survival of freedom does not hang in the balance in the way that it did in those critical months of 1940 when the fate of free men everywhere rested in the hands of those gallant lads who won the Battle of Britain. But the time through which we are to pass will be just as serious in many other ways. We have no reason to expect that victory can be won without great losses of the very best of our youth. It is quite possible that our human and material resources may yet be strained to an extent we have hardly been prepared to anticipate. At such a time on the eve of battles which will determine the future of mankind, it is fitting that our deliberations should be conducted with due regard to the full seriousness of the days in which we live and the obligations we have to preserve intact the ideals for which young men and women from this country are offering their lives.

The mover and seconder of the motion now under debate showed their full appreciation of the need for a high and unprejudiced approach to the problems before us.

I wish to extend my personal congratulations to both the mover and the seconder for speeches which I believe were the best which have opened this annual debate on the Speech from the Throne for many years. Both contained sound arguments and thoughts about the future of Ontario with which few members in the Legislature could find any ground for disagreement.

But the same cannot be said for the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. It was a strange mixture of threats, warnings, and challenges to the Government and also to people who have no connections whatever with this Legislature. On the one hand he charged me with acting as though we were living in a totalitarian state and at the same time reminded me that our government represented only a minority in the

Legislature. Surely that is a strangely assorted pair of ideas to be driving in double harness in the same speech.

Referring to the fact that I had been invited to speak at Westminster under the auspices of the Empire Parliamentary Association, the Leader of the Opposition had this to say, and I quote, "I also think we are entitled to know what he said, if he presumed to speak for the people of Ontario, or the majority of them." Just what did the Leader of the Opposition mean by this observation which was so similar to many others throughout his speech? He leaves the impression that there was something to hide or that there was something improper, without being specific in his statements, and that follows through the whole trend of his speech.

The Leader of the Opposition, I feel sure, knows perfectly well that such discussions have at all times been off the record, except in the one case of the speech of General Smuts, for reasons which are well understood. I have no intention of breaking the confidence which surrounds those discussions and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition will similarly observe the confidential character of any meeting to which he is invited under similar circumstances.

But if the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that I would take such an occasion to make statements that I would be unwilling to make publicly, I assure him he will come to learn that this is not my habit. I have made statements in private conversation and publicly about the Leader of the Opposition and the Party to which he belongs, and I have no hesitation about making these statements in his presence. I have said that I believed that most of the supporters of the C.C.F. Party were looking for a chance to bring about reforms which they thought could be made by constitutional and proper methods. But I have also said that I did not believe they would continue to support some of the leaders of that Party when they found out what their methods really were.

For that reason, one part of the speech of the Leader of the

Opposition is, I believe, very important. He denied that any spokesman for the C.C.F. Party had suggested that any Ontario farmer would have his farm taken away from him, and then went on to say that he raised this point, and I quote his words: "Because I know the administration should relieve the people of this province of the anxiety, some of them hold, that their own Government is going to take the farmer's farms away from them."

That statement, of course, would have been too ridiculous even for him, unless he had some inferential grounds for supporting it. So he went on immediately after to refer to the Griffith farm at De Cew Falls, and the circumstances under which that family had left their farm. He said that they had been treated, and I use his own words, " as if they belonged in a totalitarian state." He then made this demand which I am pleased to answer. I quote his words: "I want to know from the Government when the Griffith family is going to get their farm fa and their five acres back, which is so badly needed by them, and not by the Government, their home, their farm, and their five acres, not needed by the Government, but needed by them, and not needed by the Hydro. And I am warning the Government that unless this injustice is righted the farmers of Ontario will hear about it from me from now until the next day the votes are counted. Judging by the Griffith case, there is not a farm in this province, not a home in this province, which is safe from arbitrary seizure by some power-drunk bureaucrat.

Mr.GEORGE H. MITCHELL: (York North) I rise to a point of order, Mr.Speaker. Is it in order for the hon. the Prime Minister to read his speech?

Mr.SPEAKER: I understand the Prime Minister has notes and is making his speech from those notes. He is not reading his speech to my knowledge.

Mr.EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I have no objection.

HON. GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) It may be that I am reading from notes, and I will tell the hon.member from North York (Mr.Mitchell)

that that has been an established practice here, in regard to both the leader of the Government and the leader of the opposition for some time, because of a statement which may have some bearing on both other parties and I shall only be reading very briefly, but I do want to quote exact words, so that they will not be subject to misrepresentation at a later time. I appreciate the flattering remark from the member from York North (Mr. Mitchell) but I find I cannot remember the words exactly.

To continue quoting the exact words of the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe), he said, "Judging by the Griffith case, there is not a farm in this province, not a home in this province which is safe from arbitrary seizure by some power-drunk bureaucrat".

These are strong words even from the Leader of the Opposition. They have a strange familiar ring, but Mr.Speaker, they should not have a strange familiar ring in this Legislature unless the speaker who uses them means exactly what he says.

As I say, these are strong words, even for the leader of the opposition, reckless words, even for the leader of the opposition. Certainly I will answer that statement. The Griffith family is not going to get their farm back, for the simple reason that the property is no longer suitable for a farm, beaause of the flooding indidental to the full development of the DeCew Falls power plant. The leader of the opposition is, therefore, free to do what he sees fit, but I do ask that when he does discuss this matter, discuss it with more regard for accuracy than he displayed when he raised the subject before this Legislature. He is free to go out and tell every farmer whatever he likes, but the farmers, without hesitation, will all remember the situation, and will be amazed at his indignation over what has taken place.

After all, there is some responsibility for accuracy in matters of this kind. The leader of the opposition occupies an official position, an official position recognized in all of our procedure, and he is supposed to assume certain higher standard of accuracy in his representations

than other members who do not speak for a party, even with such disciplined conduct, as I noticed a few moments ago.

This is not something to be passed over lightly. The leader of the opposition must stand by the things he says, or else state that he does not expect them to be taken seriously. If he expects his words to be taken seriously at any time, he should expect them to be taken seriously when he charges the Government, which is supposed to be democratic, with conduct such as that which would be found in a totalitarian state.

This speech of the Leader of the Opposition was a typical example of the kind of speech which justifies all the criticisms which are so much resented by the Leader of the Opposition and some other members of his party. It was a typical example of the sort of reckless statement which he has been making for many months. He was quite willing to leave this Legislature with a wholly inaccurate impression of what the circumstances really were. Fortunately, I knew enough of the facts to correct him immediately before the wrong impression he sought to convey could go abroad uncorrected.

He sought to convey the impression amongst others that the reason the Griffith family had been forced off their farm was because they did not have the money to fight their case.

If the Leader of the Opposition had not been aware of the facts, there might be some excuse for what he did. But he was there. According to his own statement, he knew the condition of this farm. And knowing those th things, he sought to convey an impression to this Legislature which was directly contrary to the facts, and I feel, what was more important for him, an impression outside, which might go uncorrected for a while, which was directly contrary to the known facts.

I propose to summarize briefly what they were.

This was no sudden sale under pressure. It was no hard handed removal of people from their farm, such as was pictured here. Those of you who heard that pitiable story last week, just listen to these facts.

The three Griffiths voluntarily signed an agreement for sale on the 13th of March,1942, almost two years ago. The Hydro Electric Power Commission suggested buying part of the farm which had a total area of one hundred and fifty eight acres, and when I say "voluntary" I mean voluntary, after extended discussion which had proceeded with them for many months.

MR.EDWARD B.JOLLIFFE: And representation.

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) Yes, and representations by them as to their needs and their price which they should get for a farm of one hundred and fifty acres.

The three Griffiths voluntarily signed an agreement for sale on the 13th of March,1942. Do you remember that picture? Driven off there without any chance, but they signed their agreement for sale on March 13th,1942, and received instructions they must be ready to vacate in accordance with the agreement at any time. The Hydro Electric Power Commission suggested prior to that the buying of part of this property. It was the Griffith family themselves who insisted on selling the house.

In October 1942, after they had ample time for advice, perhaps not, of course, the great advice of the leader of the opposition, but had ample time to obtain advice, nevertheless, and remember that these people were not separated and away from contact; certain members of the family were working in town, and they have had plenty of chance to get advice and see what was going on, and they did.

Now, in October 1942, the sale was completed and Griffith family was paid $19,000.00 for 158 acres -- in case we should be subject to correction, to be exact, it was one hundred and fifty-eight point three acres.

MR.EDWARD B.JOLLIFFE: And some other rights.

HON.GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) The leader of the opposition's voice is not clear. I thought he said other rates.

MR.EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Other rights.

HON.GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) From the amount they received approximately $16,000.00 net after paying their accumulated obligations. They bought a forty acre farm near by for $2,800.00, so that out of this deal they had a new farm where they could have moved their stock, and a cash balance of more than $13,000.00. The Griffiths had two years to get off the property. This was a war measure, and it had to be put through at speed. They got $19,000.00 for a farm - and listen to this, listen to this pitiful tale of the farmers - they got $19,000.00 for a farm which was assessed at $4,450.00.

They made a very good bargain, and they drove a hard bargain, because they knew the commission had to have the property.

Now, if there is any criticism, it is to the Hydro Electric Power Commission for having acceded to the very high demands of the Griffith family, about which the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) is going to tell every farmer in Ontario.

When the time came for them to leave the property, in accordance with their agreement, they refused to move. There were several reasons why it became absolutely necessary that they should. One was the development of the property itself and the need for exercising control over this area, and those of you who have not seen that area, I suggest you do, not merely to visit this now derelict farm, but if you go there, you will see one of the finest achievements in this war, in our own publicly owned Hydro Power Commission, because they met the needs for war at a higher speed than has been achieved in this country before, and they put into operation a new unit of 60,000 horse power, which is now turning out power in the common effort to defeat the enemy. So if you wish to see one of the finest public plants in Ontario, pay a visit there, and while you are there, it is only a short visit farther on to see the farm so pitifully portrayed to you last week.

There was another reason why that farm had to be vacated, and that was very much more important, and the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe)

knew it, and that was because the farm house was unsuitable for human habitation. I do not mean by that not in a desirable condition, but is was unsuitable for human habitation, and he knew it. I find a medical certificate on file to that effect, but it took no medical certificate for any one to see this, who had actually visited the property, as the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) did, by his own statement last week.

There had been a fire on the property in the meantime, and it had been necessary for the Commission to put a new roof on the property to protect the building itself, a building which has valuable historical background. In spite of that, the Griffiths continued to live there under conditions which would not have been permitted anywhere and if, Mr.Speaker, the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) had wished to put the shoe on the other foot, he would have denounced, and with some justification, the Hydro Electric Power Commission, or any other party, for permitting people to live there under the conditions which existed.

But even if that had not been the case, the flooding of the area which will come with the completed development of the site will flood all but a narrow neck of land, and leave the house wholly unsuited for residential purposes.

Since the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) visited the property and investigated the circumstances, he knew all these facts. He knew the property was derelict. He knew that no serious attempt at farming was being made, and he knew also that these people had another farm to which they could have moved their live stock, and continued their farming. You will remember the story about these cows, and the fact that the Minister of Agriculture had burst out in tears at the loss of the farm products. Well, in regard to those cows, it may be interesting to know that not one of them was a milk cow, and if he had made inquiries he would have found that out.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: They were cows.

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) They were cows to you but

not milkers to the farmers.

Now, in the light of these facts, these things, Mr.Speaker, I submit are things that cannot be taken lightly.

If the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) does not mean what he says, when he charges that people are being driven out as though they were living in a totalitarian state, by "power-drunk" bureaucrats, such as you have before you now, apparently - if he did not mean that, if he is not accepting the responsibility of his office, and if the face of these facts which cannot be disputed, I have no hesitation in saying that the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) owes an obligation to this Legislature for seeking to mislead them, in spite of the facts which he knew.

The leader of the opposition may smile, but if he does not intend to apologize, then no statement he makes in future in this Legislature should be taken as having any higher value than the absolutely valueless statements he made here last week.

It will be difficult indeed for this Government, or any Government, to shoulder the heavy responsibilities which will rest upon those in public office in the months and years ahead, but the burden will be enormously increased if those who give lip service to the democratic system attempt to arouse prejudice upon a complete mis-statement of the facts, such as the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) has done in this particular case.

Now, Mr.Speaker, it is for the leader of the opposition, (Mr. Jolliffe) to make up his own mind, in the face of the facts, as he knows them, whether he makes the apology that is owed to this Legislature, or whether he will go out and tell every farmer in this province this pitiable story and be laughed at from one end of the province to the other.

(Page 152 follows)

During the comments already made on the Speech from the Throne, reference has been made to the forest resources of this province. It came up again yesterday in discussion, and this Legislature was given some extremely valuable suggestions, particularly by the member for Nipissing (Mr.Casselman), and the member for Sault Ste Marie (Mr.Harvey). These forest resources are today the most valuable assets that the public of this province own, and immediately after this Government took office we carried out an undertaking, which was suggested during the course of the election campaign would never be carried out. We cancelled the contracts which had been made for huge timber areas without consideration.

Now, I am quite prepared - and I know most members are - to make certain exceptions with regard to remarks made in the heat of the campaign, but that is very different from remarks made with the full responsibility of a member of this Legislature in the Legislature, but we will pass that over. The fact remains that we immediately cancelled contracts covering more than thirteen million acres of the choicest forest lands in the whole world, and that land has been brought back under the control of this Government, and will be administered for the benefit of the people of Ontario.

One observation that was made yesterday about the situation at Sturgeon Falls, is a thing which illustrates the very type of practice which must be stopped, and which it is our intention to stop.

I do not think that all the improper and wrong things which have been done in handling our forests have had behind them a cynical purpose. I think many have, but it is only recently that people have become conscious of the possibility that a land with such enormous forest areas as Canada, and particularly a province with such enormous forest areas as Ontario could conceivably ever face an actual shortage of commercial wood, and yet that is not only a real possibility,

but in certain areas has become an immediate danger, because we have gone ahead cutting our wood with lavish disregard for the fact that this is not something like the mineral production, which never can be replaced once it is taken out, but that it is a crop just like an ordinary annual field crop, the only difference being that instead of an annual rotation, it has a rotation varying from twenty to one hundred years, depending on the type of the wood.

A sound forestry practice in this or any other country, in this or any other province, demands that the cutting regulations shall be such that we still have the same stand of timber twenty years from now, fifty years from now, one hundred years from now. And the most vitally important thing is this, that when any new enterprise is started, it is not merely an accumulations of bricks, and stone and mortar and metal and power, but it becomes the centre of a new community in which hundreds, thousands of people find their employment, and it is the duty of this or any other Government - of this or any other administrative body - to make sure that cutting methods are imposed which make it certain that these will not simply become "ghost towns" because the wood has been cut away from the community itself.

Now, somebody will say this imposes a type of cutting which makes wood too costly. Mr.Speaker, it never can be too costly if efficient regulations are imposed which will assure sound forestry practice, and it can never be too costly in a country in the most advantageous position of any forest country in the world today, for export, if we insist that they shall not strip these areas for the benefit of this generation alone, but insist rather that it shall be maintained and continue to be an asset, so that our children and their children will still continue to benefit, as we have, from the work which can be expected from the production of that material.

It becomes more important than ever before, because of developments which are resulting from the impact of the war

itself. We are entering the fourth clear stage of the forest development. There is an interesting historical background to each of the earlier stages. When the fore-bears of many of us first came here and opened up communities, one hundred years or more ago the trees were not the friendly assets that they are today, but actually they were almost the enemies of men. They were something that men had to overcome; there was never any thought in those days that at any time could there be too much cutting, and that the cutting could cover too wide an area, and in those early days, while these were still primeval forests, a tree was looked upon as a source of fuel, for the home, and construction material, and it is rather an interesting fact that all these reservations made reservations of the oak and the pine because of their need for the construction of warships, because at that time many of the ships of war, not only of Britain but elsewhere, were made from wood here in Canada. But that period passed when the production of pulp and similar products from wood came to this country, a comparatively few years ago. Then we saw an enormous expansion in the industrial use of wood, and for the very first time the possibility presented itself that cutting could injure communities if it was done without due regard for their ultimate needs. For that reason, and for other reasons, limitations were included in many of these early contracts for the export of pulp logs. They had two purposes; one was to assure the manufacturer of the final forms of wood products an ample supply, and the other was to prevent the excessive cutting of wood on a basis which produced a less return for the wood cutting uses.

Then came the third period, which followed the last war. Many people will recall - and perhaps the lady members who now face the Legislature for the first time will recall more than the men, when rayon was looked upon as a bit of a fad. The fibres of wood were regarded as a poor substitute for silk,

and for other similar materials, but the time has come when they are not only a substitute but they have become even stronger, and during this war many of these wood fibres have been used for parachutes and for other war purposes.

Then the third time of expansion imposed enormous new demands upon our forests. For the first time in the last two decades we have seen the actual danger in Ontario, and in the whole of Canada, of cutting being carried to a point where the communities will simply close down as mining communities closed down when the mines had proceeded to a point where there was no further return.

Now, we are going to enter a period when probably the greatest expansion in the use of wood pulp of all will take place. We now have plastics and chemical by-products, and we will see the plastics used for a wide variety of things, and not included are the longer huge commercial aeroplanes which will be made, and which will make this country the centre of air communication for the whole world.

of wood which will make new things for the household, new things for almost everything we use, to a point where metals will be superceded to a very considerable degree. Taps, sinks, tables, chairs, will be made out of chemical by-products

This imposes upon us new needs for careful supervision, new needs for non-political administration of the forest products, and in saying that I am making no suggestion that it is impossible to obtain a fair and proper administration under the ordinary departmental set-up. But we are dealing, when we deal with the forests, with something that requires a long range program, a longer range program than any single thing which has yet been made. There is no other product which we make, there is no other crop we handle, where we have to regard the crop in terms of sixty or seventy or even one hundred years. With that long range viewpoint it has been found in other countries, particularly in the Scandinavian countries, that we must divorce it from Government, because from the very

nature of things, things human are temporary in their existence, no matter how tolerant an opposition may be, and recognizing that situation, they have created forest resources commissions which establish a long term policy in which they can project their planning and reforestation, and their maintenance program in terms not merely of years, but of scores of years, and the actual fact is that since they started that system in the last century, the forest stands of Norway, Sweden and Finland have actually increased rather than decreased. If they can maintain that system, surely we can maintain an equally efficient system here, when our markets are immediately at our door, and we do not have to ship across an ocean, even at the very low shipping rates involved in the case of Scandinavian shipping lines.

In the United States, also, where their cutting has gone to a far greater degree than ours, such as to destory many of their forests, they too, in many of their states have found this ~~is a~~ almost satisfactory method, and therefore, in answer to the query as to what we propose to do, I may say in accordance with the undertakings we gave, there will be a bill introduced in this Legislature to create forest resource commission with full administrative powers, which will be in the hands of men who will be divorced from the active legislative responsibilities, and who will be called upon to institute here in Ontario forestry practices in keeping with the needs of this great province of ours.

Now, Mr.Speaker, I only intend to discuss one other particular subject today. It was one which was raised by way of question. The other matters dealt with in the Speech from the Throne can be effectively dealt with as bills are introduced, and as the debate proceeds either on the Speech from the Throne, or in a budget debate afterwards.

I was asked what the purpose of Ontario House was, and I believe that this is the best occasion for me to give you an explanation.

In opening Ontario House again, we were not merely re-opening an office for Ontario under the conditions which existed before. We were meeting an entirely new situation. I have no intention whatever of re-opening any debate as to whether my predecessor in office, who is here today was right or wrong in the course he then followed. I make it quite definite that the place which Ontario then had would not have been suitable for the work which we now contemplate in the new quarters. New conditions have arisen, and I may say, when I make that remark, that it is due to the movement of activities in London which only those who have been there recently will perhaps fully appreciate. As so often happens in many great communities of that kind, the old part of the Strand where Ontario House was, and where other official offices still are, has become almost a back-water except for the through traffic. The activities have moved either east toward the purely commercial centre, or moved west toward Trafalgar Square and beyond.

So, in seeking a location for the Ontario office, the first consideration was to find a suitable location either on Trafalgar Square itself, which is still, I may assure those who were in London during the last war, and have a rather nostalgic visualization of that old square, you may be sure that it is still the centre of activity of Canadians on leave in London.

So our problem was to find a suitable location either on Trafalgar Square itself or some place as close to the west as we could. There was no site available on Trafalgar Square. Fortunately most of the buildings there are still intact, although some have been destroyed, and we were very fortunate to find a building which is less than two hundred yards from Trafalgar Square, and for that reason alone, within two hundred yards of Canada House, and from the Canadian Military Headquarters which is next door, and really only a matter of

perhaps a hundred feet away from British Columbia House. I might continue there and say that it is also close to some of the war services offices, such as the Red Cross and so on, so it is right in the heart of Canadian activities in London. It is situated on Charles Second Street, which to those who remember London, is a short street just off Hay Market above Pall Mall and connects the Hay Market with the foot of lower Regent Street. It is therefore, an extremely centralized location. It belonged to the Imperial Airforce, and because of that fact, was very suitable from the point of view of giving bright administrative offices, which could be visited by the troops. I am a little fearful that the light has been increased in the last few days by a misplaced bomb, but I am informed today it has not in any way damaged the building itself. It is,however, thoroughly suitable with excellent office accomodation, for the work we have in mind.

Now, as to what the nature of that work is. First, and most important, is it provides a place where the members of the armed forces from Ontario can find a ready way of obtaining information which they wish about their people or about things at home. One of the things which is very noticeable is the tremendous desire on the part of all members of the armed forces, no matter what branch of the service they belong to, for news about things at home. I assure you that those manoeuvres they conduct now are conducted with the greatest similarity to active service conditions, and while the men are on the manoeuvres, they are completely out of touch with the ordinary daily events which are going on, and there is a great desire on their part to have some place where they can establish contact. Many of them naturally have problems which they wish solved, and which can be solved by those who can act for them in the way of conveying home information obtained from official sources.

New problems have arisen for many of them. There are those who raised some question about the desirability of immigration. Well, Mr.Speaker, that is not a problem any longer. Already immigration has started in a big way, when we have somewhere close to eighteen thousand or nineteen thousand Canadian wives from the British Isles, with quite a large additional supply now of new Canadians, who will be coming with them, and it seems to me we have crossed the first hurdle in a rather large way, and as the Ontario troops constitute very nearly one-half of those overseas, it is likely that we already have some fifteen thousand or sixteen thousand people from the British Isles in addition to the troops ear marked for Ontario homes, and they are very much in need of some sort of assistance in getting them to the communities to which they belong, and are very much in need of some way of being brought into contact with these communities.

A HON.MEMBER: Is it a matrimonial bureau?

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) No, but it may become that, if you think you should work it that way.

As a matter of fact, I cannot imagine, in all seriousness, a better way to provide a very desirable addition to our own community than from amongst some of those very attractive young ladies who have already sought the opportunity of entering Canada when the war is over - without husbands as yet. But it is quite obvious that there are many very real problems, because a lot of these lads have been away for four years, they are married, and now have families of their own there, and they will wish to have an opportunity of gaining such information as they can about the communities to which they will return, and so forth. That will be one of the primary services.

Then there is another thing, and that is they will have

the opportunity when they get to London of having someone who knows London well directing them to places they can go on leave, and that I assure you is a very important service at a time like this, and will continue to be until the war and the demobilization periods are over.

Still another thing is the fact that when they are wounded and their families are having great difficulty in getting in touch with them, it will be of great importance if the families here can get in touch with Ontario House, and have them through Headquarters get such information as may be available and which would not be passed on in the ordinary official communication.

There again we can tie-in with That, to some extent, the ordinary amenities, getting together, and seeing that the lads in Ontario are brought together in town, and in connection with that we are opening up a canteen where members of the armed forces, both men and women will have an opportunity of going and getting meals at cost, and to whatever extent is available we hope that we will be able to remind them of Ontario in the things that they get, and although there are warnings of a shortage of maple syrup, we hope we will be able to get enough to them to let them have pan cakes and maple syrup for at least some of their meals, after the place is opened. Ontario House is actually open now, on a limited scale, and the canteen should be opened in the course of the next week or so.

Now, tying in closely with this is the subject of immigration. I was very pleased to hear the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) say that he himself approved of that general idea subject, very properly, to certain precautions with regard to those who have first claim on our employment here. But there are ways in which we can benefit greatly even now by bringing a certain type of people here. As I have already mentioned, our most dangerous weak spot in the conversion problem is the shortage of highly skilled trained

draft designers for industry, and already, although the offices have not been announced and formally opened, we have received over there, I have been informed, hundreds of applications from highly skilled people of that type. This need not displease the people here. We can very properly bring in a number of people with that training of that type, for the very purpose of creating other employment right here amongst our own people.

Insofar as any wider scale of immigration is concerned, I assure you that any measure which will be adopted will of necessity have due regard to the first purpose of this Legislature, and of every member of the Legislature, which is that those who live here, those who have gone overseas in uniform have the first claim upon our efforts in creating employment for them in the years to come.

But there is a third and extremely important function of Ontario House, and that is to attract British industry here.

I was told before I left that there would be some resistance, or that there might be some resistance in Britain to the idea of moving a branch plant here because of the necessity of maintaining production at a full level in Britain itself. I made the announcement the day before I left in regard to the fact that we were interested in attracting branch plants of British industry here. I thought I was leaving by air that night, but the plane was delayed a day, and the next day from seven o'clock in the morning until I left I was hardly off the telephone, as a result of British manufacturers from all over the British Isles calling to see what the chances were of coming over here.

I had lunch on the last day I was there with one of the largest manufacturers in Britain, who was firmly determined that as long as they will be permitted, they wanted to open a branch industry here which will be producing an entirely new line which will compete with nothing we now make and that is the kind of thing we want in here, because they are making many

because they are making many things from the very wood products I have been discussing, by the new chemical processes, and on a very large scale. But since I left, I have been informed of a tremendous number of inquiries in regard to industrial opportunities, and one of the things that every member of this house can do is to encourage the cities, towns, and villages in his own riding to prepare material which will show prospective manufacturers exactly what the opportunities are, so that these may be available in Ontario House.

- Page 163 follows-

And some of you who may say, "Well, after all ours is a remote community, and it is not likely that industry will ever come there" -- to you, may I express my own convictions that it is most desirable that industrial production be decentralized as much as possible, and that is one of the results of this war, which is so vivid to anybody who goes to Britain, that is, in order that they might avoid the danger of over-centralized industrial production add the consequence of paralysation of military output of any particular kind, may have created a small branch plants all over the country side. And quite properly, what they thought was that it would result in a reduction in industrial efficiency, because they thought it would reduce efficiency to have to bring parts from all over the country to the assembly lines, but they actually found that the industrial efficiency was increased because in spite of the necessity of bringing these parts together in an assembling plant, the workers were living under such better working conditions that their output demonstrated their better physical condition, and today in Britain they are determined that they will maintain the decentralization, and the very last day I was there I saw one of the county councils with plans before them on the floor discussing this very subject of decentralization, in their own country, which was one of the highly industrialized counties of England, so that they would improve the working conditions in that county.

And so I say to you members from the rural ridings, if you have in your ridings resources, such as power, and living opportunities for people, you might well consider the desirability of preparing in compact pamphlet form, the essential information, which may be sent to Ontario House, and I can assure you that all of these communities will receive equally fair treatment in the distribution of that material.

Last week a representative of the Toronto commission flew to Britain. He perhaps got away from the gun first, but at least it shows the interest taken, and he is over there now trying to interest the British manufacturers in getting plants over here.

The Ontario Boards of Trade met recently, and they passed

a resolution that the government should be asked to provide office space for a representative to be sent over there of all the Boards of Trade of the province, to stimulate industrial interest in Ontario, and we certainly will cooperate with them to the very limit when they appoint a man, and are ready to send him over.

Then, of course, the lasting and long term purpose of this office is to stimulate interest in Ontario production. I believe that when this war is over Britain will not only be our best agricultural market, as she has always been in the past, but will also be our best indutrial market, because of the devastation which has taken place in Briain -- and please let no one undersetimate the extent of that devastation. The rather cheerful way in which they take their punishment has, I am afraid, been inclined to lead some people to place a lower estimate on the actual damage than really exists. In the neighborhood of five million hom homes and other buildings have either been destroyed or will require replacement. When you reduce that to terms of reconstruction, and also think of the many homes which have not had a "dab" of paint on them since the war started, and have had no repairs of any kind since the first day of the war, it is not difficult to visualize the enormous demands there are going to be, not merely for timber and other construction material, but also for all sorts of household equipment that will have to go into the houses, the very type I have referred to before, plastic and synthetic, and so on.

Also, there is the possibility that we will probably be called upon to supply more specialties, like refrigerators and radios and things of that kind. It is a tremendous market, the most compact purchasing market in the whole world, the simplest market in which to sell to them the things we have to sell and just the place for Ontario to have a business representative in that market.

And so, from the long term point of view, that is one of our main objectives, and already great interest is being shown in what we can ship over there, and a very great interest is being shown in the agricultural products we can ship over. They

have gone on now for four and one-half years without many of the little luxuries we still take as a matter of course, and we can ship those things, under modern refrigerating methods and lay them down in London as fresh as they were when they left the plant or the tree or the ground here. It is a tremendous market, and it will be an increaingly great market as time goes on, and as the Germans are driven back from European territory they now occupy, there will be further markets for us, and it will be the purpose of Canada House to follow the opportunities in those markets.

I hope I have explained to you the purpose of Ontario House. If any further detail is required, or any further information is required as to ways in which individual members can make use of these vicinities, I urge you to make enquiries at my office, and we will cooperate in every way, because Ontario House is the business house in London of the people of Ontario, not of this government; Ontario House is there to serve the purposes of every citizen here in whatever way it can, either in relation to the troops, or in relation to business or any other activity, and I strongly urge that every member here, representing as he does in his own riding, no matter to what party they belong, will make full use of the facilities, and do not hesitate to make enquiries at any time as to how different activities can be extended. Further, I assure you that we will welcome suggestions as to any new things which can be done which will not only help the members of the armed forces overseas, but help this province of ours in the future through what Ontario house can do. Those who are engaged over there are rather in the front line today, and I thought it might interest you if I read the P.S. to a personal letter which I just received today from Major Armstrong, the agent general. This came over fairly fast, as it is dated the 22nd of February, and the P.S. reads:

"My flat was bombed out last Friday and again on Sunday. It is all air-conditioned now, but I am still holding the fort. No injury. The bomb had my number on it but fortunately the wrong initials".

Our people over there are very much in the front line

at this time. They are doing a good job, and are anxious to do a good job for everyone who gives them the opportunity to serve.

Now, as to the particular purpose; I perhaps may answer that by reading also a very short statement, which was the first statement of the things that we stood for:

"We will maintain British institutions and strengthen the British partnership by every means in the constitutional power of the government of Ontario."

Now, Mr.Speaker, Ontario House proposes to strengthen the partnership with the people of Britain in every way within its power. And also may I say that we do not disregard the fact that as the years go on and services of this sort are extended by experience and by the suggestions that are made, it will greatly increase the business activities which is the very foundation of that partnership, and I look not merely for a continuation of Britain as our largest market for agriculture in the future, but I look for Britain to be a greatly increased market in the future and a very profitable partner with whom to be associated.

Certainly, so far as we are concerned, as a government, we propose to use Ontario House in every way we can, and we propose to develop that market to the limit of our abilities, and to keep fresh and vigorous those old associations with poeple to whom not only we as citizens of Ontario but the whole world is greatly indebted.

(Page 167 follows)

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Mr.Speaker, I would like to take this my first opportunity of adding my congratulations to those already so ably expressed to you, on your unanimous selection to the very honourable and important position to which you were elected on the first day of this, the twenty-first Legislature of Ontario.

This I now do in all sincerity on behalf of the Liberal members of the house, and particularly on my own behalf, as our personal and very friendly relations extend back many years before you became a member of this house, as I am sure you will recall.

We have every confidence that you will discharge your important duties in accordance with the best traditions of your high office. As the Liberal party has been so -- shall I in an understatement say -- advantageously situated here by being placed on both sides of the centre aisle, it would be difficult indeed for you to show any partiality, as you must of necessity see and hear us on the right as well as on the left.

Incidently, Mr.Speaker, I do not congratulate the Government or commend it on the change in the structure of the seating here. As you will recall, it was I think in 1930 that the then Conservative government changed the structure, giving it what was then called "the lucky horse shoe bend" and I think it improved the accoustics at this end of the house, and made it more convenient certainly for the hon.members who were of necessity seated in this region to see and hear what was going on up in the "seats of the mighty". I do not know just the reason why the hon. the minister of public works found it necessary on this, the first seesion, with so many new members, to make this change back again to the old rigid rectangular line. Possibly they will set aside the parts removed, as the day may come when we will wish to change it back again.

And now, I should like to follow the time honoured custom of commending the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I agree with the words of the honourable the premier and the leader of the opposition, that they discharged their duties in a manner which reflected great credit to themselves, and to the constituencies which were honoured by their selection to perform

these important duties.

I, with other members, listened with great interest to the words of the hon. the premier this afternoon and last Thursday, and I do not think there will be many here who will take exception to most of the things he uttered.

We listened with interest to his review of the work of the Research Foundations, an organization which was set up here in Ontario several years ago. It did splendid work through the peace years in connection with giving assistance to manufacturing concerns, and various problems which affected the agricultural industry, and even in peace times made a decided contribution to the advancement of the province generally, and we were extremely fortunate in having such an organization available which at once could deal with the problems which presented themselves in war time.

I presume it is still under the very able direction of Dr.Spearman, and he has collected around himself, when last I was in touch with that organization, a very able body of expert assistants.

Now, in regard to this Griffith matter at the DeCew Falls has received a good deal of attention in the house. As was pointed out, this was initiated back in 1942 under a previous administration, and on a couple of occasions these complaints have come before us before. It is, of course, most unfortunate that in this great enterprise of the development of power, which occasioned flooding, it was necessary to take over vast areas of land in many instances, and that people were dispossessed of their holdings to which they have a very strong sentimental attachment, as was evidently so in this particular case, but the public good must take precedence over other circumstances, and the policy I have always felt in all cases should be that the most generous terms possible be extended in such circumstances.

I recall that when we were in opposition years ago, and these great transmission lines were brought up from the Quebec border, we seriously criticized the hydro commission and the government of the day for the adjustments which were made with the farmers at that time when they were crossing their farms

and placing these steel towers on valuable land, and we contended, and I think with considerable justification, that the farmers were unfairly dealt with, and certainly it was our wish and our instructions, as to all branches of government and to commissions under government control in any way, or appointments, that when such action became necessary, those affected should be generously dealt with, not only fairly but generously, and when looking into this matter as I did before, I found the facts substantially as the hon. the prime minister has set them out, that they received some nineteen thousand dollars for a one hundred and fifty acre farm, assessed at $4450.00, and I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that as a farmer I could not find it possible to criticise the hydro commission for having made an unfair or an ungenerous settlement in this particular case.

I did not know the condition of the fire, and would be interested in rounding out the story as to whether that fire occurred before or after the sale was made. I presume it was after the sale and the property belonged to the hydro.

Now, the hon. the prime minister dealt at considerable length with the propesed appointment of a forest resources commission in the province. I know that that has been his policy for some time. We felt that the reorganization of the department under competent, trained forestry officials could continue to give good service to this province as it has in the past, and the reorganization was effected, and I have always felt that under the present deputy minister the province had a public servant well trained to give outstanding service in this regard.

There is nothing new in the government recovering to the Crown certain leased rights, when it is found that they are not necessary for the working of a plant, or that these concessions have been given undertakings which are not being carried out by those who received the concessions, when they did not erect pulp mills or saw mills or other such industries, after having undertaken to do so. I know the previous administrations also recovered many acres under these circumstances.

It has always been assured to us by competent experts of the department that the annual increment, the increased growth

far exceded the annual cutting, and we, of course, are prepared to give the government every encouragement and every assistance in any forward-looking policy which will maintain in the perpetuity these vast and important forest resources of the province of Ontario.

Now, the hon.member for Huron (Mr.Taylor) who moved the address stressed a point which has given me great concern and also it must have given concern to the hon.premier because he opened his remarks this afternoon by warning the house that we were entering on or were in a very grave time of this war, probably not as gravely serious as it was in 1941 or in 1940, but still those who are in a position to know the facts have taken every opportunity in recent weeks to warn the people of what is undoubtedly ahead, and I was interested in reading the report of an address by Vice Marshal Curtis, just last night, here in the city of Toronto, in which he said:

"The subconscious feeling that the war is as good as won was issued last night at Toronto Board of Trade dinner by Air Vice Marshal Curtis. We are, both here and overseas, devoting a portion of our effort to post war planning, and that is most important. The danger that accompanies this is that those connected with it infect others with their peace time thinking, and there is developing a subconscious feeling that the war is as good as won, and everything is lovely.

"Gentlemen, that is the dangerous sign. The war is far from over. Unfortunately, there will be a heavier casualty than we have yet suffered, and it is very disconcerting for our lads fighting an enemy who is fighting tooth and nail for every inch they give up, to receive letters from Canada saying, 'Hooray, the war will soon be over, and then you will be back home' ".

Recently, Mr.Speaker, I had the opportunity of attending a function given in honor of a local lad from home, from my next neighbour farmer, who had won the D.F.C., for very gallant action, as a member of the R.C.A.F., and the tenor of his remarks was very strongly along the same line, that any one who thought

this war was nearly over should have his job for a few months, and they would soon form a different opinion.

So it struck me in reading the speech from the throne that the government, in that important document, might have stressed a little more than they did, when it was clearly pointed out that we are now well on into the fifth year of war, and from all battle fronts come encouraging reports that justify a confidence in victory.

This house will be engaged in the discussion and consideration of many problems dealing with various aspects of the administration of the affairs of the province, and I do trust that they have kept before them the fact that until the war is over and victory has been won, the main objective is still that we must not let down the gallant men of the fighting forces, or in any way make it possible that those who have already made such sacrifices -- many of them the complete sacrifice, the final sacrifice -- that they shall not have been in vain.

In referring to that gallant citizen from my own municipality, Flying Officer Ellwood Allen, I would like also to say to this house that at the meeting a list was read of over sixty young men and young women graduated from our continuation school who were in different branches of the fighting services. Of that sixty, some three had made the supreme sacrifice, all in the R.C.A.F. air crews, and all fighting the enemy in distant foreign skies.

That is just an indication, Mr.Speaker, of the war effort of rural Ontario, in these remote sections of the province, and the contribution that has been made, which is well illustrated by well over sixty from a small rural community, and of course, they do not include those who have enlisted from there -- and there are many of them, possibly even more - who have not attended the continuation school. So that we are extremely proud of our young men and our young women who just a few days ago, it seems to us, were the boys and girls about our fireside.

With the advantage of our schools, our churches, our community facilities of all kinds, they have proven themselves

to be the equal of any throughout the world, and Ontario has every reason to be proud of the young men and the young women who are fighting our battles for us today.

Now, the leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) has drawn our attention to the presence of the two lady members in the house. The hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) enjoyed the great distinction of being the first lady member in the House of Commons as well, and her activities there were of such an important nature that her name became a household word throughout Canada, and a much greater area as well, and we are looking forward to her activities in this parliament, and I am sure that she will make a very notable contribution here, as she did at Ottawa some years ago.

The hon.member for Bracondale (Mrs.R.M.Luckock) who has a son fighting overseas, I am sure will also make an outstanding contribution to our deliberations and debates. Certainly, if she is like her father -- and those of us who knew the late J.J.Morrison will realize that she comes by her interest in public affairs and politics very honestly indeed -- we may expect a distinct contribution from her.

I well recall, Mr.Speaker, -- and hope you will not hold this against the late Mr.Morrison, nor his illustrious daughter -- that some twenty-six years ago when he was organizing for the U.F.O., he came up and spent a day and a night at our place, and persuaded me to become a candidate in the 1919 election, and I have always felt that he was possibly more responsible than anybody else for the fact that I was in the government that was elected in 1919.

So that my interests in the hon.member for Bracondale (Mrs. R.M.Luckock) and her late father are very great indeed, sir, as you will appreciate.

I must sincerely congratulate these two lady members on their most brilliant victories, and join with others in welcoming them to this house. I had hoped at one time we might have the distinction of having a lady member in this group, but my hon.

friend from Leeds (Mr.Reynolds) convinced the electorate down there otherwise.

HON.T.L.KENNEDY: They cannot beat him down there.

MR. HARRY C.NIXON: Now, the speech from the throne forecast a considerable grist of legislation for the session. Much of this we can support on merit, and some for which I may not have the same enthusiasm, like measure to acquire the stockyards, for instance. I know that the government has a direct mandate from the people for the legislation contemplated.

In this connection, it is rather interesting to note the different reasons given for the taking over of the stockyards. As given in the government's platform, it says, "The stockyards will be taken over by the government and operated as a publicly owned enterprise so that speculations and manipulations may be stopped and fair prices assured." Well, the reason given in the speech that, "Legislation will be introduced for the purpose of acquiring the stockyards for the sole interest of the breeders of the province", makes me feel rather dubious that the province will be able to give any better or any cheaper service to the breeders or those who use its facilities, than the corporation, whoever they are, which has been conducting the stockyards, and I predict that the department will have many a headache in its operation.

I presume, as government property, they will no longer contribute taxes to the municipality, which is a consideration, and I suggest to the hon. minister of agriculture that he might give the agricultural committee of this house -- a very important committee in the past, and I am sure it will be in the future, composed of many members so competent to serve on that committee -- that he should assign to them the duty of looking into this stock-yard situation, and acquiring for us sufficient information of all phases of the proposal.

It did seem that the hon. minister in a recent interview was rather searching about for reasons to justify this particular move. He said, "Ninety per cent of the people believe the government is taking over the stockyards in order to place an independent party between the farmer and the packer." There was some justification

for that in view of the announcement in the election platform, and the people who know the stockyards will think that it is a good thing, but they are only one per cent right.

"The great advantage of the government owning the stockyards", the hon. minister said, "is that it gives the department of agriculture an absolute check of the conditions of the livestock industry in Ontario. As an example, if the quality of cattle arriving from a certain county is low grade, the stockyards are the first place which will show, and the department can take immediate steps to halt any deterioration, or to improve the standards. Even if the government loses twenty-five thousand dollars a year" -- and I do not know how the hon. minister arrived at that figure. It might have been a considered estimate --

HON.T.L.KENNEDY: I don't remember giving those figures. However, let it go this time.

MR.HARRY C.NIXON: --"It would save much more than that in fighting a disease", and so forth.

If the hon.minister (Mr.Kennedy) does not remember giving the figures, I will be glad to send them to him but I do suggest that the government could get the same information about the quality of the stock coming from different parts of the province without actually taking over the yards.

Now, I know that the government is committed to the policy, and naturally they would like to have as full information as possible with respect to the whole situation, but may I put forward this suggestion in all sincerity, that the agricultural committee of the house might well look into this whole subject.

The government has appointed a good many committees, and commissions since they came into office. They have more of them, and have more confidence in them fortunately than I have, after considerable experience with commissions in the past in this province, but I trust that their expectations will be rewarded, and no doubt in due time reports will come in which I trust will justify the expences which were entailed in their appointment.

But I have seen the splendid work done by committees of

the Legislature. After all, we are elected and sent here by the people, and are responsible members, and there is a great deal of work of this kind that can very properly be done by committees consisting of members of the house, to whom are assigned particular duties to perform, and report back to the Legislature, and the hon. the prime minister will find that he could make a very beneficial use of the members of the house and at much less cost to the treasury of the province of Ontario than he has heretofor.

Now, I wish to comment in particular upon the plans outlined in the speech from the throne for hydro. I think the hydro commission, under the government policy, is moving along in the right direction, and I trust that these are just the first steps and not the final steps.

Hydro has been the subject of much controversy and debate in this Legislature for many years, even before I became a member a quarter of a century ago, and I do not expect to live to hear the last word when this great public ownership project is functioning to suit everybody. Sir James Whitney, at one time said that "hydro would be as free as air". That was many years ago, and we have not yet come to that happy position in our use of hydro. Probably the fiercest debate was waged over the cancellation of the Quebec contract by a previous administration, and now that our conservative friends are back in power, notwithstanding the bitterness of the attack made on the then government for the drastic action taken, I do not see the proposal yet put forward that these Quebec contracts should be restored in their original form and wording. It is true there are not many members left in the conservative benches who were members of the government "of all talent", of Mr.Ferguson and Mr. Henry. As a matter of fact, I think my hon. friend from Peel, the minister of agriculture (Hon.D.L.Kennedy) is the only one left. Perhaps that is just an indication of the "survival of the fittest".

HON.T.L.KENNEDY: I agree with that.

MR.HARRY C.NIXON: But I do not think that there is any hon. member of this house, no matter who who wants these amazing clauses put back into any contract with the hydro which this government may make.

When we remember there was a provision for the payment of power purchased by this commission from the province of Quebec to be paid for in American funds, for instance, and there was also a provision that any taxes which might be added by either the Federal government or the Provincial government in Quebec, a taxing jurisdiction entirely outside of our control, should be added to the power bill which individual users would have to pay and also practically a "will clause" that provided if power should be needed in Quebec they could withdraw it from Ontario, and when they got through with it they would put it back on our doorstep, and we would have to play with it, which practically made it an "at will power". My point can be easily understood.

Power was purchased much cheaper, at some two dollars and a half per horse power, and I think the contracts were put on a good, sound, fair basis, and no contract can be expected to continue satisfactorily that is not on that basis for any period for twenty or thirty years, or even ninety-nine years, and as far as I know the parties in Quebec are satisfied with their contracts. I think they are making money out of them, and we here in Ontario have every reason to be satisfied and thankful that that power was available.

At that time it was estimated that some ninety-one million dollars was saved to the power users of this province because of the revision of these contracts, but then our currency was not at a discount, which has ever since been a consideration since the war started, and we all know of the taxes which have been put on these corporations in the intervening years, and it would be difficult indeed to estimate the saving effected to power users of the province of Ontario.

I commend the move to sacrifice the hydro structure by amalgamating the three systems; the Georgian Bay, the Niagara, and the Eastern. Frankly, I never could understand the necessity for maintaining these separate entities, as long as they have been kept in separate systems. But I also commend as the first step, the fixing of the maximum of thirty-nine dollars that any municipality will be required to pay for a hydro. I trust I have put the right interpretation on that sentence in the speech of the throne.

My hon. friend from Carlton (Mr.Acres) has for many years in this house advocated a flat rate. At on time the hon. premier when he was leader of the opposition, last year I think it was, submitted a resolution for a flat rate which was afterwards withdrawn, and appeared in a modified form under someone else's name.

Now, the government can go as far as it likes in the adjustment of rates on a more equitable basis, even to a flat rate, and they will have my support, and I think I can speak for most of the hon. members in this group. The ooriginal situation has completely changed in proximity to the Niagara and some other particular developments which meant that the municipality was entitled to cheaper power.

And now, a great deal of our electric energy comes from vast distances, and is simply placed into the system along with that generated locally, and the rates which were formerly enjoyed because of close proximity and development, I do not think are any longer of such important concern, because the whole of the credit of the whole province of Ontario has been pledged to make available this power from great distances, and to the people of the province no matter where located.

But benefits along the lines of those formerly enjoyed, those who enjoyed the cheaper rates because o f the enjoyment of these rates, industry was able to be protected, and to that extent made it difficult for the smaller municipalities to compete.

Now, there was legislation passed last session providing for the amal for the amalgamation of these various rural systems, and that has been done. I do not intend to discuss that in detail at the present time. I felt that the move was along the right direction at the ti e, and I am rather surprised at the criticism which is developing due to the cost in some of these rural communities.

But it did seem rather a cheap gesture when the dollar service charge was eliminated. We were all in favor of that elimination, and it has been more or less nulified by adding

the amount of kilwatt hours which must be paid for at the first rate, from 126 for three months to 180, and I know in Brant, where we paid 3 cents for the 126, we now have to pay 4 cents for 180, and while $3.33 was struck off in service charge, $3.42 was added on by this one change alone. It certainly has not been well received, I can say to my hon.friends, because, under the circumstances, what was taken away with one hand was put back with the other, as I have pointed out.

This government and the hydro could well afford to carry, for a time, any slack necessitated by this adjustment, in striking off the service charge.

I believe the Bill before the house, which I have not seen, and certainly will not discuss at this point, provides that there shall be a grant from the Provincial Treasurer to the Hydro to meet any losses of that nature, and I do suggest to the government that they might go much further in the equalization of rates and make them more equitable, and that the hydro commission might cover, out of their reserves, any costs which are here entailed, because their reserves have been built up tremendously in the last eight years by efficient administration, and I believe the hydro had efficient administration, because in 1935 their reserves totalled some seventy-nine million dollars, and they had been eaten into and had diminished to a considerable extent by contribution to rates, in order to prevent these rates from amounting to the thirty dollars or more for the city of Toronto and other areas within the Niagara district. They were built up, however, until in 1942 they exceeded one hundred and eighty-two million, five hundred thousand dollars from seventy-nine billion, (mil) a very substantial reserve indeed.

And now, there were no stabilizing funds at all in 1935. In 1942 that fund amounted to thirteen million five hundred thousand dollars, and I understand that that fund was largely for the stabilization of rates, and could well be used in part for the purpose which I have just outlined, as it requires very little money indeed to make these adjustments.

Then, in contingency, the reserves were six million six hundred thousand dollars in 1935; in 1942 it had amounted to

twenty-four million dollars. There was nothing in miscellaneous reserves in 1935, and one and one-half million dollars in 1942, so the reserves in hydro are certainly in a very healthy condition indeed, and I think the time has come when if properly used, both rural and urban should get the benefit of these vast savings, because we are approaching the time when my hon. friends are seeking to induce industry to come to this province, and there will be much wartime industry, and it will all have to be changed over to peace time activities, and I know of nothing that can equal cheap hydro as a blessing for the farmer and as an encouragement to industry in the city.

Now, the Sarnia Public Utilities Commission did a considerable amount of work on this question of a flat rate and started an agitation which was very beneficial I think even if it did not achieve its objective in the immediate instance. But they estimated, as I gather from their literature, on a grant in aid of $1,300,000 would be all that was required, to make a maximum coat of some $23.50 of horse power. If that grant were made equally by the province and by the Hydro Commission, certainly neither treasuries would feel the drain because we have in the past assisted the extension of rural hydro by grants from the Treasury to a very great extent running into very many millions of dollars, and that call upon the Treasury will not have to be made in the immediate future again in any case. Certainly until the Metals Controller relieves us of some of the wartime restrictions on the use of metals for this purpose. Then hydro power was so rapidly extended throughout the province that we were informed last year that in the neighborhood of eighty per cent of the farmers so located I think could be serviced by hydro or receive hydro service and the Government will be in the fortunate position in the future of not being called upon to find such large sums of money for the expansion of the rural hydro as the field has to such a very great extent already been served.

I was pleased indeed at the comment of the Premier that he believed in the centralization of industry insofar as that can be carried out. It was necessary in England. Under the bombing conditions they had to decentralize their industry. Here in Ontario we can be very thankful that we have not such a factor to contend with or to think about. But the great centralization of industry in a few large centres has not been a healthy condition as we found when we were in the depths of depression and many of our smaller outlying centres with their small industries carried on in a healthy manner and there was a minimum problem with respect to unemployment. I trust the Government will go much further than they have in this initial step in making more equitable and closer to a flat rate even if they are not prepared to go all the way, the

costs of hydro throughout the different sections of Ontario.

As an illustration of the advancement that was made with respect to Hydro policies in the last nine years, I may say that the rural lines were increased by 10,650 miles, while rural consumers increased in number from 63840 to 135,106, or a total increase of 71,266. The Government paid out in bonuses to rural lines $10,400,000.00, and I think that the province is today reaping the benefit of these sound policies because it is by individual effort backed up by hydro power not only in industry but on the farms, that we have been able to produce the volume of goods required by the war effort.

I was interested in reading the other day that for every man employed in the aluminum industry they used 100 horse power of electric energy, and that is the reason why our labor in the industries and on the farms has been so outstandingly efficient in this war compared with the last war, that they have had back of them this great hydro development.

There has been very great improvement in the rates paid by municipalities during the last nine years. The average rate in the Niagara District in 1934 was $27.30, and the only thing that prevented it from being $30.00 was that $2.50 was taken from Reserves and paid on the cost to prevent that high rate, which was felt to be too large for industry and for the user to pay. In 1942, the Georgian Bay system was reduced from $36.80 to $34.43, and Eastern Ontario from $33.23 to $27.00. So that there has been marked progress made for a number of years in this connection.

To my mind the most serious problem facing the Hydro Commission and the Government will be the sources of new power and their availability at an early date. I do not know of any major construction which is under way at the present time. Reference has been made to the DeCew Falls which the premier opened in October, and one would almost

have thought that he had dug it out himself the fuss that was made over him but that, of course, was started two years ago under a previous administration and he was in the happy position of being on the spot when it opened. But we have from 60,000 to 65,000 horse power which I understand was very badly needed and all in use, but if there is further construction under way at the present time I do not know of it. With the great demand upon the Hydro Commission - I suppose they are handling well over two and a quarter million of horse power, they are in a dangerous position indeed if they have no reserve and in the ordinary course of events and normal activity in our province, increasing quantities of hydro power will be necessary and we will find ourselves at a great disadvantage indeed in looking for new industry to come to this province if we have not available adequate blocks of hydro power at lowest cost.

Legislation was put through the house last year to make it possible to proceed with power development on the upper Ottawa. I know the Government - the opposition at that time - the Government of today took exception to certain provisions in that agreement. There is nothing in the speech from the Throne to indicate that they have a new policy with respect to the Ottawa, and, of course, the responsibility is now theirs which was formerly ours.

Another source of power is, of course, the great St. Lawrence, but we have seen that batted around from pillar to post for a quarter of a century, and at one time my friend from Dundas had the distinction of signing an agreement for the development of the St.Lawrence. A few years later I signed an agreement with the Ottawa Government as Provincial Secretary, but in both instances nothing came of the, treaty negotiations with the United States, and being an international stream just seems that every time we get to the point we are

ready to develop power on the St.Lawrence that some factor or other makes it impossible to proceed. So that if we do not develop power on the St.Lawrence or on the Ottawa the only other place to look for adequate power supply I presume is in the province of Quebec again and notwithstanding the satisfactory contract we now have I think it would be advantageous for us to develop our own resources, which we would subsequently own, rather than pay for purchased power and at the end of the contract period we would have nothing whatever to show for the the amount of money paid out for power where the same amount would not only pay for the power but the construction and at the end of thirty years we would own the plant free of debt.

We listened with a great deal of interest to the premier's policy with respect to Ontario House in London and I fancy after that explanation there will not be a great deal of criticism from any section of this house. It is true that I was a member of the Government some years ago which, after looking into the situation over there very carefully, decided to discontinue the Ontario House, and we disposed of it. The premier said this afternoon that it was not suitable in any case for the purposes for which he wanted it and that was our size up of the situation at that time. Certainly it was not contributing to any great extent in 1934 as we found it to any useful function. And it was only closed and disposed of after careful investigation. It had previously been in the branch of the Agricultural Department referred to as the Immigration Branch and in those days we were not exactly looking for new immigrants. As the leader of the opposition has pointed out from the records, the federal authorities were sending them back to England because we could not find jobs for them in this country and it was difficult to see where they were assisting in the sale of Ontario produce, as that was largely a duplication of Federal activity and responsibility. So that in so far as an Agent-General representing Ontario with quarters in London suitably located can be of

assistance to the armed services there is no one in this Legislature who would criticize or object to that policy.

With respect to immigration there, again, there might be a very honest difference of opinion, but that immigration of the type the prime minister instances there can be little objection and certainly little you can do about it in any case, but responsible authorities, I think would be well advised to carefully consider indeed the situation here before any immigration policy is embarked upon. There will be great numbers of men and women in the services to be demobilized and jobs to be found for them. There will be vast numbers engaged in wartime industry for whom peacetime jobs will have to be found. Mr.Graham Towers, head of the Bank of Canada estimated the other day that there would be 4,700,000 workers available for employment in civilian jobs after the war. At least 1,500,000 more than the number employed at the present and the survey which was made by Dr. Weir anticipated some million and a half or a million several hundred thousand new jobs available after the war. The premier challenged that survey in the house and said that Dr.Weir had got those figures from some source which he as prime minister had no knowledge of. I am informed, Mr.Speaker, that Dr. Weir a year ago approximately did come to the provincial government at a time when neither my friend from Gray nor myself were in the Government and spent considerable time in discussion with the Ministers and particularly with the Deputy Ministers and undoubtedly the figures which he compiled were obtained at that time. I have no personal knowledge of that I may tell my hon. friend the premier, but I have no doubt if he inquired among the Deputy Ministers of the service - Health, Public Works and other departments that would be vitally interested, he would find this was the case and I know that he is anxious to be fair with respect to this report from Dr. Weir at Ottawa.

Then with very brief remarks with regard to education, I

note that the prime minister has himself retained this portfolio, to supervise directly the important Department of Education. I would warn him that it is, as he already knows, a very heavy department indeed to administer. Two very good men in this province, two immediate predecessors, died in harness. We certainly do not want to see that happen to our hon.friend. Much progress was made, Mr.Speaker, as you know, under the late Dr.McArthur, a very outstanding educationalist, and I do not concede that the affairs of education are in such a bad state in this province as some would indicate. Naturally we are all anxious to see reforms and Ontario kept in the forefront in this vitally important department which touches every home - parents, taxpayers and children in the home, who are the pupils in the schools. So we will watch with interest and give every support possible to the policies of the Government which will tend to improve our educational system in this province. But like the leader of the opposition I was more impressed by what was not in the Speech from the Throne than what was there with respect to education, because the Government was most definite and very clear in its policy at the time of the election with respect to school taxes. Number 9 of the 22 points says:

> "There will be a sweeping revision of our whole system of real estate taxation so that the owning and improvement of homes and farm land which are the very foundation of our society will not be discouraged by excessive taxation. As an initial step in that direction the Provincial Government will assume at least 50% of the school taxes now charged against real estate. It is however to be clearly understood that this change will not affect the authority of the local school boards".

When we pick up the Speech from the Throne this clause on page 1 is considerable of a let-down, if I may so

describe it.

"The most difficult single educational problem requiring solution is the unsatisfactory system of financing the maintenance of the schools of the province. Intensive study has been given to this subject, and the results of the inquiries which have been made will be reported to the Legislature where the subject will be fully discussed".

As we pointed out the difference between pledge and performance in this case is rather startling indeed. But I, of course, assume that the Government cannot brush the pledge off with this casual reference and that we may still look forward to this pledge being carried out, which was unquestionably the boldest and most attractive bid for public support that was ever made in a general election in this province. Certainly it occasioned the bringing out of the biggest type and blackest ink on all newspapers in the province which was supporting the Progressive-Conservative party. And pages of photos of houses in Toronto, Hamilton and elsewhere were carried with the taxes that were now being paid on them and the 50% that the owner would have to pay if they elected Progressive-Conservatives.

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) You are not referring to Mr.Roebuck's advertisements, are you?

MR. HARRY C.NIXON: And individual taxpayers and myself among them dug out our tax bills to see exactly what we did have to pay for school taxes and as we found - as it was in my case, my annual tax on farm was $194.00 - if I could just cut that in two, believe it or not, Mr.Speaker, I almost voted Conservative myself.

The leader of the opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) the other day commented on the fact that I had been a member here

representing the grand old constituency of Brant for a quarter of a century - the only one in the house with that record as the hon. member for Peel had a brief recess from among us when he was defeated by the hon. Duncan Marshall in 1934 - and he wondered how a member retained a seat for that length of time. Well, I can tell you, Mr.Speaker, that certainly I never made any promises to the constituents of that riding that I did not carry out and when the next election comes around - whether it be soon or four or five years off - if my hon. friends cannot challenge any ratepayer in this province to produce their tax bill of 1944-45 and their current tax bill and show them that it has been cut in half - as far as school taxes are concerned anyway - then I will warn them now that they will not be deserving of the continued support of that constituency which they won on this very definite promise of 50% to be paid by the provincial treasury on school taxes being paid by real estate.

There were a number of other matters that I had in mind to touch upon, but Bills that are now before the house or will be before the house in the course of a few days will give us the opportunity to deal with them under those circumstances.

I would just like to say in closing that we carry no animosities whatever from the election. Life is too short and these times are too deadly grim, Mr.Speaker, for anything like that. It has never been my policy, it has never been my nature to carry any such animosities, and I have sat both in opposition and Government and participated in many keenly fought debates but never yet has there been a member of the house or an ex member that I could not greet and call him friend. I had strong convictions that the people were entitled to an opportunity to vote for what government they wanted to administer their affairs in this province - the term for which the previous administration was elected had

long since transpired and the people were given that opportunity and they have spoken and certainly I am the last one in the world to quarrel with the voice of the people.

All hon. members of this house have the welfare of the province at heart and are anxious to co-operate I believe for the general good and anxious in particular to assist in any and every way to advance the war effort to the end that victory might be achieved at the earliest possible moment.

The prime minister has made a presentation of his attitude, the attitude of the Government, under the exceptional circumstances which as a whole faces them in this house and we are prepared to give all possible support to legislation or resolutions from whatever section of the house they may come on the basis of their merits, with no thought, Mr. Speaker, of party bias or expediency. I thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER A.MACLEOD: (Bellwoods) Mr.Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. MacLeod moves the adjournment of the debate. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON.GEORGE A.DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr.Speaker, I move the adjournment of the house.

Mr.SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the house adjourn..Is the motion carried?

Motion agreed to.

Upon motion from the Prime Minister the house rose at 5.39 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
MAR 2 - 1944
RECEIVED

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Speaker: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Wednesday, March 1st, 1944.

The House met at Three p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reports by committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. T. L KENNEDY: I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Vivian that leave be granted to introduce a bill intituled, "Sugar Beet Subsidies Act, 1944", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Kennedy moves, seconded by Mr. Vivian that Bill intituled, "Sugar Beet Subsidies Act, 1944" be now read the first time.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "Sugar Beet Subsidies Act, 1944". First reading of the Bill.

MR SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: (Ontario) Mr. Speaker, several members of the House have been wondering why the flowers are on my desk. Some have thought it was because of a wedding, but they are rather late, because that occurred many years ago. Others think it is my birthday. I would like, in order to set at rest any wondering in the minds of hon. members of this House to say that these flowers are from some of my compatriots, in celebration of my being honoured as being the only Welshman in the House. I believe I am the only Welshman, and my fellow

Welshmen in the city, and particularly St. David Society — and this is St. David's day — felt they would like to have the flowers put on my desk.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, I might join the members, and assure the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) of our respect for his St. David's Day, and as long as it does not call for anybody singing, "The Men of Harlech", either together, or in solo, we will join in felicitations, and we hope that the ceremony which will be taking place this evening will be as pleasant as those which have occurred in the past.

Before the Orders of the day, may I say, so that the members of the House will know what the situation is, that while it was discussed, we will not sit this evening. That, of course, will give the Welshmen in the Legislature the opportunity of addressing the St. David's Society to-night. But I may say, in order to get along with the speech from the Throne, we will sit to-morrow night after supper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 11. I move the second reading of Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves, second reading of Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development". Shall the motion carry.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 12.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order: second reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Council Act", Mr. Drew.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves second reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Council Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 13.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The thirteenth order, Bill number 31, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations", Mr. Blackwell.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves second reading of the Bill intituled, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 15.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order, second reading of Bill number 43, "An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act", Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Daley moves second reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act". Shall the motion carry.

An hon. member has asked for an explanation of the Bill.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: I am sorry, sir, I did not get the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member has asked if you will be good enough to explain Bill number 43.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: There is really very little to add to what I said yesterday. The Bill is in keeping with a Bill already in existance, which permits the granting of a certificate to firemen upon having achieved certain qualifications. This Bill is designed upon the request of a large group representing certain industries, province-wide, supported not only by the proprietors, but by the employees, and in this particular instance by the union, and we felt that this would be a desirable thing to do, that is, to pass an amendment which would enable the Lieutenant Governor in Council to pass regulations if the request was considered sufficient from any particular group — that such regulations should then be passed.

It would have the effect of protecting the worker, who has achieved a certain progress in his chosen field; it would protect the employers, who upon hiring a man who had reached a certain qualification,

and he would be enabled to secure the certificate, and it would also protect the person hiring any man in this particular industry.

I would like to make it definitely clear there is nothing compulsory about it; it is simply an Act whereb the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, provided a sufficient request is made, issue a regulation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) First Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order: resuming of an adjourned debate on a motion of consideration of the speech of the honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods) Mr. Speaker, may I at the very outset tender to you on behalf of our group our very sincere felicitations on your election to your high office. Your long experience in public life and your wide knowledge of parliamentary procedure, equip you, we are sure, to preside over this Legislature with dignity and with judgment and with complete impartiality, and it is our hope at the end of your tenure of office, you will find yourself in the happy position of having your name associated with the most progressive Legislature in the history of Ontario.

And may I join with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) in greeting the presence in this House of two distinguished women. In the case of the hon. member from East York, (Miss Macphail) it has been my privilege to know her, rather intimately, over a period of twenty years, although she may regret my referring to the number of years. I first met the hon. member from East York (Miss Macphail) in my own native province of Nova Scotia, and I recall well one winter's night in Truro, where I accompanied her to the normal school, in that town, and where she delivered a fine, inspirational address to the normal students in that institution. And I remember her last words in that address, even though it is twenty years ago. She said, "Follow the gleam, follow the gleam" --

MISS MacPHAIL: (York East) I am trying to.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: I think we will all agree, despite

political differences, that the hon. member from East York (Miss Macphail) has been "following the gleam", and has been helping other people to follow that gleam, and I am sure she has a great contribution to make to the deliberations of this House.

I am also very happy to see here the hon. member from Bracondale (Mrs. R. M. Luckock), my neighbouring riding. I am interested in the hon. member from Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock) not only as a neighbour, but also as a constituent, and after all, we do have to cultivate our constituents, and I hope that she voted wisely and well on the fourth of August last.

I should also like to compliment very warmly the mover and seconder of this address. I thought both speeches were well delivered, with great content, and I had the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that these two addresses revealed that the progressive conservative party had not only undergone a face lifting process at Winnipeg, but that these addresses revealed a considerable elevation of the progressive conservative soul, and I feel that they got us off to a very good start, and I hope that all of us who participate in this debate will maintain the very high level set by the mover and seconder.

There is one other thing I should like to mention, not in a formal way, but with deep sincerity, and that is to refer to the presence in this House of three hon. members who speak for the French Canadian minority in the province of Ontario. I am particularly happy that these three hon. members survived the storm, and that we have in them a link between the people of Ontario and the people of the great province of Quebec, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature will take to heart the appeal made to the citizens of our province by Sir William Mulock on the occasion of his one hundredth birthday, when he made a strong impassioned appeal for unity between the French and English speaking people of our Nation.

I regret, as I am sure other hon. members do, that from time to time things are said in this province, and in the province of Quebec, which are not conducive to national unity, and I hope that just now in the midst of this

war, and as we face the post war, that we will so conduct ourselves that it will be possible in the difficult years that lie ahead for the French and English speaking people of this country to come together in invincible unity for a better Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I also congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) for his contribution to this debate. I think that we all agree that it was a very clear-cut and emphatic statement of his party's position, and I think we all feel that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has a great contribution to make to the success of this Legislature, and we are very happy on our part to see here no less than thirty-four representatives of that party. We feel that these hon. members enjoy the confidence of the people who elected them, and that they are going to make a real contribution to the success of our deliberations, and I am particularly happy to see included in the thirty-four no less than nineteen trade unionists, and with the permission of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I would like to bring that up to twenty-one for the whole House by including in the trade unionists phalanyx my colleague and myself, also have the honour to belong to the trade union movement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is proper that I should say a word or two about the attitude of our group in this Legislature. The hon. prime minister and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) have already declared their attitudes. The hon. prime minister -- well, perhaps I will take the leader of the opposition first (Mr. Jolliffe). The leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), in his opening address said this, "To the extent that forthcoming legislation actually does represent progress we will support it. We shall welcome it, and we shall not be afraid to give the government credit for such measures".

The hon. prime minister himself said that he believed that there was no reason why a wide spirit of cooperation should not be achieved by those who believe in the welfare of the province, and not party

expediency"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel in these two statements, and adding to them what the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has said, that we do have a basis for real, genuine collaboration of all parties in this province for reform, because, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the one outstanding fact about the election contest on the fourth of August was this, that the overwhelmingly majority of the people of Ontario, regardless of party label, voted for a wide reform in this province. I think it would be a big mistake on anyone's part to think that those who voted for the party now sitting on the treasury benches, voted for anything other than this reform programe; certainly they did not vote for the type of conservative party that we knew a number of years ago.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the very outset that we are very happy indeed to associate ourselves completely with the sentiment expressed by the hon. prime minister, by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Ontario would be outraged by a snap election. The people of this province do not want, in the midst of this war, with all its attending problems, to go through another campaign, such as the one we had in August last. We can work together here in a way that will be beneficial to this province of our's.

Now, hon. members are aware that at the very outset of this session the hon. prime minister and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) have locked horns in a rather violent way, and after the debate yesterday afternoon, I happened to be reading a book by Mr. Claude Bower, an American historian, called, "The Tragic Era", and dealing with the period immediately following the American Civil War, and in one chapter he deals with the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson, which he describes very graphically, and he recalls one of the important days of Andrew Johnson's impeachment trial, and he paints this picture of the chief principals at that trial, Thaddeus Stevens and Senator Ben Butler, and as I read it I felt that what we witnessed here yesterday afternoon was rather reminescent of that scene. I quote from Mr. Bower's book. He said:

"The great day arrived. Stevens was carried to the Senate, and Butler entered to suffer a momentary attack of stage fright. He had worked himself into the notion that he was to play an immortal part. Not unnoticed by him was the ladies' gallery, resplendent with bright beautiful women in the most gorgeous apparel.

> Able, cunning, endowed richly in demagogic tricks, he tried to speak the language of restraint, and read from printed slips, though with ease and little damage to his elocution. Denying that the Senate sat in a judicial capacity, with a view to converting the hearing into a political lynching party, he entered upon an extravagant amplication of the articles"

Commenting upon the scene, the New York "Nation", said,

> "His invective was like the commingled screeching of a hundred circular saws, and the rumbling of one gun carriage on a bad pavement".

I felt there was a little note of just that in what the hon. Prime Minister said in reply to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) yesterday afternoon.

I am not here to discuss the merits or demerits of the Griffith case, but I do say it would be much better for the hon. Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) not to conduct the debate of this assembly on that level, but rather to take a point of departure from that basis, and I hope we have heard the last of the Griffith case, although I recognize the right of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to deliver his counter offensive, but I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that we were really listening yesterday afternoon to the opening barrage of an appeal for the Haldiman riding, and we are likely, in the next few weeks, to hear a great deal more of this heavy artillery, following which we shall be able to get down to "brass -tacks" business of this Legislature.

I will say of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that he

stood up to the heavy artillery rather well, and I got the impression from this distance that after it was all over, his head was bloody, but unbowed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the provincial leader of the labour progressive party is not in this house, and I think I have found a happy solution to this problem. I think, instead of jarring the nerves of the people of Haldiman county by having a three-party contest this month, that a very happy solution might be for the contestants of all three parties to withdraw, and give an acclamation to the leader of the labour progressive party. At least, that would be in keeping with the solicitude shown by the hon. prime minister of Canada for the national leader of the progressive conservative party, and I detect something developing at Ottawa to-day that almost borders on a case of anxiety neurosis on the part of the prime minister, as far as hon. Mr. Bracken taking his seat in the house of commons is concerned.

HON. GEORGE A DREW: (Prime Minister) We have not the same neurosis here.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: Well, do not be too optomistic; you cannot tell what will develop before the session is over.

But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that I do hope that in the fullness of time, if I may put it that way, that this Legislature will have the benefit of the long experience and expensive knowledge of my colleague and friend, Mr. Leslie Morris, the provincial leader of the labour progressive party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear the hon. prime minister say a little more about the war in his opening remarks yesterday afternoon. I was glad too, that he found a seconder for the sentiment he expressed, in the hon. member for Grant (Mr. Nixon). We have to realize that, as far as our country is concerned, we have yet to feel the full impact of this war, and I sense a rather over optomistic feeling in this country about the war, a tendency to treat it as something remote from this country, and from our people.

I was struck by the fact when I turned on my radio at 10:00 o'clock last night, the first thing I heard was not news about the war and the battles which were fought yesterday, in which thousands of people gave their lives, but an announcement to the effect that meat rationing is to be discontinued in this country, and I find that headlined to-day in the Toronto press.

I wonder if this does not suggest that too many people in this country are thinking of the war as something that affects their eating or their drinking and not as something that has to do with the whole future destiny of this nation, and the whole generations of Canada who may be yet losing their lives in this conflict.

We live in the shadow of great events within the next thirty or sixty days the great western offensive may be opened, and the hopes of Ontario, and the hopes of Canada generally will begin to feel the impact of this war, for the first time.

There are members of this House who have felt it already, such as my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Nixon). For my own part, I do not deal with the war as an abstraction, because the war has already affected my own immediate family, when, over the week-end I received the news of the death of a second nephew of mine who was killed in action over the continent and I think this afternoon, regarding the son of the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon), and these hundreds of others of young Canadians who have given their lives in this conflict, we would do well to remember them in the words of Stephen Spender, when he said,

> "Among the names of those who in their lives fought for life, who wore at their hearts the fire's center, born of the sun, they travelled a short while towards the sun, and left the vivid air signed with their honour".

And I am sure that the hon. members will join me in paying tribute to these gallant sons of Canada who have gone out and offered their lives in the supreme sacrifice for the future of their country.

I think we should take to heart some words spoken by the prime minister of Great Britain the other day, when he said,

"There is one thing that we all agreed on at Teheran above all others to which we were bound in solemn compact, and that is to fall upon and smite the Hun by land, sea and air with all the strength that is in us during the coming spring and summer. It is this task to which we must vow ourselves with all the moral virtues we possess. The task is heavy, the toil is long, the trial will be severe. But let us all try to do our best, to do our duty. Victory may not be so far away and will certainly not be denied us in the end."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the remaining period of this Legislature we should conduct our affairs with this thought of the Briti_sh prime minister in mind.

The war comes first, and it will require the greatest assertions of the people of this province and this nation to ensure victory of which the prime minister of Britain is so confident.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the war takes precedent over everything else, then shall we deny that the time to plan and prepare for the post-war is now? And I think in our plans for post-war efforts in Ontario or in the nation as a whole, it is very important that we should have this perspective in mind. There is a tendancy in this country on the part of some people to feel that the aftermath of this war is going to be one of chaos; that it is going to be an aftermath in which hundreds of thousands of people will again be in the bread lines, and that veterans of this war will be selling shoe laces and apples on the street corners.

I think myself that is a very short-sighted view. I do not think we should qualify or say anything that will accentuate that feeling among the people of Ontario and of Canada, because if the people feel that way, if they are apprehensive about the post-war, then I fear they will fall into that state of mind described by "Homo the Sap" in his pamphlets on "permanent war", and people may feel that in the interests of their own security and well being, perhaps it would be a good thing to have this war go on, since war seems to be the only thing that puts people to work

and keeps people employed.

But I think that those who have that point of view are very short sighted. I think they overlook the fact that certain great historical developments have taken place in the very midst of this war, and that is the basic agreement that has been reached between the three or four great powers engaged in this war, namely Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union and China. And I regret very much that nothing so far has been said about that great historical meeting that took place in Teheran on the sixth of December when the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Soviet Union met for the first time to consider results of this war and of the post-war. I think it was a world shaking event, an event that has received scant attention by the press of this country, excepting that part of the press has dealt rather contemptuously with it, and I think the usefulness will be served, since a number of months have elapsed since this agreement was reached, that I read it, as it will only take a moment or two. This agreement was signed at Teheran by Mr. Churchill, by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin. The agreement says:

> "We, the president of the United States of America, the prime minister of Great Britain, and the premier of the Soviet Union, have met in these four days past in this the capital of our ally, Teheran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.
>
> We express our determination that our nations shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow.
>
> As to the war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of operations which will be undertaken from the east, west and south. The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.
>
> And as to the peace, we are sure that our concord will make

it an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the nations to make a peace which will command goodwill from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the co-operation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and in mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into the world family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea, and their war plants from the air. Our attacks will be relentless and increasing.

Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very short-sighted policy to comment upon a historical occasion like that in these words — and I am quoting now from the "Canadian Forum" of January 1944, and I read these words:

"They say that the meeting at Teheran was achieved in an impenetrable cloud of secrecy in which the great chess game was played off, and they say the little fellows can do little but trust and obey. Our fate is in their keeping.

Nevertheless from countless the cry arose 'surely some day we shall learn how to shape our own future in a manner that does not place such terrible demands upon the wisdom of

three ageing men'".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is a very terrible and irresponsible attitude to take toward a meeting that brought the president of the United States some eight thousand or nine thousand miles from his post, that took the prime minister of Great Britain from his job of directing the British war effort, and took the premier of the Soviet Union away from his post as commander-in-chief of the army. I rather look upon this agreement as the most costly agreement that was ever reached in human history, but I say to the hon. members of this house that the road, the long and tortuous road which led from Manchuria, in 1931, down to Abysinnia, to the Iberian peninsula, on to Czecko Slovakia, Austria, France, to Norway and Greece and all the other countries which have gone down in this confliet — that road is piled high with the bodies of perhaps fifty million human beings, and I look upon the three great principals at the Teheran conference as men who represented the collective intelligence of mankind, and they did not go there by accident to work out a "test game", but they went there as men who witnessed the awful terrifying struggle of civilization, as we know it, being pushed to the very precipice of disaster, and they recognized the only thing that could save this civilization was their unity, and their endeavour when this war is over to extend that unity into the period of an enduring peace.

If, Mr. Speaker, we push aside events of that kind as something that is merely a case of "three ageing men getting together", and "putting something over" on each other and "putting something over on the world", then I think that we have completely lost our function of responsible and thinking citizens. It is my firm conviction that the unity achieved between the United States of America, Great Britain and the Soviet Union together with the other allies in the united Nations serves as a basis for victory in this war, perhaps at an early date, and perhaps longer than we think, and it also provides the basis for the orderly progress of this world after this war is over, and unless that is accepted as a fact, then I

suggest that the plans of what we do in this province of Ontario does not mean very much. We have a plan in relation to the kind of a world we are going to live in after the war is over —

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: And I say, Mr. Speaker, — and I address myself here to all the members of the house — I do not see the period of chaos in this country after this war is over. It is quite unnecessary. I do not see that at all. I think that when we realize that the whole continent of Europe before this war is over may be reduced to ashes and ruin, just as it took the collective power and might, military and economic of Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union to win this war, so it will take their combined economic power to rebuild this world after the war is over. And I attach great importance to that. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are others who share this view point. This view point is not only held by the party that is often referred to contemptuously as "the party of Tim Buck", as though Tim Buck, the international leader of the national labour progressive party was the only person trying to sell the full implication at Teheran. In that connection, let me quote from a speech made by Mr. Edward L. Stetinius, an official of the United States state department in which he says:

> "Lend-lease operations, as we know them, now, will some day draw to a close, but we know already that the principle of mutual aid in mutual self-interest that is embodies in the Lend-Lease Act must live on. Today there is more unity of purpose and of action among freedom-loving peoples than ever before. In that unity we can find the strength to build a peaceful world in which freedom and opportunity will be secure for all."

And I find also in the annual report to the shareholders of the Royal Bank of Canada, Mr. Morris W. Wilson, the president of that institution, has this to say — I do not refer to Wilson here with any temerity.

because, after all, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) did quote from Mr. Graham Power's speech, he being the President of the Bank of Canada, so apparently it is quite proper to quote bankers, even if you are on the left wing.

Said Mr. Wilson:

> "I personally believe that large outright gifts of food, raw materials, finished goods and machinery to backward and devastated countries will in the long run, and even from the most selfish point of view, not only contribute most to human welfare, but both in the short and long run be in the best interests of those nations which can afford to make the gifts.
> If this is too much to expect of human beings in their present stage of development, the alternative must be loans on a very large scale on long and easy terms, or probably a combination of both loans and gifts. I think such loans would have to be to governments, because the management of an international fund presumably under the control of the great powers could hardly expect to decide on the merits of individual applicants, and, even if they did, would doubtless in due course be accused of attempting to influence internal business policies or trends."

I suggest that the sentiment, Mr. Chairman, contained in that statement is a very considerable improvement over the mentality expressed at the end of the last war by Mr. Herbert Hoover. It is a step forward.

Then, if I may, I would like to quote from the speech from the prime minister of this country made to the American Federation of Labour in this city in 1942, where he said to them:

> "I believe the war is teaching us that the obstacles to full employment are not really obstacles".

(Page 206 follows)

4.00 o'clock p.m.

I agree with that fully. I think that is quite true and I think it is rather unfortunate it should be hindsight, so to speak.

Then just let me finish this section of my address by referring to another statement of Mr. Wilson in the same report to which I referred earlier. Mr. Wilson said first of all:

> "First of all, what are the general objectives to be sought after the war? It seems to me that we must think of several. (1) Seeking the best means of turning our abundant natural resources into use for the benefit of the country. (2) Planning to eliminate mass unemployment and remove the fear caused by feeling of insecurity. (3) Bringing together the interests of business, agriculture, and labor. (4) Preserving our front against inflation, while protecting ourselves against stagnation and depression."

I think that there is a lot of food for thought in this because it is one of the few occasions that I have read a statement from a bank president where he called for the collaboration of business, agriculture and labor. I think that is a new note, and I welcome, as I am sure does every hon. member in this house the thought. I believe that after this war is over there will be in this nation, as there is in this house now, a very wide basis for cooperation between all sections of the community. I cannot imagine anything that would rob this nation of the fruits of victory more than a policy of war between classes of people. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, - and I am sure that my hon. friends opposite are waiting for this - cooperation in the interests of the nation now and in the post-war is a two way thoroughfare. And I think that those people in Canada today who are maligning and vilifying the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation as a nationalist socialist organization are not helping to bring about that unity of labor, farming and business that is desirable after this war is over. I say this: that the attack on my hon. friends opposite is an unprincipled attack because no one who

has ever accused them of being nationalist socialists believe that for one moment. It is all a piece of the sort of thing we had in this country several years ago when a certain distinguished American gentleman in an article in the Liberty Magazine said this:

> "The Reds are knocking at our gates, we cannot afford to let them in. We must guard the workers against red schemes and red ruses. We must keep their minds clean and unspoiled."

Now, Mr. Speaker, who do you suppose wrote those moving words? None other than Al Capone, America's leading gangster, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Major W. E. Gladstone Murray and that creature of the insect world in the city of Toronto, who is striking out against the C. C. F. and the trades union movement possessed just about the same kind of mentality as the gentleman whose words I have just quoted. Because I know and I know that the trades union movement in Canada knows that the darts and the arrows that are aimed at the C.C.F. have a target beyond that point, and the people who are attacking them are attacking the whole labor movement. I do not understand why it is necessary for free enterprise to encourage these high-powered men to defend them. Does not free enterprise in this country have any confidence in itself? What are they afraid of? And I find it rather interesting that a few days ago that respectable organs of liberal opinion in the city of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg Free Press, had this to say, and I quote:

> "Mr. Gladstone Murray, the former general manager of the CBC, has now assumed the role of public defender of individual enterprise. Our eastern spies report that as the Don Quixote of the political arena he is rushing frantically about tilting at the CCF windmills. They report, further, that if free

"enterprise can survive Mr. Murray's defence of it, it is a very strong and virile system indeed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to be very careful how we approach this very delicate problem. I do not saddle individual enterprise or free enterprise or Capitalism, or whatever you want to call it, with the sole responsibility for the irresponsible sort of thing that the exterminator is peddling in this city or that Gladstone Murray is peddling to the boards of trade and chambers of commerce across the country. Only a few days ago he made the charge that the provincial leader of the Labor-Progressive Party has a plan in his pocket for a general strike at the conclusion of this war. That is a blatant falsehood, and he knows it, because I can say that a couple of months ago - if you can forgive me - I visited Mr. Gladstone Murray in his office and he has a very nice office. He is very well upholstered. He wears a blue blazer trimmed with blue braid and very ornate insignia of some kind, probably a yacht club or something of the sort, and he has Egyptian cigarettes on his desk in the office, and he said in a moment of candor: "You know, Mr. MacLeod, I have taken on a very difficult job. My job is to try to humanize Canadian industrialists and it is a very difficult job. They are a much harder lot than the people I have been dealing with in England."

And he gave me the impression that he was going to put these people through a finishing school, as it were, of polishing them off a bit.

Apparently this particular section which I do not believe are representative of Canadian industry - just the cruder section of it, resented Mr. Murray's efforts to teach them good manners, and they concluded that was not worth

the $100,000. a year and so Gladstone Murray discovered that he had to give them stronger meat, and that stronger meat was that the Labor-Progressive Party, the C.C.F. and other people in this country were planning a general strike after the war was over, and that, of course, recalls Hitler's burning of the Reichstag in Germany as an excuse for plunging the German nation to misery and plunging the world into a bloody war.

I want to be perfectly fair with management, with the leaders of industry in this country and other countries and I therefore read the statement made by Mr. Charles E. Wilson of the General Electric Company and Vice-Chairman of the War Production Board of the United States, who in an address to the National Association of Manufacturers said:

> "I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life, and we know it. This above all is a time when the industrial leaders of America owe it to their country and to themselves to exercise temperate judgment - to practice the arts of compromise - to avoid the temptation of sacrificing enduring values for temporary gain - and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity".

I think that Canadian industrialists and Canadian bankers and leaders of our financial institutions would do very well to ponder that sober warning from one of their own kind who occupies a high position in the United States. I say that the labor movement in this country, to the extent that I am able to speak for it and I realize

that I can only speak for it in part - I am here as a result of a mandate given to me by the working people of the war industries in the riding of Bellwoods - I say that the labor movement in Canada, the Trade and Labor Congress, the Canadian Congress of Labor, would feel far happier now and in the post-war period if they did not have to waste their time fighting governments and fighting employers but rather cooperating with the governments and with employers in enabling this country to absorb the shock of the post-war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about our own province of Ontario. This is a great province that has made magnificent contributions to Canada's war effort. It is estimated, I believe, that sixty to sixty-five per-cent of the total war production of Canada has come from this province. In 1939, for instance, the forty-four leading industries in Ontario employed 236,377 workers and reported a gross production to the value of one billion three hundred and fifty-eight million dollars. In 1941, two years later, employment in these same industries jumped to a total of 345,356 workers, an increase of almost 107,000. At the same time the gross value of production jumped up one billion seventy-four million nine hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars to a total of two billion four hundred and three million, nine hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars. That is what has happened in Ontario during this war period, and that is a very encouraging picture. That picture means that thousands of people who were sleeping on park benches or standing in bread lines are now engaged in productive useful work. And I say that everything that the province of Ontario was able to achieve under conditions of war Ontario can achieve in conditions of peace.

I think it was the leader of the opposition who quoted Mr. Graham Towers as having said: "What it is physically possible to produce it is financially possible to produce." I believe that and the labor movement believes

it. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the steps that this Government has already taken in the direction of planning for the post-war. We welcome the decision of this Government to establish a new department of Planning and Development and I was very much impressed with the report that the Prime Minister gave on that new department. I regret, however, or, perhaps I should say, that I felt a sense of let-down when I read in the press a day or two ago that it is now proposed to incorporate this new Ministery within the Ministry of Labor or, at least, to give the Minister of Labor two jobs. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province will not take this new department very seriously if it is just going to become an adjunct to an existing government department, and I would suggest that is quite an unnecessary step. This is in no way detracting from the ability of the hon. Minister of Labor, who certainly has his hands full. There are an awful lot of problems in this province affecting labor that has yet to be solved, and unless the Ministry is intending to deal boldly with post-war reconstruction then I suggest in all deference to the Prime Minister that he should promote and move up to the front benches some of the very able men that he has sitting on this side of the house, and make this the job of one single responsible Minister. He will have his hands full and will have to have a great deal of assistance. However, in principle I think the plan is very sound, and will be welcomed as a great step forward.

I would suggest to the Prime Minister further that he give some consideration to the question of actually involving the people of this province in this new undertaking and I would suggest specifically to him that he might encourage in a public statement in this house or otherwise

the establishment in every town and city and municipality in this province of Councils of Planning and Development made up of Boards of Trade, the Trades Union, Chambers of Commerce, and all other civic bodies who are intimately acquainted with the problems of their own community, who will be able to make practical suggestions to the Government as to what can be done in that particular community. After all, I think people on the spot, who know their local problems, are likely to give the Government better advice than a research board of some kind sitting here in Queen's Park, and I think, further more, that such councils as I am proposing would be welcomed by the municipalities, because not many cities, especially cities like Windsor - they are already beginning to feel alarmed about the possibility of the great automobile industry shutting down and leaving them with large numbers of unemployed people. One of the major weaknesses during this war, as the leader of the opposition pointed out quite correctly, was the failure of the Federal Government to properly involve the people in the war effort. It was on a hit-and-miss basis. The labor movement in Canada has been begging for five years now to be included as a partner with management and government in solving the problems of production and despite the frustrations that they experienced it can be said, I think, that the labor movement has made vital contribution in enabling this country to win the battle of production. I suggest we should profit by the mistakes that were made by the National Government in this respect and that the Premier should afford an opportunity to the people of Ontario to give their whole-hearted cooperation to this new ministry in solving the problems that it has set before itself, and that, Mr. Speaker, will be one which will achieve the collaboration of classes that I suggested earlier because you will notice that I said the Boards of

Trade, Chambers of Commerce, Trade Unions and all other civic bodies that are acquainted with those problems of their communities and who can sit down, prepare a brief, make a study of the conditions in their community and submit their proposals to this new Ministry for solving the problem in their particular community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to pass hurriedly to the proposals in the Speech from the Throne affecting the labor movement. I am very glad to see that we are to have legislation, a bill at least, that will limit the hours of work to forty-eight hours a week and ensure an annual holiday of one week with pay. Now, I do not want to be petty about this, but I must point out that that particular provision was incorporated in the covenants of the League of Nations after the last war, and I believe that the Legislature of Ontario passed a resolution adopting that in principle. But twenty-five years have passed, and nothing has been done about it. I would suggest to the Minister of Labor that since he has not prepared his Bill, that he might very seriously consider, having regard to the adjustments that must take place in the post-war, that he might consider making provision in the bill for reducing the hours to forty hours a week at the conclusion of this war and possibly adding on another week's vacation. Because after this war is over the nerves of the working people of this country are going to be badly frayed. There is going to be, we hope, an abundant labor supply, and it could be a very good thing to make sure that every one will have work by reducing the working week to forty hours and giving the workers two weeks' vacation with pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a little exchange the other day between the leader of the opposition and the Attorney General flowing out of a statement that the Attorney General made about good unions and bad unions

which was very interesting to listen to. I did not see that statement and I do not think the Attorney General elaborated it during his exchange with the leader of the opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Attorney General that there are good unions and bad unions. There are legitimate unions and there are company unions. Then another way, there are legitimate unions and there are illegitimate unions and I would suggest that the Attorney General and the Minister of Labor might get together in this way. The other day we had a discussion on an amendment to the Legitimation Act. Now, I heard that word for the first time and I was fascinated with it. It is really a sixty-four dollar word. The Attorney General told my colleague from St. Andrews that it is proposed in the fulness of time to remove the stigma so-called illegitimate word and in future not to stamp birth certificates with the word "illegitimate". Now, in all seriousness may I suggest to the Attorney General that he keep all those rubber stamps and all paraphenalia showing the word "illegitimate" in the past so far as birth is concerned, and pass it all over, lock, stock and barrel, to the Minister of Labor so that when he has an application for certification from a company union he can stamp it with "illegitimate" and send it back.

Now, I compliment the Minister of Labor on the despatch with which he let it be known that he will apply the new Dominion Labor Code to all industry in Ontario. That was a very good move and raised the Minister's stature as Minister of Labor. There was a time when the Liberals in Ontario thought that Peter Heenan was the greatest Minister of Labor that Ontario ever had. The member from Kenora evidently thought that because he ran against Peter and defeated him. I would like to see the present Minister of Labor win for himself the distinction of being the greatest

Labor Minister in Ontario's history, and I suggest to him that he would be rendering a very great service to this province and this nation if he studied a little more closely the new Dominion Labor Code which has not yet been proclaimed - has been laid on the table - and you know the Wage Control Order was also on the table for a while, but labor began to speak its mind and then the Prime Minister himself a few days ago in meeting a delegation from the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada said it was most regretable that that Wage Control Order was made public in its present form and he stated that the necessary changes would be made to bring it into line of harmony with what the labor movement wants.

Now, some people have already looked into this Labor Code and there seems to be a widespread opinion that there were a lot of defects with it. The principle is good. It is a step forward, but as it stands today certain revisions are necessary. I am not going to elaborate them here, but I am going to pass on to the Minister of Labor a memo that I have before me which I hope he will study, and, should he be going to Ottawa, to confer with Mr. Mitchell in the near future, I hope that he will take it upon himself to represent not only the Department of Labor but the labor movement in the province of Ontario and make representations to the Government for the changes that are required in the Code before it becomes law. If we do not succeed in achieving those changes, there is no reason in the world why Ontario's Minister of Labor should not apply the principle of the Dominion Labor Code and make amendments to it in its application to the province of Ontario. Because I am told by those who have studied the Code - I have not seen it myself yet - I am told in many respects, Mr. Minister, it is not an improvement over the legislation introduced in this Legislature last session, and I think that you would be

rendering a great service to national unity if you would go to Ottawa and point out to the Minister of Labor and to the directors that the legislation as it exists now is not acceptable to the province of Ontario, and I think that you would receive the commendation of the labor movement for doing that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word as to the Minister of Agriculture whom I see seated at his post, a very estimable gentleman.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY: I agree with that.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: I told him today that he is one of the men in this house of whom it can be said that he has clean hands and a pure heart, and I hope it has not lifted up his soul into vanity or sworn deceitfully at any time. But I was reading a press clipping on a speech made by the Minister in Simcoe the other day in which he said: "There were one hundred and ninety thousand farmers in Ontario five years ago. I do not think there are a hundred and fifty thousand today. We have to build up the farming industry, and the farmers will have to help themselves to achieve the things they should have."

That is a very good sentiment, but I think that the Minister of Agriculture should make it his business to look into certain aspects of agriculture in this province that may have attracted his attention. Now, it may seem rather ludicrous that a farmer from Bellwoods riding should be undertaking to lecture a real farmer from Peel.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: (York East) The city people think they are the only ones who know how to farm.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: That is true. We have Victory gardens. And we make a success of them. But we are of the opinion that the Minister of Agriculture should make a study of the growth of landlordisms and tenancy in Ontario agriculture. I do not have any precise figures

on this but I am told that there is a growing tendency toward landlordism and tenancy in the province. There is also a very great decline in the sown acreage in this province, and we think that bearing these two points in mind that the Minister of Agriculture after having looked into this question, might formulate a policy which would ensure the maintenance of the family farm. I am not coming now to the Griffith case, mind you, but the maintenance of the family farm owned and operated by the farm family itself in our judgment should be the foundation of Ontario's agricultural policy. We believe, too, that the correction of spreads in prices of agricultural commodities and industrial products by legislation directed to this end and by curbing the packing and processing monopolies, especially in the new industries which use agricultural crops for their raw material. We believe there should be a floor under the farm prices to the grower and legislation to prevent higher prices to the consumer. The payment of provincial subsidies to the farmers where necessary and low-interest credits by the province. We think that there should be steps taken to bring about a reduction in the price of agricultural machinery and orderly marketing through democratically elected boards of farmers in each community, and planned production through farm production committees working in close conjunction with the Provincial Department of Agriculture. We hope, too, that the Minister will look into the question of the establishment of technical centres and machine repair depots to increase farm efficiency, and the encouragement of farmers' cooperatives. A thorough survey of Ontario's arable land, to improve sub-marginal lands and provide soil nourishment, and to guarantee the settlement of veterans upon good land. We suggest further free

scholarships to farm youth and demobilized veterans, and a larger system of agricultural schools and colleges. And a vigorous program for rural electrification for to bring the Hydro into every farm home in Ontario and a minimum wage for farm labor and the inclusion of farm workers in all protective legislation.

Now, while I am on that point I want to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he consider very carefully the question of making a standing committee on agriculture of this Legislature something more than a few names on a piece of paper. I agree with what the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Harry C. Nixon) said yesterday that the Minister of Agriculture and other ministers can get a good deal of good advice and helpful counsel from all members of this Legislature, and I hope, therefore, that in this session these committees will not remain as routine affairs that must be struck off because they are provided for in a book but become living, vital bodies that will enable such hon. members as the hon. member from Rainy River (Mr. George Lockhart) and the hon. member from East York (Miss Agnes Macphail) and hon. member from Grey, and the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Joseph B. Salsberg) who is very familiar with farm problems in that constituency and others who will sit down and discuss the practical problems of the farming population of this province and help the Minister of Agriculture to formulate and work out and enact legislation for a practical, modern up-to-date policy on agriculture.

I would say, to return to my hon. friend, the Minister of Labor (Hon. Charles Daley), you know the impression of this house is that the Labor Committee is the least important committee of all. I believe it very rarely meets and I think that you would be doing a good thing for yourself if you saw to it that on that Labor Committee you had leaders of the trades union movement who are in this house now, who are intimately acquainted with the problems of the

labor movement and who can help you to make the Department of Labor a department that will really come to grips with problems affecting management and labor here. I would suggest that you avail yourself of the good counsel and good advice of a number of people in this house who have come here eager and anxious to play a constructive part in the life of this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps I should say a word about education. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Harry C. Nixon) did not miss the opportunity to throw a harpoon at the Minister of Education for his failure in the legislative progrem of the government to make any reference to the 50% share of the taxes on education. Now, when I read the Speech from the Throne and saw this omission I was reminded of something that the former member for South York, who sat where the hon member from Fort William (Carfield Adamson) now sits in the house, said to the predecessor of the Minister of Labor at the time the Collective Bargaining legislation was up. The Government members who were here will recall that the Legislature was called to pass a bill on collective bargaining, a new charter of labor as it were, and got here and there was no bill and the present Prime Minister was very irate about that and the former member from South York in his good humoured attack on the former Minister of Labor likened him to the lead cow in the stock yard. You know what the lead cow is. He is lead up to a nice spot of feed and he is a decoy for the other boys or girls that are coming up behind and the cows follow the leader thinking they are going up to have a nice feed of oats and just as they get to within the smell of the oats a door opens and they are led into the slaughter pen, and the former member for South York accused the former Minister of Labor of doing

Just that to the labor movement for forty years, he said. Well, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there are some municipalities in Ontario that feel the same way about the present Minister of Education. If he did not lead them behind the lead cow he certainly led them up into a high mountain and they had high hopes that they were going to be able to solve many of their municipal problems on the basis of getting back 50% of the cost of education. The Speech from the Throne says nothing about it except the general statement to the effect - we will hear all about it. Well, we have not heard about it yet.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) You will at the proper time.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: But I feel sure that the Prime Minister is a man of honour and that he had in mind to take this Legislature into his confidence and tell us exactly what he has in mind but he, I am sure, will not feel badly if I point out that there was a sinking of hearts among some of the councillors and mayors and reeves when the Speech from the Throne appeared in the press and there was nothing about this very alluring policy that caused Mr. McCullough to really go to town in getting out the black type to splash it on the front page of the Globe and Mail, but we will wait for them and we hope when the explanation comes it will be adequate.

Let me say a word or two about provision made in the legislative program for returned veterans. I agree that the proposals contained here are very good, but I really think that they might go a bit further. It seems to me that it would be a very good thing if the Government would make representation to the Dominion Government to increase the clothing allowance now paid to the discharged veterans. As hon. members know the present clothing allowance is $65.00 and I suggest that that is an insult to any

man who is prepared to give his life for this country, sacrifice everything he has only to come back and be given a paltry $65.00 to clothe himself with, and I felt the other day when the Minister of National Defence said, "Well, after all, they are given their military shoes and they are also allowed to keep the uniform" - do we want the returned veterans of this war walking down Yonge Street in this city with a cheap second hand store suit and a big pair of military boots on his feet? I do not think so and I think that the Federal Government should be pressed to give every discharged man a minimum of $125.00 so that he can go into a decent store and buy himself some decent clothes.

Now, this leads me to the question of Dominion-Provincial relations. I was very sorry in reading the Speech from the Throne to find no reference there to this question although in the second of the twenty-two points the Progressive-Conservative Party was committed to work in effective cooperation with the Dominion Government and with all other governing bodies in Canada in all activities which will assist in the prosecution of the war, etc. etc. But I want to say in fairness to the Prime Minister that he made up for that omission and I want to say I am very sincere - although I am not in the Government ranks, merely occupying the same side of the Polish Corridor with him - that you are to be very warmly complimented on the statesman-like approach you have taken to this question of the immediate necessity of a Dominion-Provincial conference. You might have been excused for - how shall I put it - for not overlooking the fact that the Government at Ottawa is of a party other than your own and I know that you have a very deep desire to see your own national leader in that high post some day, but I think that in your letter to the Prime Minister you approached this whole question in a non-partisan

spirit and made it perfectly clear to the Dominion Government that this Government is eager to sit down around a table with the Federal leaders and work out in detail those problems which affect the prosecution of the war and adjustments that must take place in the post-war and not a line or word in that letter could subject the Prime Minister to the accusation of playing petty partisan politics. I want to thank you. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we did get the impression from some statements made by the Minister of Health that it is contemplated to work out a provincial health policy that will be a counter-poise of the national health effort. We may not be correctly informed on that, but we do believe it is in the best interests of this country to have a national health policy in which all the provinces will cooperate rather than to permit a situation to develop where the people of Canada as a whole will be deprived of adequate health protection as a result of the unwillingness of any province to cooperate on that score.

I am very glad to see, too, provisions here for amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act by extending it to certain occupational diseases. This may be going a little further than you are prepared to go but I would seriously ask the Minister of Labor to consider whether we have not arrived at the time when the Compensation Act should provide one hundred per cent compensation for all Ontario workers during the period of disability. I do not think it is a very healthy situation that any worker should be deprived of - what is it - one-third of his wages as the result of an accident caused through no fault of his own. I think that would be the humane thing to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of problems that I have not touched upon at all. I have done this deliberately because my colleague from St. Andrew (Mr. Joseph B. Salsberg) will be participating in this debate

and he will have many constructive proposals to make, and so I conclude my remarks by saying once again to the members of this Legislature - and I include myself in it; I am very conscious of my responsibility here. I am conscious of the fact that my contribution and the contribution of my colleagues can only be a very modest contribution because we are the second smallest party in the Legislature, but we shall try to the best of our ability to make our contribution a good contribution, a constructive contribution and we approach all parties in this Legislature not on the basis of party labels. I am sure that it must have been clear at the outset of my remarks that there are some differences between us and hon. members opposite, and yet that ought not to be stretched too far. I want to say to them that given the program they have adopted, given the reforms that they are advocating, we are allies in the same cause and therefore we are allies of each other but I want to go a bit further than that and say that it would be absolutely wrong for anyone in this Legislature to take the position that all the bad men are on this side of the house and all the good men are over there. I do not believe that at all. I have been very much impressed with what I have heard from the members of this side of the house who have spoken here and in conversation with them and I think they are every bit as much devoted to the welfare and well-being of this province as are the members on the opposite side of the house. I believe that sincerely. There is a wide basis of cooperation between us. We can help by our actions here, by weighing our words, by avoiding any tendency to speak in an irresponsible manner, we can avoid any suggestion in the mind of the Ontario people that this is an unstable Legislature.

I think it may turn out, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province chose well, acted wisely on the fourth of

August by making the position of this Legislature such that there is a very narrow area in which any party can pursue partisan petty politics and that we are in the position here where in the interests of the people who sent us here we can work together, cooperate, offer constructive proposals and do our utmost to achieve that thing which I said in the remarks on the address to the Speaker, namely, to make this twenty-first Legislature of Ontario the most progressive Legislature in the seventy-six years of the history of this province.

I close by repeating the same words uttered by the Prime Minister of Britain only the other day when at the close of his address he said: "My hope is that generous instincts of unity will not depart from us in these times of immense exertion and grievous sacrifice and that we shall not fall apart abroad or at home."

And I would close with these words spoken by a great British poet that I think might be the principle that we would all conform to in the party that we serve in this Legislature - and I hope we will be here for five years; I hope we will run our full course, and it will be unnecessary for the people of Ontario to go through a hotly contested election campaign in which there will be counter-charges and general slandering of each other. That is not good ---

AN HON. MEMBER: Anywhere.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: Anywhere, no doubt about that, but we shall be here in larger numbers after the next election, and I say, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, we should take to heart the words of the great William Blake the very moving words of his poem in which he says:

"I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In this our green and pleasant land."

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (East York): Mr. Speaker, I want in beginning my speech in the Legislature of Ontario to follow the practice of saying how well I think the mover and the seconder of the address in reply performed their duties. I do think that they did remarkably well. I thought the mover delivered his speech in almost perfect style and I thought the substance of the seconder was worthy of a great deal of comment.

Then I want to thank the leader of the Liberal Party - whom I think isnot in at the moment, the hon. member for Brant (Harry Nixon) for his very kind welcome to the two women members in the Legislature. I must say when the leader of the party to which I have the honour to belong mentioned in the Legislature that in his party there was the first two women members, I wondered if our warmth of welcome was not any greater than the enthusiasm of the moment but I am very happy now to know that the leader of the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Brant (Harry Nixon) did welcome the member for Bracondale (Mrs. Rae Luckock) and myself with very gracious words. And we will strive, I am sure, by our devotion to the interests of the people of Ontario to be worthy of his good opinions and as he was speaking I thought that the spirit of the United Farmers Movement still lives and those of us who worked long and arduously in that movement will always be found very similarly on agricultural policy. I was so happy that the Member of the Liberal Party did bring into the debate the name of the person whom I think served this Province very loyally, Mr. J.J. Morrison, and Mr. Morrison did a great deal for this Province. During his lifetime it did not seem that it probably was the service that he had hoped it would be, but actually he laid the foundation for movements that have now become very strong because of the t ings that he taught farmers - that is, to have faith in themselves, to look after their own affairs, is showing strongly now in the growing power of the federation

of agriculture in Ontario. It is essential also in the further development of the cooperative movement a d I hope I may say without any reflection upon Mr. Morrision it is showing in the rise of the cooperative commonwealth federati on, because those are the things that he wanted farmers to do for themselves.

Then, before going on with my speech, which is to be solely on agriculture, I want to say that I do feel very honoured to have been chosen as the representative of the historic and populous constituency of York East - a constituency that was long represented in this House by a farmer Premier, the Hon. George S. Henry, and at some time in other and later debates I want to deal with the problems that particularly affect many of the people in York Township, but today, since I am dealing with agriculture, their problems and the problems of the two counties on the north will be part of my address but not specifically so treated.

All the farmers at this moment who are shipping milk into Toronto and belong to the Toronto Milk Associated are very disturbed to find that on the first day of May that the subsidy that is being paid them by the Federal Covernment is to be lowered by twenty cents. Isuppose that is twenty cents a hundred and it looks to the farmers as thought the subsidy which the Federal Government is paying to the consumers of two cents a quart is now to be taken out of the farmer. Well, I must say it would not be anything new because so often that is what Governments do, both Provincial and Federal, making a great show of service and when the whole thing boils down it is the farmer pays the bill and that is the kind of thing that is embittering agriculture.

I want to say a warm word of praise to the man whom I have admired for a long time and that is to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I could not always say it to the cabinet he served in, but I could say for him personally I have a very great admiration because I think he is a devoted friend of the practical farmer. I want to congratulate him on the setting up of the commission of inquiry and particularly of the

method of his selection. When the Minister of Agriculture asked the farmers, various organizations - to many of which I belong - to meet in oneof the downtown hotels last Fall I was glad to go and see how the thing did operate and certainly the Government - and I cannot help but think that the Minister of Agriculture advised that it should be so - the farmers themselves chose the commission with three exceptions, two from Northern Ontario, where there did not seem to be sufficient organization of the farmers to send representatives, and the chairman. But in the case of at least one of the northern men I think no better choice could have been made by the Government. I do not know who the other is at all. They chose the president of the Rainey River Cooperative - the manager of the Producers Cooperative Creamery, the member for Rainey River says. Anyway, it is the biggest cooperative in the Rainey River district. I would have been even happier over the whole matter of the commission had the Government permitted the commissioners to choose its own chairman, but be that as it may, the Government must have its own reasons for choosing the particular chairman they did. He would not have been my choice but I am not the Government after all. For various reasons he would not have been my choice and I would rather have seen the farmers chose their own chairman.

I am looking forward with very great interest to the recommendations which that commission will bring in and as to such of them as the Government will present to us in legislation and otherwise, and I think when they do come in we will have a quite lengthy debate on the important subject of agriculture, and for that I am extremely grateful because agriculture does not usually get the place in discussion in parliament and legislature which its importance merits. It is pushed off as something of no consequence, when, as a matter of fact, it is of the greatest possible interest.

I want to review for a moment - and I am going to do the discouraging part first - what the picture of agriculture has been in the last thirty or forty years and it is a very black picture and I am sure no one knows of any better, if as well,

than the present Minister of Agriculture. The farmers of Canada and Ontario had difficulty often selling produce because this whole country, our economy in Canada, our whole canadian economy was dominated by a source of super-industrialism and so the needs of the industrial group had to be considered at every turn and if they thought that the purchasing of goods from abroad/that might come in competition with them was not desirable then the farmers had to lose markets abroad in which they could have sold in order to please the industrialists at home. That went on and on for a very long time resulting in such figures as these: for instance, we can say the farming population of Canada, starting from the first world war in 1914 up to 1940, up to this year, has been roughly a third, a little more than a third at the beginning of this period and something less than that at the end; I think it is up now to be twenty-eight percent, and here is the income of the agricultural people in Canada - the figures are not new; I am not presenting them as new. I am simply presenting the very black picture. From 1914 the farmers of Canada received roughly a third of the national income - that is 1914 to 1919 and from 1924 to 1929 one-sixth and from 1930 to 1940 one-tenth of the national income. I was just noticing in a little pamphlet that came to my desk today - it is published by the Alberta Wheat Pool - that last year, 1943, that they give the percentage of farm population to total population as twenty-eight percent. This is from the Federal Bureau of Statistics - someone has figured it out - that if the national income had been distributed on a mathematical basis according to population the farm income would have been a billion dollars more than it actually was this last past year of 1943.

(Page 229 follows)

ccl

Now, you cannot do that to a great industry over a long period without bringing on national disaster, not only to the farmers, but to everybody who serves them by selling them things, or by being their doctor, or their lawyer, or their minister, or their school teacher, or serving them in any possible way.

And one cause, undoubtedly, of the depression was the farmer's inability to purchase his just share of the products in Canada.

And this long time of depression and exhaustion financially, on the part of the farmer, did terrible things to the farmers themselves. It discouraged the people on the land; it drove the youth from the land. It is true that during the depression they had to go back home, but they only went home for food and shelter, and not to stay, and while it might not have been that particular group of youths which left the land, we have seen an unprecedented exodus from the land since the outbreak of this war. Many of the young, and some who are not so young, have left the farms to go into the armed forces, or into industry, any industry but agriculture. And those who would have stayed on, and would have been the key men in agriculture, were not permitted by the national authorities to stay and pursue the task for which they were best fitted, the task of producing food for Canada, and for other members of the United Nations.

Then, what were the effects on the countryside? Well, anybody who drives out in the early spring before the grass gets green and things get blooming, can see, even if they are pretty dense about it -- they can see what that long period of depression has done to the countryside. And again you see that period, where we got one-third, one-sixth, one-tenth, of the national income.

Then, too, we were dominated by the super-industrialism which wanted to get cheap food, and primarily, whether consciously or unconsciously, I don't know, -- but primarily they wanted cheap food in order that they could keep down the wage levels and keep up profit levels, and because we have gone through a long period of cheap food, food that was paid for out of the farmer's toil, that is, he himself never got recompensed for the cost of his production, and because of all that we have buildings going to pieces, and which were not repaired, which were shoddy, and

ccz

unpainted; we have a lot of what the hon. prime minister yesterday called "derelict farms". And the people could not afford electricity, even if it went by them, and even if before the war they would have been able because of the sufficient quantity of material and all that to have installed them.

But everything in the rural communities suffered -- everything, the culture, the idealism, the schools, the churches -- everything, and those who come from the country as I do -- although I am at the moment living in the city of Toronto I am essentially a country person -- we know that the rural schools are not modern, that they do not belong to the day of the automobile and the day of the aeroplane, that they are just what they were when we first remember them, and back even further than that, little one-roomed schools; it is not as though we lived in a scientific age at all, where modern pictures and radio play a part in visual education, where teachers are underpaid, sometimes untrained, for certainly they get no special training to teach in rural schools, and therefore they have no understanding of the problems of the families who send their children to that school; where schools are supposed to be something that is open between nine o'clock and four o'clock, and it is a sacrilegious thing, having them open after that; where our secondary schools have failed almost utterly to meet the problems of the rural people, to turn out men and women from the schools who are alive, aware, and alert as to how they can make life better in the rural communities, and how they can make agriculture a finer and a better industry, because these secondary schools were devised in the cities and for the cities, if that is any good -- which I doubt. Oh, you learn to read, and that is always an advantage, but it is entirely unrelated to the problem of the people who send their children to school and for that reason young men at the ages of seventeen and eighteen, who are going on the farm, will not go to school. As many of them have said to me, "it is not anything about what I want to know; it does not help me", and, therefore, they stopped school. It is quite understandable. I know why they stopped school, but it is a pitiful thing.

And, too, the teachers instead of staying a life time in

CCS

the community, and becoming a rock of stability and inspiration to that community, will move rapidly from school to school seeking better salaries in the towns and cities.

The same thing happens to churches. It is a known fact which I think no one will take the trouble to deny that most ministers in the country parishes and charges are woefully underpaid; that the clergy who are going to serve in the rural communities have no special training for their task, and they move amongst a people whose lives they do not understand, and whose problems they do not understand, and sometimes in the pulpit I have heard them deny that the farmers have any problems at all, at least indirectly, and sometimes directly, because they do not know about them -- they are over their heads.

I know that now some churches are trying to change that, trying to educate specially trained rural ministers so that they will know something about the problems that affect and inflict the people they are going to minister to.

And not only that -- and I do not mean this to be harsh, although it is hard to state a picture as terrible as this one without seeming harsh, but the political rights of agriculture have been bedevilled by the industrial magnates who tried, and succeeded very well indeed, to capture all the rural seats, and to use the incumbents of those seats to forward their own policies, and not to forward the rural policies. All this has had its effect upon the farmers. It has made them suspicious and cynical and bitter, and I do not wonder. They have been "let down" too often, and that they still have faith in democracy shows they are indeed the very backbone of the country.

Now, that is a black picture. But I do think there is improvement; I mean, I think I see a little dawn breaking, and I want to tell the Legislature, if I may, somethings which I think are encouraging.

I hope that many of the members of this house heard Lord Delamore, who spoke to the Canadian Club recently, and I think perhaps it was a good thing that he had that old sixteenth century pipe with him, or he perhaps would not have "got away" with it. But his talk was straight from the shoulder, and I think he told them some things that they ought to know, whether

6C4 they like it or not. Incidently I heard him in Quebec city as well as here, and he made a very, very excellent address. He said that in Great Britain they had been neglecting agriculture, but from this time on, and starting now, during the war, agriculture will be given the place there that its importance merited, and that from now on they were going to remember that agriculture is the most important industry in Britain. That was almost a surprise to me to hear that agriculture was the most important industry in Britain, because we think of Britain as a manufacturer's and trader's country primarily, however, that is the statement that he made.

And, another little bit of light I think I see in the horison is the new attitude about tariffs. I do not think tariffs are going to be very important in the world we are entering, but we have listened -- I as a very interested Canadian citizen, have listened for long years to debates on the tariff. We listened to the liberal party talk low tariffs, but it was just talk. The liberal talk only differs slightly from the conservative talk; the conservatives talked high tariffs, but really they were not much higher than the liberal tariffs, they moved them up, I think somewhere about three percent. The liberals talked low tariffs, they did not do anything about it, and the conservatives talked high tariffs, and did nothing about it, and I think Mr. Bennett did something for tariffs when he raised them sky high and ended the argument in their favor. After all, you have to end an argument some way, and that probably was as good as any.

I am taking a lot of fun out of this, and we are ~~are~~ listening to and reading about a speech by the new leader of the progressive conservatives which smacks, I think, wonderfully accurately of the old free trade speeches; certainly they are speeches which are quite similar to the speeches made by the united farmers, twenty-five years ago. It almost seems that life has some compensation. I do not know how the old Tories stand it, but since I am not one, I am not worrying about it.

Then the most encouraging thing I have seen recently is

the new attitude about food, which was exemplified by a conference of forty-four nations at Hot Springs, Virginia, at the end of last May or the beginning of June of last year. They came to the conclusion that food is a tremendously important thing. I think that anybody who has been hungry knows that. But they also think that we have to do something about it. I have here the report of the Hot Springs conference, which I am not going to read at any length, but they have a great many resolution, and so on, but in the main what they did say was, "Adequate food is now within the reach of all men in all lands, at least potentially", and so they want to set about making food available to all people in all lands, and the first step was the setting up of an organization, first interim, then to be a permanent organization, so that they can confer with each other, and they can carry out the recommendations to which the forty-four nations agreed.

Surely that is a change, and there is hope there, and they are going further this year, and in all probability in Canada there will be a gathering of farmers, not only of Canada, but of Canada, the British countries that are big food producers, and the United States of America. That is not the forty-four nations, but is the beginning of a plan to bring the farmers of the world together, especially the big ones who are going to do the exporting, to try and feed Europe and Asia in the next few years. Not to see how they can cut down acreage, but to see how they can speed up production to a point where they may have food available to all men everywhere. That is a pretty big program indeed, but I feel that they are going at it in a realistic way and I like that a lot better, and there is a little more hope in it. If this conference had been a meeting of the ministers of agriculture -- with all respect to our own minister; I think he would have been alright, but I am never so sure about the others -- they had gone at it in that way, it would not have been a hopeful conference as it is in this case where this is an organization of farmers, of people who have to deal with the thing technically as well as economically, and everybody who went to that conference came away tremendously enthused, and with a feeling that at last internationalism was

CC6 getting on a rational basis where you get the people who do the same kind of jobs from all over the world together to talk about how they were going to do the things they thought must be done.

Now then, we have made another discovery in this war. I think this is going to prove of great benefit in the years to come. but it is a revolutionary thing. We have learned we can give things away. They call it "lend-lease" or "lease-lend" or "mutual aid" or something. It would be too shocking to call it a "gift", and that could not stand up, so they think of some other way of saying it, but actually we have learned to give away vast quantities of food while paying for the food in the countries where it is produced in the currency of the realm. That is, the farmers that do the growing here are to be paid for the good of the nation, and then the nations will give it away to the people who have not got the food, and who need it, and have stomachs. I do not think anything more remarkable and more encouraging than that has come out of this war, so far as food is concerned, that is, that we have learned we can give food away.

I remember being out in Saskatchewan in the summer of 1940 when they had a very fine crop, and I saw farms in Southern Saskatchewan with so much wheat on them that they could not find places for it. They had all sorts of devices to try and get it into something, even making enclosures with wire and wheat sheaves. Then I went up, not two hundred miles north in Saskatchewan and was in homes -- talk about"derelict homes", I was in homes where there was no bedding on the beds, no sheets and pillow cases; they would not have known what they were, I think; at least, they did not have them, and where the housewives' most prized possession was a flour bag, and where the family was judged by how much flour was in the bag; if it was nearly full, they were on top of the world, if it was down to the last baking, they were sunk, and I thought then there must be something wrong with us, that we could not be intelligent, or we could have moved flour from South Saskatchewan up to Northern Saskatchewan; it was only about two hundred miles; you could have taken it up in a wagon, but nobody managed to get it donw, not even "Jimmie"Gardiner's machinery,

CCF

I think there was one other encouraging thing, and you will be amused at this, but I want you to be amused, if you feel like it. There is one other gleam -- and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I was immensely flattered that the member from Bellwood (Mr. MacLeod) remembered even a sentence of a speech I made twenty years ago -- that is really something. I quite remember my visit to Nova Scotia at the time.

But, Mr. Speaker, this new gleam, or additional gleam of hope is the raising of a part of the people into an organization, the name of which is "Co-operative Commonwealth Federation", a very awkward and cumbersome name, but that is it, and, of course, I know that Ontario thinks that the C.C.F. is simply a workers' party. Well, farmers are workers, and in the two bye-elections we won last year out west, the farmers were elected in both instances, and one of them was the president -- or was up until he resigned to become a candidate -- of the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture, which has some significance out there, and when the C.C.F. members met at Regina last christmas -- between christmas and new years -- sixty M.P.P.'s. of the Commonwealth Party from all over Canada, the largest occupational group was farmers, and I think that fact should not be allowed to pass, because that does mean that the farmers are using the C.C.F., they are freeing themselves from the domination of industrialization, which they are sick of, and from which they have suffered over a long period.

Now, the other day, when the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) our young and able leader, of whom we are proud, however the hon. prime minister may feel -- was speaking, he mentioned five important points in national policy which affect agriculture. I have no wish to repeat them, but I simply want to make a couple -- or two or three -- comments.

At the moment, the farmers of Canada are greatly interested in all this talk about "price floor", and Mr. King has said that he will institute or establish, or hammer in, -- or whatever you do -- price floors. But, knowing the prime minister of Canada, the farmers are wondering at what level he will put the floor in, because after all, that is the whole point. A floor, if

CCS it is at the bottom of the basement, will not be much good to the farmers. If it is over a height of five inches, he will run just as surely as if he was at the bottom of the ocean. So they want to know where is the floor going. And this party takes the stand and has always taken the stand, that the price floor should take into account all factors of the cost of production, and "all" includes the farmers wages, and the farmers' wives wages, in as much as she contributes to production, and the wages of such other members of the family who work full time or part time in the production, and there will have to be care taken about that, because a floor in the wrong place will just not be any help at all.

A great change has taken place in the thinking of the farmers of Canada in relation to such things as planned production.

I will never forget, however long I may live -- and I do not expect to live as long as Sir William Mulock, but even if I did, I think I would still remember the debate in the House of Commons when putting through the marketing act. The group I always sat with in the House of Commons always voted on the merit of a question as it arose, which made us vote sometimes with the liberals and sometimes with the conservatives. In this instance we were very much behind Mr. Bennett, because he was introducing the Marketing Act of Canada, which, if you remember, did get through the house at that time, but was lost in the course afterwards, and we will have to get it again.

I remember that the liberal party staged a debate of one month duration against the Marketing Act, and it was all on the point that under the Marketing Act the liberties of the farmer would be interferred with. They were out for private enterprise with a vengeance. If there is any point the government wants to know, just contact the liberal party in Ottawa; they know all the answers.

At that time farmers were not clear on this point. They did not quite know what "planned production" meant. They were not sure of the Marketing Act, and the export trade and the import trade; it all seemed to look hazy and a little risky, and farmers are not risky fellows; they want to be awfully sure

before they move. But there has been a great change in that regard, and today farmers have come to two or three conclusions, and one of them is that they do not intend to put up with the domestic prices in Canada based upon the Canadian prices for the small exportable surplus.

As Mr. J.A. Marrion, the president of the Catholic Farm League in Quebec, and also a director of the Co-operative Federation, and one of the leading farmers in Quebec, puts it, -- he says:

"Why should the spoonful of butter we export set the price of the tubful we eat at home".

That is exactly the question the farmers are asking themselves everywhere, and there are a great many groups of farmers now meeting in their sitting rooms and kitchens talking about this thing, and they know one thing -- and this is, I think, as concisely as I can put it -- they want a national marketing act; they want the export and import trade, and they want neutritional standards of eating in Canada to be as high as possible. They want to have the best arrangements made for exchanging goods between us and other countries of the world, and if we accomplish that then they believe they must only produce such goods as they know are going to be sold. They are no longer willing to go out into hit-and-miss production program; They are tired of that. Mr. T.C. Douglas, M.P., said here in Toronto the other night, in a very able speech, "Under that method the only thing you can be sure of is that if you have hogs you will have no price, and if you get a price, there will be no hogs".

So the farmers today say they want a planned production, planned by themselves, not by anybody else, and they want under the Marketing Act an organization of commodity groups -- they want to see that the domestic price is based on the cost of production. They know you must take the world price for what you sell on the world's market, but they want to be so thoroughly organized that they can add a small levy, put upon the goods when they are put on the market, so that they can build up a fund -- they have a name for the fund --

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Stabilization Fund.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: Yes, that is right, "Stabilization Fund", and then out of the Stabilization Fund, the world price

CC10 can be brought up to the domestic price in such cases as it falls below it.

I remember when I was in Sweden in the late summer of 1936, and they were explaining to me their agricultural policies there, that is just what they were doing. They were not allowing farmer's prices to fall to disastrous levels, as they did in Canada. As a matter of fact, they never had a depression and may I most respectively point out to the government that they had a social democratic government, and so had Denmark, and so had Finland.

There is nothing to worry about a social democratic government. I do not like to see people worrying. It is bad for their health, so I want to comfort them by telling them that the best governments in the world were in the Scandinavian countries, and a determining factor was the organization of the people into farm unions, in trade unions, and co-operative movements, and a social democratic party, so people ought to get over this great scare they have had.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken a little longer than I should on the things we cannot help. The Ontario government can recommend that they think these things should be done, but they are outside the jurisdiction of the province, and there is nothing we can really do in this house about them.

Now, I want to devote the remainder of my time to what we can do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the minister of agriculture (hon. Mr. Kennedy) is aware, one of the problems confronting the farmers now is the great spread there is between the prices the farmer gets, and the prices the consumer pays. Everybody is aware of that. People ask, "Why is it?" And they think if the farmer gets what they are paying, that the farmers are rolling in wealth, and if they get the opportunity to think of it and think that the farmer does not get it, they say "Who does get it? Why does the bacon become so expensive before it gets to the people?", and you begin to wonder about these steaks -- these dollar and seventy-five cent steaks that they are eating down town, and they wonder what part of the beef that grows on,

And the same thing with tomatoes, they wonder about them.

Mcll

when they can hardly sell them because of the very low prices, and they wonder how much they cost out of the cans. I know the government is aware of the spread, and is uneasy about it. And they have started out in what they term a wholly disinterested but ineffective way, and that is by socializing the stockyards. Well, I am glad they are converted to socialism. Somehow in the hands of the conservative government I think it is perfectly safe, and I am not worried. I think they have also put it on a patriotic grounds, because they seem to have a corner on the patriotism, as well as a great many other things.

I want to show you some very interesting figures, to show that that thing need not have been done at all. All they had to do to get the stockyards -- now, just wait; just you wait. They were coming to whoever wanted to pick them up for a song. Here is what has been happening. Here is the trend, and a very clear trend. I have a great many figures on that, but I will only give you three years, because it illustrates it quite as well, and it will not bore you quite so much.

If you take Swifts and the Canada Packers -- and when you have taken them, you have practically taken the stockyards -- in 1933, there were some 67,000 head of cattle brought to the market, and some 15,000 went direct to the packing plant or, putting it in another way, 18.2 percent of the total went to the packing plant.

In 1937 there was purchased by Swifts, 58,200 head of cattle in the yards, and 21,900 went directly to the plant, or 27.4 percent. You see, it comes up from 18 percent to 27.4 percent.

In 1943, Swifts purchased 45,000 head in the stockyards, and 22,000 went direct to the plant, or 33 percent of the total.

In Canada Packers, in 1933 they purchased 103,300 head in the yards, and 52,300 went direct to the plant, or 33 percent.

By 1937, the Canada Packers was up. They had gone up to 38.3 percent, going directly to the plant.

In 1943, for the Canada Packers, 48.5 percent went to the plant direct, so I think anybody who is familiar at all with the livestock market or with hogs, knows they no longer go through the yards, that is unless you count the 15 carloads that came

CC12 down from Winnipeg last year, and they did not know what to do with them, so they let them die on the way down, many of them were dead when they got here.

So the stockyards are a declining factor in this whole situation. There is no use going on, and making the minister of agriculture feel worse than he undoubtedly must now, but it was a case of waiting, biding our time. So I have come to the conclusion that the government must be killing two birds with one stone, letting the shareholders out of a hole and seeming to please the farmer in the good old traditional manner.

I am informed that the stockyards used to be owned by Swifts, but legislation was passed in the United States which made it imperative that all big packing firms had to get rid of their shares in the stockyards, so they sold them to another company, whether to a holding company of themselves, or something really outside, I have no way of knowing.

I am told also that their return on the investment for the last year, for which figures are available, was four percent, and they have substantial reserves which are well invested in bonds, and so on.

Now, I want to say that I do not like to give the hon. ministers advice. He knows much more about this than I do -- about these things, but I want to say to him that if he really wants to lessen this spread, just carry this socialization a little further, and socialize the packing plants. They are the fellows with the "dough".

Mr. Coldwell was in this town a few weeks ago -- and in case any of you do not know who Mr. Coldwell is, he is a national leader of the Co-operation Commonwealth Federation, and a most estimable gentleman, even though the Globe and Mail does say "The wicked men like Coldwell". Well, he is less like a wicked man than any man I know of. But I would be the last to deprive the Globe and Mail of any comfort it gets, because it certainly works hard at the job.

Now, Mr. McLean is a very charming gentleman and host -- Mr. J.S. McLean, president of the Canada Packers, and he denied that they made 41 percent on their common stock on each year,

0013 which was the statement Mr. Coldwell had made, that the Canada Packers Limited had paid dividends on its common stock of more than 41 percent. Mr. McLean denied it. He claimed that the dividends were equivalent to less than 5 percent of the stockholders' equity. Well, Mr. McLean reached this conclusion by including the capital assets, which have increased by more than one-third -- about seventeen million dollars -- since the outbreak of war, and all reserves. The fact is, of course, that the capital assets and reserves represent profit made out of the funds. And, of course, I do not wonder that Mr. McLean cannot read his own balance sheets; they are a difficult thing to understand.

But that represents in profit -- and these are for the years 1938, 1939, and 1940 -- $5.50, $8.34, and $8.06 per share of stock originally valued at $7.19. They are doing not badly. But even in the worst of the depression, when the farmer's profits were nil and away below that -- if you can go down below "nil" -- the Canada Packers still made a great profit, and anybody familiar with the old Royal Commission on Price Spreads would find on page ~~55~~ 56 of that report, that in the year 1933, out of the consumer's dollar the farmer received 5.4 cents less than he had received out of the consumer's dollar in 1929, but that the Canada Packers received 5.4 more out of the consumer's dollars than they had in 1929.

I remember there was a terrific row about it at the time, because it did seem a bit thick that when agriculture had hardly enough to stay on the farms -- many losing their farms and all they owned -- that even in that period the profits of Canada Packers went up all the time and the farmer's profits went down. So the crux of the spread between hogs and bacon, is the packer's profit. I noticed the minister of agriculture says that the government is not going to handle the stockyards. They are going to hand it over to the farmers. I wish he would pursue the same policy with regard to the packing houses. It is not only in the making of bacon that Canada Packers is becoming an affliction

to the farmers, but they are now invading many other fields, amongst them are the fertilizer field, by-products, the feed field, also by-products, the tanneries, and so forth. I do not know whether they are also going into the "and so forth" or not as yet, but at least wherever the farmer turns he comes up whack against the packing plant, and Boy, is he sore. If you want to get the farmer really amused, tell the funny stories you know about the packers. You do not need to do anything else. So, if the minister really wants to serve agriculture, the place to do it is to socialize the packing plants.

If we had organizations in agriculture to the extent here they had in Denmark before the Germans overran it, the farmers themselves could quite easily and simply take over the whole packing business, but we are not developed to that extent. I wonder if it would be possible, to do that very thing, under the very splendid legislation Ontario has called, I think, "The Farm Production Control Act". A similar federal act was called "National Farm Products Market Act" -- would it not be possible to organize all hog producers, for instance, in the province, into a marketing scheme, where it could be carried on a little more than just what is required by the legislation. Then the hog farmers could, through their executive, negotiate with the packers and get some sort of a reasonable deal with them, just as the milk producers now negotiate with the milk processers, to arrive at what they think is a reasonable spread. I do not see why it could not be done. I think we are now at a place where it could be done under the legislation which we now have, and then if the government is serious in trying to help agriculture, it would only be another step to assist agriculture and assist the hog producers to become the owners, if not the masters, like Canada Packers, Swifts, and a number of small judiciously situated packing plants in this province. That is a thing which probably would be more agreeable to the present government.

It probably would come to the same thing, where you would be nosing out the big fellows, but that is what we have to do.

It is not that I have any feeling against the Canada

Packers. I happen to like J.S. McLean. I don't know why. But it is the same with everything else, like tomatoes, and plums and pears, and all that kind of thing. The minister will be able to tell the house how many agreements are in operation under that Act, but they only give control to the farmers over that portion of their crop that is processed, and has nothing to do with the fruit of it, that what is sold by the bushel, and by the peck, which is a very large part of the crop. I do not know what the proportion is.

But, again, I cannot see why we are not just at the place where the farmer with a sympathetic governmental encouragement, cannot become their own processers.

Now, the whole co-operative idea is growing. Henry Wallace, one of the bright minds of this continent, says: "Co-operation is the greatest idea of this generation". Well, that is a big statement, but it is a great idea, and it is the idea of the people getting control over their own economic lives, and it is growing, and one of the things that helps it is such adult educational groups as "Farm Forums". I think the Farm Forums have done three significant things; one is they have taught people the beauty and philosophy of co-operation, because it is the philosophy of life and brotherhood, which leads to efficiency.

The second thing that the Farm Forums have taught is to make country people aware of what they could do to help themselves in the line of providing health facilities and educational opportunities. They now have communities, where these three things are looked into, and they have been meeting and studying and discussing, and sending back their conclusions to their national office, which is down here on King Street, and there have been some quite interesting reflections of interest focust upon Federal Cabinet ministers, and I venture to say that the same will be true provincially.

For instance, the health committee of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture has already been to see the minister of Health, Dr. Vivian, and has presented what they want. Now, what they want is all of these things, the co-operation and health and education. The farmers are unanimous in that, and what I mean is if you think

CC 16 now you can go out and change their minds, you are a bit late. They have been thinking alike, and they have allwanted that for so long, that I very respectfully suggest to the minister of health (Mr. Vivian) that he think of this when they come again to present their claim, as I assure him they will. They want enabling legislation by this province to enable a municipality to provide through taxation for health services after a plebicite has been taken in the municipality.

But I am not quoting that part of it, because it would be just repetition. But I have here a report from the "Rural Co-operator" of December 14th, in which they state, to the minister of health, :

> "We are here to-day to ask for legislation enabling rural people to establish, after taking a plebicite, for municipal health services under the general direction and supervision of the department of health.
>
> We know the Federal Government is considering a national health insurance programe and we consider that, as proposed in the brief of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, a municipal health scheme should be incorporated in the national scheme. We feel that the establishment now of municipal health services by enabling legislation in Ontario will further this development, and will fit into a national scheme.
>
> We think there is no question whatever of the need nor of the urgency of immediate action.
>
> We also feel that partial measures will not meet the situation. We must take thorough going action and for rural communities we are convinced that the only adequate action is the establishment of municipal health services."

That is quite emphatic, and that is the way they talk, in whatever county or township you go. ~~This~~ Said they did not like their

interview with the hon. Minister of health, (Mr. Vivian) one of their further issues, dated February 15th has this to say on the same subject:

> "The request for municipal doctor legislation in this province is becoming an old story. Many Ontario farm people want the right to organize self services for themselves, as has been done by many farm municipalities on the prairies. Merely appointing a few more inspectors to chase around telling the people what is wrong with them will not suffice. If the Ontario Department of Health proves half as responsive to the will of the people as the Ontario Department of Agriculture appears to be, shall have municipal doctor legislation at the coming session".

I think that is a very interesting thing to note that the favourite minister of this Government in the minds of all the farmers in Ontario, is the hon. minister of agriculture. (Mr. Kennedy). That is pretty nearly an ideal situation.

Now, I have to be through in fifteen minutes, but I think I can do it. I will try hard anyway. I do not want to take up time now to talk about rural education, but I hope to have an opportunity a little later to do so, but I certainly will want to talk about it very much indeed, but to summarize it, may I say that I do not think the O.A.C., and the Kempville Schools should have been taken away, considering the purpose for which they were established, certainly not while we have four or five art colleges in this province. After all, we did not have many colleges, and I do not see why we should have had to give both of ours up, in that great splurge of patriotism, with three or four art colleges going on undisturbed. I think a lot of sorority houses could have been taken for this purpose, without anybody being too much upset. I was very happy to hear in the speech from the Throne that the Kempville School will be back with us before the 1st of May, and I hope it will not be long before the O.A.C. is restored to the job of educating people

in rural Ontario.

And may I say just one thing more -- we never seem to be quite satisfied with what comes from the speech from the Throne, but I suppose that is to be expected. But we want the O.A.C. and the Kemptville Schools to be taken out of and away from the Department of Agriculture.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY: That is quite all right with me.

MISS MACPHAIL: I knew he was of the kind of a man I thought he was. However, I do not want to see these schools made a political football from administration to administration, and they have been before. I want to see them put in the position where educational institutions should be, and I would like to see one half of the Governors chosen by the organized farmers of Ontario and the other half split between them, the Government and the alumni of the schools.

(Page 247 follows)

Then, I think we would be in a place where we could begin to have extension services, and adult education through farmer colleges, training vast numbers of rural youths. After all, that is what the Ontario agriculture college and Kempville is intended to do. But, after all, the O.A.C. has very well slipped off the beam. It does not do much of that. Most of the people who go to the O.A.C. now are helping such as our friends as I have been enumerating to-day, the matters, and more effectively "skinning" the farmers. That is what the graduates of the O.A.C. work the hardest at. They do not farm. It is true, the agricultural representatives do a good job, but the agricultural representatives are overworked, their offices are understaffed, one man trying to go over a big county and trying to help everybody solve their agricultural problems. Just think of that. It is fantastic. There should be a staff to do that work.

There are two other subjects I wished to deal with, but I am not sure I can do them both in the time which is left to me so I will eliminate one of them, and I may have a chance to get at the other later on.

But one thing I do want, is a commission to preserve the unity of the farmer's family, that is, to give the farmer's family, as such, a better standing, and make of them an important social unit. I have no sentimental attachment to that particular side of the farm, but my attachment is deep and real to the farm family, because the farm family is a very special thing. The children in the farm family from their earliest years are self-reliant, they are aware of the bond between work and reward. If they are going to have skates, they know how to get them. They know they must take care of the poultry, or milk the cows, or dig the potatoes, or do some real bit of work that will enable them to do this thing which is very precious to their young hearts. And they belong to a group, the greatest group in the history of all people, the family group, and they have that feeling of being a part of that enterprise. Teachers and principals of the city schools, technical and otherwise, many of them have said to me,

"Their greatest problem is trying to develop in the growing youth a sense of responsibility and feeling that they have something to do with the home or business where the living is earned, or the country or the community".

That is not a difficult thing in a farm family. For that reason I want the farm family to be preserved, and if it is going to be, something is going to have to be done because we are living in an age of power machinery, and the small farmer cannot afford the machinery which is necessary for efficient production.

But I do think that this is a point at which the Ontario Government can do much. I mean, I have not time to quote now as I intended to do, but it can be established by an authority in a Canadian department of agriculture, by a man called, "Tabflesh", or some such awful name — that machinery is most economical when it is used up to a thousand hours per year, and it is not economical at all if it used less than two hundred hours, nor even two hundred hours, but the cost drops steadily from whatever medium you start with up to one thousand hours per year.

Now then, how is the small farmer, the one hundred acre farmer, in Ontario — which is the average size — how is he to get the benefit of power machinery and yet not have to carry a tremendous overhead in this expensive machinery, which a farmer cannot afford to carry? How? Well, there are two or three ways. One is they can organize a machinery cooperative up and down a concession, maybe taking in a thousand acres or more, and they can operate under bylaws and a provincial charter, and they can buy, if they have the money, a full line of power machinery. I think in that case the Government would be well advised to encourage them to do this sort of thing by making loans available. I know in Nova Scotia the Department of Agriculture has what they call a "tractor and equipment purchase assistance policy", which sets out to do that very thing, to help recognized organizations of farmers to buy power machinery to carry on their work more efficiently. But the farmer can do it, if they have the money, for themselves, but

this little pamphlet put out by the Farm Forum called, "Plan to reach the family farm" gives four instances, one in New Brunswick, two in Manitoba and one in Ontario, where the farmers have organized themselves, and have now either paid for or borrowed the money to purchase the machines in order that they might make small units into a more efficient operating group.

There is one other thing which I think can be done. I saw it done in two widely scattered parts of the world. That was, that the Government itself set up machinery stations in convenient places, and made high powered machinery available to the farmers at a nominal rental. I saw that in Abitibi County, where they have done everything possible by way of colonization, and there they have made these bull dozers, and other heavy machinery available at the rent which was enough to pay for the machinery, over a determined period of years, and also for a man to operate it. Because everybody says that the thing to watch is having a good mechanic on the machine, and keeping him on the machine, and not just letting everybody who rents the machine and works it, operate it, that is, not to let everyone who rents the machine operate it, but to have one man to care for it at all times.

The other place I saw it was a few years ago, I went to a place — I think it is safe to say it now, about fifty miles south of Moscow, and saw there a very large machinery station, and they were carrying on all through the country side, where the farmers could come and rent them.

Now, in conclusion — and I am really going to make it — I feel that no policy for agriculture will be complete that did not give attention to social and living conditions. I am very interested in farm women. I do not know any women who do a finer job in life. They raise far more than their share of the Canadian population, and they see them leave and go to the city. They struggle to get their children educated, to start them off into life with a good standard of behaviour, with integrity and principle, and they work very hard, and so I want to see those women thought of when we are forming a provincial policy.

I want to see the farm home become the kind of a thing I would like it to be, and for them to have electricity, electric washing machi es, to have water on tap in the kitchen, to have bath-rooms, to have refrigeratorz, and have a little leisure, and something to read. That is revolutionary -- all of it. But I want to see all that, and this could easily be done in post war time, in the rural communities where the youth centers of the community are not really what they should be. We should have a rural community center built around an agricultural vocational school, an agricultural high school, where they can get education, and I want to get the matriculation in agriculture in our highschools.

I want to see a community center where there will be sports, programes, tennis, a school, rooms for drama and for singing. Why not? If we go on at this rate we are not going to be able to populate our Ontario farms with our own Ontario people. We are losing out rather rapidly, and so I feel that the building of an ideal community centorwith all of the facilities for a joyous and happy life for many people, where they may be able to meet their fellows in their own community, rather than have to get in a car and drive for fifty miles, to go to a show about life which is entirely foreign to their own, and I feel sure that such community centers would be a good national and provincial investment. It is not a wild idea. It is an idea that will help us to be a better people, because I am sure that when our native sons go off the farm, that is the day of disaster in this country.

And so, if we have to spend a lot of money and do a lot of thinking in order to solve this problem in so far as we can, then I want to see it done, because I have faith enough in the members of this Legislature to feel that every member wants these things done. There may be obstacles which they think are too great and it cannot be done, but at least if we want it done, surely together we might travel a very long way toward making rural life the lovely thing

it could be.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: (St. Patrick) Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Roberts moves the adjournment of the debate. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. HARRY C. NIXON: Would the hon. prime minister tell us whether the debate will be continued to-morrow?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) We have certain bills we want to take up to-morrow, and then will proceed with the debate on the Throne speech, and then proceed to-morrow evening. I am sure everybody would like to see us bring the Throne debate to a conclusion reasonably soon.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Shall we be continuing with this debate both in the afternoon and in the evening?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Yes, but it will be sometime before we start in the afternoon, because we have a number of bills ready for committee, and we may not get started on the debate before four o'clock or half past.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the House adjourns. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned until 3:00 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

The House rose at six o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Thursday, March 2, 1944.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
MAR 3 - 1944
RECEIVED

- - - - - - - - -

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reports by committee.

MR A. J. STEWART: (Kingston) Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a second and final report of the select committee appointed to strike the standing committees ordered by this House, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Stewart (Kingston) begs leave to present the following as the second and final report.

The committee recommends that the standing committees of the House as listed hereunder be composed as follows:

"COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Anderson, Arnott, Blackwell, Brown, Casselman, Connor, Cook, Dennison, Dent, Docker, Downie, Duckworth, Duff, Frost, Gordon, Hanna, Hepburn, (Elgin), Hunt, Johnston, Jolliffe, Kelly, Kennedy, Laurier, Leavens, Luckock, MacLeod, Macphail, Millard, Murdoch, Murphy, McEwing, McIntyre, McPhee, Oliver, Patrick, Pringle, Roberts, Robertson, Robinson, (Waterloo South), Robson, Scott, Steel, Stewart, (Kingston), Strange, Webster -- 46

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs, Begin, Belanger, Brown, Carlin,

Casselman, Downie, Duff, Dunbar, Frost, Goodfellow, Hancock, Johnston, Jolliffe, Kehoe, Kelly, Luckock, MacLeod, Macphail, Miller, Murdoch, Murphy, McDonald, McPhee, Nixon, Overall, Patrick, Porter, Pringle, Riggs, Roberts, Robinson, (Port Arthur), Robinson, (Waterloo South), Robson, Strange, Taylor, (Huron), Vivian, Warren, Webster, Williams — 40

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS.

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Acres, Anderson, Arnott, Begin, Bennett, Blackwell, Brown, Carlin, Challies, Connor, Cook, Daley, Dennison, Dickson, Docker, Doucett, Duckworth, Dunbar, Frost, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hancock, Hanna, Harvey, Hepburn, (Prince Edward-Lennox). Hepburn, (Elgin), Hunt, Jolliffe, Kelly, Kennedy, Leavens, Lockhart, Luckock, MacLeod, Macphail, Miller, Mitchell, Murdoch, Murphy, Murray, McDonald, McEwing, McIntyre, McPhee, Nixon, Oliver, Overall, Patrick, Patterson, Porter, Pringle, Reynolds, Roberts, Robinson, (Port Arthur), Robson, Scott, Smith, Steel, Stewart, (Kingston), Strange, Taylor, (Temiskaming), Taylor, (Huron), Thompson, Thornberry, Vivian, Webster, Williams, Wismer - 70

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Acres, Alles, Anderson, Arnott, Begin, Belanger, Bennett, Blackwell, Brown, Casselman, Challies, Connor, Daley, Dennison, Dent, Dickson, Doucett, Downie, Duckworth, Dunbar, Frost, Goodfellow, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hepburn, (Prince Edward-Lennox), Hepburn, (Elgin) Hunt, Johnston, Jolliffe, Kehoe, Kelly, Kennedy, Leavens, Lockhart, Luckock, MacGillivrary, MacLeod, Millard, Miller, Mitchell, Murdoch, Murphy, McIntyre, McPhee, Nixon, Oliver, Overall, Patrick, Patterson, Porter, Pringle, Reynolds, Riggs, Roberts, Robinson, (Port Arthur), Robinson, (Waterloo South), Smith, Stewart, (Kingston), Strange, Taylor, (Temiskaming), Taylor, (Huron), Thompson, Thornberry, Vivian, Warren, Webster, Williams, Wismer - 70

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Alles, Anderson, Arnott, Begin,

Casselman, Challies, Dennison, Dent, Dickson, Docker, Duff, Dunbar, Goodfellow, Hanna, Hunt, Kelly, Kennedy, Laurier, Leavens, Luckock, Millard, Murphy, McIntyre, Pringle, Riggs, Roberts, Robertson, Salsberg, Taylor (Temiskaming) - 30.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of five Members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Anderson, Arnott, Begin, Bennett, Blackwell, Brown, Carlin, Challies, Daley, Dennison, Dent, Docker, Doucett, Duckworth, Dunbar, Frost, Goodfellow, Gordon, Grummett, Hancock, Hanna, Harvey, Hepburn (Elgin), Hunt, Johnston, Jolliffe, Kehoe, Kelly, Kennedy, Laurier, Leavens, Lockhart, MacGillivray, Mitchell, Murdoch, Murphy, Murray, McDonald, McEwing, McPhee, Nixon, Patrick, Patterson, Porter, Reynolds, Riggs, Roberts, Robinson (Port Arthur), Robinson (Waterloo South), Salsberg, Smith, Steel, Stewart (Kingston) Strange, Taylor (Temiskaming), Thompson, Thornberry, Vivian, Williams - 60.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Arnott, Belanger, Blackwell, Brown, Dennison, Docker, Frost, Grummett, Hancock, Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox), Jolliffe, Kehoe, Kelly, Laurier, MacLeod, Murdoch, McDonald, Nixon, Patrick, Porter, Reynolds, Roberts, Robinson (Waterloo South) Scott, Stewart (Kingston) Taylor (Temiskaming), Taylor (Huron), Warren, Wismer - 30.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of five Members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Acres, Anderson, Belanger, Brown, Carlin, Casselman, Challies, Cook, Dennison,

Dent, Dickson, Doucett, Downie, Duff, Goodfellow, Hall, Hancock, Hanna, Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox) Hepburn (Elgin), Hunt, Johnston, Jolliffe, Kelly, Kennedy, Leavens, Lockhart, Luckock, Macphail, Mitchell, Murdoch, Murphy, Murray, McDonald, McEwing, McIntyre, Nixon, Oliver, Overall, Patrick, Pringle, Reynolds, Robinson (Waterloo South), Robson, Salsberg, Scott, Smith, Steel, Strange, Taylor (Temiskaming), Taylor (Huron), Thompson, Warren, Webster - 55

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Acres, Alles, Bennett, Brown, Carlin, Casselman, Challies, Cook, Dent, Dickson, Docker, Doucett, Dunbar, Goodfellow, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hancock, Hanna, Harvey, Hepburn, (Prince Edward-Lennox), Hepburn, (Elgin), Hunt, Johnston, Kehoe, Kelly, Lockhart, Luckock, MacGillivray, Millard, Miller, Mitchell, Murdock, Murray, McDonald, McIntyre, McPhee, Nixon, Oliver, Overall, Patrick, Patterson, Porter, Pringle, Reynolds, Riggs, Robinson, (Port Arthur), Robson, Salsberg, Scott, Smith, Stewart, (Kingston), Strange, Taylor, (Temiskaming) Taylor, (Huron), Thompson, Warren, Webster, Wismer - 60

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

The Honourable Mr. Drew, Messrs. Alles, Arnott, Belanger, Blackwell, Carlin, Challies, Connor, Cook, Daley, Duckworth, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Harvey, Hepburn (Prince Edward-Lennox), Hepburn, (Elgin), Jolliffe, Kelly, Leavens, MacGillivray, Millard, Murdoch, Murphy, Murray, McPhee, Nixon, Porter, Reynolds, Riggs, Roberts, Robertson, Robinson, (Port Arthur), Salsberg, Scott, Steel, Strange, Taylor, (Huron), Thompson, Williams - 40

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven Members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the report be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presentation of Bills.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded Mr. Jolliffe that leave be given to introduce a Bill entitled (An Act to amend the Mothers' Allowance Act", and that the same be now read the first time.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Will the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) please explain.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT: The purpose of the proposed sub-section, which differs from the present one -- and perhaps I had better say that the one in this clause "B" provides at present that a person other than the mother of a child can qualify for allowance under the Mothers' Allowance Act only if the child is an orphan, although the mother is able to qualify if she is the wife of a man who is permanently unemployable by reason of physical or mental disability, or the wife of a man who has deserted her and has not been heard of for at least three years, and she has not adequate means to care for the child.

The amendment would permit a person other than the mother to qualify for an allowance if the child's mother is deceased or confined to a public institution, where it was shown that if the mother was not deceased or not confined, she could qualify for an allowance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Grummett, this Bill effects the revenue of the province, and such a Bill can only be introduced by a minister of the government. I will have to rule your motion out of order.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest that the matter be taken into further consideration. I am not at the moment addressing myself to any argument regarding the scope or nature of the Bill; I am merely suggesting that it be reconsidered. Then I might have argued, but will not at the moment, that a Bill which is concerned primarily with eligibility and not directly at all with the revenue or with the expenditure of public funds, should be considered. I will say no more, except, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that it be taken into consideration, and

AA6 it may be that you, sir, would see fit to say more about it at some later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I can say at the moment is that this Bill is one which does involve the expenditure of money, consequently I cannot take it before the house. I would ask the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) if he will not withdraw his motion, and see if it cannot be handled another way.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT: Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day; I believe I should refer to a matter which is of concern to every member in this Legislature, and which appeared in the press yesterday and again today.

Announcement has been given of a draft Bill, prepared by the Department of Pensions and National Health, and as I have had a number of enquiries, and I am sure others have, with regard to this measure, I believe that I should place before the Legislature exactly what the situation is.

I will read the first paragraph from a Canadian Press despatch appearing in a newspaper this morning:

"New financial plan for health insurance. More generous to Provincial government; less costly to individuals of low incomes, but more costly to those earning moderate or higher incomes, was submitted to the Commons' Social Security Committee today by Pensions Minister Mackenzie".

Now, I might explain that this is exactly the sort of thing I was referring to in my request to the Prime Minister of Canada two months ago for a conference, at which the broad bases of approach to these problems could be established. I will not re-read the whole letter, but I will read simply the second paragraph of a letter which I have already read into the record, because it was on January 6th I wrote the Prime Minister of Canada for a Dominion-Provincial conference. The

AA7

second paragraph reads as follows:

"I need not say that we are most anxious to co-operate in every practical way which will assure effective post war planning and the prompt rehabilitation of the members of our armed forces. I believe it is extremely important, however, that where it will be necessary to obtain the agreement of the Provincial government in regard to joint occupation of fields of Legislation ordinarily under their exclusive jurisdiction, there should be a previous discussion so that any measures introduced will be on a basis agreed upon in advance.

At present there are agreements in regard to health and education awaiting adjustment between the Dominion and Provincial governments. I believe it is very difficult to deal with this or with any other similar agreement until we have reached some understanding in regard to the present and future constitutional relationship of the various governments."

I then requested that a conference should be called at the earliest possible date. I said we would be prepared to send representatives to the conference at such a time as would be convenient to the Prime Minister, and I did urge that a conference be held at the earliest possible date.

To that, as I have already indicated I received a reply dated January 15th stating that copies of my letter had been forwarded to each of the other provincial premiers with the enquiry as to whether they were prepared to attend such a conference, and yesterday I received a letter from the Clerk of the Privy Council stating that it was not now possible to fix a definite date for a conference. It was pointed out it had been hoped to hold it during the Easter recess of the Dominion Parliament, but that, because of other parliament sittings, the date could not now be fixed.

This presented a very real problem that I thought should be clearly before this Legislature. In the first place, the Bill that has been announced, and which no doubt conveys to the public the impression that it is a government measure, -- of the Dominion government -- has not yet, in fact, been presented to

AAB

the House of Commons at all. It has merely been referred to the Social Security Committee.

Now, I must point out that no one in this Legislature, and certainly least of all, the members of the government who must assume the first responsibility of dealing with these matters, is in a position to deal effectively by way of comment or otherwise when a Bill of this nature is merely in a state of suspended animation before a committee, and is not yet even established as a government measure. There would be nothing to make sure that this Bill might ever even be presented by the government and, therefore, it is impossible to make definite comments about the implications of this Bill, because we cannot tell whether or not it might come back in another entirely different form, if at all, from the Social Security Committee.

But what I do wish to point out is this; This government, under the British North America Act has certain responsibilities. There are certain fields of legislation in which this government -- and when I say "this government" I mean the government of Ontario from time to time -- must act, or no one acts at all.

We are not merely a subsidiary government of the Dominion Parliament. Under our constitution there is one field of legislation for us, one field of legislation for the Dominion Government, and there are certain overlapping fields as well. I have indicated on behalf of the government, and having regard to the addresses of the leaders of the different groups in this Legislature, it is evident that I spoke the thoughts of the Legislature as a whole, when I said we are prepared to co-operate in every way, but if there is to be effective co-operation in planning for the future, it must be cooperation, and it must be an approach to the problem which recognizes the duties and obligations of the prime minister as well as the duties and obligations of the Dominion government, and I think it is most unfortunate that Bills with such far-reaching consequences as this should be presented to the public as though they were in fact government measures when the fact is a mere flowing perhaps as a kite over to the Social Securities Committee, and at the time that this is made public there has been no consultation with the

prime minister, and particularly with the department of the Provincial government directly concerned with these matters, insofar as its present of insurance is concerned.

Some of the broader details with regard to health measures, and so on, have been discussed in earlier correspondence.

Now, I can only repeat that this government is not only ready but is anxious to co-operate in every way, and I repeat the statement I expressed in my letter to the prime minister that it is essential that we should meet to discuss the bases upon which our plans for the future will proceed, but in view of the fact that I have just been notified there is to be no immediate conference, I do wish to make this clear, that this government wishes to co-operate; this government has no desire to place any difficulties in the way of effective planning, but this government does intend to insist upon the constitutional rights of the province of Ontario, and this government does intend to insist that in matters that affect the affairs of both governments, there shall be a consultation before we recognize any obligation under any legislation which is prepared, and I can only, therefore, in closing these remarks, emphasize still more than I have before the need for an early conference so that this and all the other difficult subjects with which we must deal can be discussed, and a common bond found for their solution.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question of the hon. the prime minister, arising out of this matter, which he may or may not be able to answer today. I don't know.

But first, may I say that this, of course, is nothing new. The matter was raised during the last session of the Dominion Parliament, and it is not the first time that it has been presented as though it were approaching the Statute books, when it is, I suggest, still a very long way indeed from reaching the Statute books.

The question I wish to ask, however, is, can the hon. prime minister indicate whether, since the present government took office, there has been any representation made specifically with reference to this subject on behalf of the province of

Ontario and the Dominion in the light of the plans which the present administration may have for the extension of health services in Ontario?

I am asking, in other words, whether the administration has taken any initiative in presenting to the Dominion government the views of the Ontario government with respect to health services, and a possible scheme of health insurance, in which the province of Ontario would have a part?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I might say that health is only one of a great variety of subjects in which we have taken the initiative, and, in fact, in this matter we have requested information which we have not received, and there have been departmental communications, asking for just the sort of information that I am now indicating we should have had before this was made public.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions. In relation to these resolutions, I beg to inform the house that the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor having been notified of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends the consideration of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the speaker do now leave the chair and that the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Upon Mr. Drew's motion the speaker now left the chair and the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole (Mr. Roland Patterson, chairman)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution Number four, by Mr. Challies.

"Resolved;that where in a rural power district within the meaning of the power commission act, by reason of the maximum service charge having been reduced or removed, the revenue derived by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for

any class of service rendered by it in the rural power district is not sufficient to meet the necessary cost of the service as specified by the commission, the deficit shall be chargeable to and payable out of the consolidated revenue funds".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Can we have a little information on it from the hon. minister first, Mr. Chairman?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Imight explain, prior to that, while it is quite proper to ask for it now if it is desired, this is the formal resolution which permits the introduction ofthe Bill itself for the second reading, and discussion could very well take place on the second reading of the Bill, or hear, whichever is preferred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution Number five by Mr. Doucett:

"Resolved that subsidies as provided by the Highway Improvement Act for Township Roads shall be paybale in respect of expenditures made in a township under the provision of Bill Number 37, 'The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944' ".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): The same applies here. The resolution, of course, can have no effect if the Bill is not adopted. It is purely an enabling resolution.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: That is quite alright, Mr. Chairman, except to this extent, and perhaps I might make the point now because I do not want it thought that it is directed against any particular resolution. On second reading I suggest the minister responsible should give some explanation and some advocacy for the Bill without being called upon to do so. If it is worth being introduced, it is worth two minutes of his time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): I move the committee rise and report.

The speaker resumed the chair.

MR. ROLAND PATTERSON: (chairman of the house in committee) The committee of the whole house, Mr. Speaker, makes to rise and report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson moves the committee rise and report. Shall the report carry? (Motion agreed to).

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I move that the house now go into a committee of the whole to discuss certain Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the speaker do now leave the chair and the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole to discuss certain Bills. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker now leaves the chair and the house resolves itself into a committee of the whole (Mr. Roland Patterson, chairman).

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Order number two,

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order; second reading of Bill number 30, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act", Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 30, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act". Shall section one form part of the Bill?

4 HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the house will recall that the leader of the opposition expressed the opinion that the expression "barristers and solicitors" wherever they appeared in this Bill, would be improved by deleting the word "and" between "barrister" and "solicitor", and substituting therefor the word "or".

At that time I expressed the view that the present draftsmanship, which was the draftsmanship of the Law Society and not of the Legislative Council, was quite adequate. I understand the leader of the opposition has taken the matter up with the president of the Law Society, who has expressed his indifference as to which expression could be used in the Bill, "barrister and solicitor" or "barrister or solicitor", and that being the case, and not wishing to be dogmatic, and in view of that expression of indifference on the part of those who wish the Bill, I am quite prepared to entertain a motion

AA13 for an amendment to that extent, by the leader of the opposition,

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did prepare an amendment which I showed to the hon. the Attorney General the other day, but which I am afraid I did not recover from him.

I might say that the treasurer of the Law Society did not express exactly "indifference" about the matter - that was the word that was used - nor was that the used expression. However, I appreciate the hon. the Attorney General's willingness to entertain or accept an amendment, and I would ask one of my colleagues to move the amendment which was prepared.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Joliffe that the Bill be amended by substituting for section one of the Bill the following clause:

"1. Section 50 of the Law Society Act is amended by striking out the words 'the widows and orphans of barristers and solicitors' in the second line, and inserting in lieu thereof the following, 'barristers or solicitors, their widows, orphans or dependents', and by striking out the words 'widows and orphans' in the sixth and seventh lines, and inserting in lieu thereof, the words, 'barristers or solicitors, their widows, orphans or dependents', so that the said section shall now read as follows:

'The Benchers may establish a fund for the benefit of barristers or solicitors, their widows, orphans or dependents, to be called 'The Law Benevolent Fund', and shall make all necessary rules and regulations for the management and investment of such fund, and the terms of subscription and appropriation thereof, and the conditions under which such barristers or solicitors, their widows, orphans or dependents, shall be entitled to share in such fund."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment be adopted?

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall section one, as amended, form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall section two form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the bill as amended be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Order number three

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order; the house in committee. on Bill number 25, "The Wartime Housing Act", Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: Bill 25, "The Wartime Housing Act". This is a Bill which makes it possible for the municipalities to enter into agreement with the Wartime Housing at a fixed amount, for two rooms, $24.00, and $30.00 for three.

This is an agreement which was arrived at when the municipalities met the Wartime Housing representatives in my office. This agreement is something which will make it possible for the municipalities now to collect the arrears outstanding since 1940, when the houses were first built, and municipalities have not been in a position to legally collect anything, in lieu of taxes.

MR. WILLIAM C. RIGGS: Mr. Chairman, is this what the municipalities are agreed upon, by this legislation? Is that my understanding? Are they all agreed upon that?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: Everyone who appeared before us was agreed upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section one form part of the Bill?

MR. OLIVER: Had any municipality entered into any agreement prior to the Bill?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: No.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: And no taxes collected at all in any instance?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: I understand that some have, but it was not legal. Wartime housing did in some municipalities make advances to the municipalities, and this is to do it in a legal way.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): What was the legal provision, and why were they not collecting?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: You cannot assess Dominion government property and, therefore, the Wartime Housing felt it was not fair for these houses to be erected in these municipalities without paying something to the municipalities. Now, some people might think that this is a small amount, $24.00 and $30.00. That is the minimum, and in cases where Wartime

Housing constructed sewers, water mains, sidewalks, built roads, put in lighting, and paid one dollar for street lighting, -- one dollar per month -- and built in some municipalities schools -- after all, when you come to think of it, it is a very very fair agreement, I would consider, that is, for the minimum. Some municipalities will be compelled to approach the Wartime Housing and get a better deal, because they did not have schools constructed in their municipalities, or did not have the sewer systems installed or the sidewalks constructed, and, therefore, they are entitled to make a better agreement, but it up to that municipality. We do not wish to dictate to the municipalities, it is up to them to make their own agreements, and they must not accept less than this amount.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL: If I might add a word to what the hon. minister has said regarding this matter. From my own experience, with regard to these grants which have been made by wartime housing, I believe it is strictly one of a bargain between the housing and the municipalities. Some of the municipalities have come out considerably better in this regard than others. I am sorry to have to say that the Wartime Housing has not been anything like consistent in its dealings with these different municipalities.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he can tell us if there is any intention at all to pass on the amount of money the Wartime Housing is going to pay or get out of the people who are already living in these houses? I represent a riding in which there is a very large district exclusively controlled by the Wartime Housing, and some of the rents, -- in fact all of the rents which are charged for these houses are to say the least exorbitant. People without any descent conveniences, are in places and having to pay $30.00, plus $1.00 for a stove, for a six room place.

Is there any indication of an intention to hand a percentage of their $24.00 rent back, so that they get it out of the renters, still?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: That will be a question between the Wartime Housing and the tenant. We can have no control over the

Wartime Housing, so that will be a matter for them to decide whether they make a refund to any tenant residing in any house. We would be asking too much of the gentlemen to step in and settle the disputes with regard to the rents of the homes. They are making a minimum agreement in order to have some starting point, you may say, and that will maybe come to some final agreement.

And now, one hon. member has mentioned about making these deals, but there is one thing you must not overlook, that the municipalities approached the Federal government under Wartime Housing, and offered $10.00 per house, and invited them to build in their municipality, and they are now getting $24.00 and $30.00 in the city of Hamilton, and in the city of Windsor -- the mayors of these municipalities set in my office and said they were willing to take the $10.00 to have these homes constructed in their municipalities because they realized what the purchasing power meant to the city. A man living in these homes spends his money in the municipality, and with different business people and they were willing to accept $10.00 when it was first mooted.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not so much concerned actually with how much the municipality might initially have been prepared to accept. As I understand a statement previously made by the hon. minister, it was to the effect that representatives of some municipalities and the wartime housing had met him in his office. Do I understand, therefore, that there was no question about this possibility of handing on to the renters this additional cost that the Wartime Housing is going to be involved in? Do I understand that they discussed how much taxes Wartime Housing were willing to pay, and did not discuss the possibility of part of that extra cost being put back on the renters? The rents are already too high, Mr. Minister.

HON. GEORGE M. DREW: That was not brought to my attention and was never mentioned by any member of the municipalities.

MR. WILLIAMS: Then the answer from the hon. minister is that he did not do anything about it?

HON. GEORGE M. DREW: (prime minister): After that, following along the lines we have been discussing, may I say that we have to follow the lines of our constitutional field; we have no

power to deal between Wartime Housing and the tenants -- none whatever.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to rise again, but.I recognize the constitutional difficulties, but in as much as the Department of Municipal Affairs did enter into an agreement with Wartime Housing, all I am asking is did they seek to have some idea from the Wartime Housing as to this extra cost.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: The Department of Municipal Affairs did not enter into any agreement with Wartime Housing. They were the go-between between the Wartime Housing and the Municipalities in order to have an agreement signed to pass in this Legislature, which was agreed to by both, and we had no part in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 form part of the Bill?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. minister in connection with section 4, if it is wise to assume that these agreements will no longer be necessary six months after the cessation of hostilities.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: I may say, for the information of the hon. member of St. David (Mr. Dennison) that it was talked over, and the municipalities felt that these houses should not remain there, unless some further agreement was made six months after. They were very anxious that the Wartime Housing -- in fact, they have embodied in their agreement a clause for the removal of these houses at the request of the municipalities within six months after the cessation of hostilities.

HON. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Is there any such agreement that they will be removed?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: It is up to the municipalities to make that agreement, but they stated they did wish that in the agreement, and will make it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 be made a part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6, as amended, be made part of the Bill?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: There is a change made in the provision of section 6. The wording will be:

"The money mentioned in section 2 shall be distributed by council to each of the bodies to which the council is required by law, to levy rates in the same proportion as the levy on all such bodies bears to the total levy".

That is to say, if a school for instance was ten percent of the total levy -- if it had been assessed in the ordinary way -- then they would get ten percent of this $24.00. Everybody will get their own fair proportion. The Law Clerk, which proposed the section was not clear enough. When he drew this section first he did not know, -- when he drew it first, he was not a K.C., but now he is a K.C. and had to make a change in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6, as amended, form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 8 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 9 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 10 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 11 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 12 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Will the minister explain what that refers to?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: That is an Act which was passed at the last Legislature, and this overrides that. I think I read it. I have not got the book here, but I will give it

to you from memory. It was where they made it possible that they assess the home and the municipality would collect from the tenant. That was found very unsatisfactory by the municipality. They thought it would be more satisfactory to collect one lump sum from the Wartime Housing.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 13 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 14 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill as amended be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW:(prime minister) Order No. 5.

CLERK OF HOUSE: Fifth Order; House in committee on Bill No. 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act", Mr. Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister) Order No. 6.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, house in committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act", Mr. Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 31, "An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chai rman, I am not quarrelling with section 1, but I wonder, however, if the hon. minister could give us the reason for the reduction in the rate of interest. I suppose there is a good reason.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I cannot add much more to what I said at the time I introduced the Bill, but we

feel that a rate of ten percent on penalties or unpaid balances on this land was accepted, and we propose to reduce it to six percent, which will be more in keeping with the municipal rates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported.

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (prime minister): Order No. 7.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; the house in committee on Bill No. 33, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act", Mr. Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 33, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: The hon. minister would not like to explain that one would he?

MOTION Agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Order No. 8.

(Page 273 follows)

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth order; house in committee on Bill number 34, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", Mr. Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 34, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 9.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineth order; house in committee on Bill number 37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944", Mr. Doucett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 8 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 9 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 10 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 11 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 12 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 13 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 14 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 15 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 16 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 17 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 10.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order; house in committee on Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development", Mr. Drew.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew) Mr. Chairman, section 1 deals with the question of the Minister of Planning and Development. Now, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether this is the proper section under which the question should

be raised, but I believe it should be raised at any rate, and that is, whether we shall have aseperate Minister administering the Department, or shall we have a Minister of another Department assuming the responsibility for this new Department that is being set up? I would welcome guidance from you, Mr. Chairman, as to whether this is the time and place to discuss this question.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is.

MR. JOSEPH B. SAISBERG: (St. Andrew) It is? Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) the leader of our group in the house pointed out in the debate in the house yesterday the Bill that is before us. The measure that is proposed by the Government is generally welcomed by all people in the province, and I am sure that all sections of the house welcome the leadership of the Government in setting up a Department for planning and development, as one of the essential features of a rounding-out, comprehensive post-war measure.

However, we should be quite clear that if such a department, to fulfil the expectations of the people, meets the requirements of the province we feel that it must become the key department of the Government for the next immediate period of time.

Now, one can not prophecy the time when the war will be victoriously concluded. The best advice we have from the head of the British Government is that we must have no illusions, and not expect an early termination. But I think that in the Speech from the Throne the Lieutenant Governor has quite correctly pointed out that it is time to plan now for post-war measures and the outline of the bills and the elaboration of this task in the Speech from the Throne, makes it quite clear that this is a tremendous and collosal task; it is a task to plan for the development of a new industry, it is a plan to deal with a great problem

of public housing, slum clearances, civic improvements, a department of natural resources, the establishment of new industry, and so on, and it is evident to me that if we take the task seriously we must envisage this department as one of the most energetic within the Government, and must be headed by a man especially capable of handling it, a man enabled to devote his whole time to this task, and the announcement in the press that this Department will be relegated - and I use that word advisedly - to the Minister of Labor, hardly meets with the approval of the people, and certainly is not in the spirit of the problem that is before us. With all due respect to the hon. Minister of Labor, he has, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) a full time job on his hands now. This Department requires a man free of all other obligations, enabled to surround himself with the best minds in the province, and to form a non-partisan advisory committee that will include every class, every political party, and every group in the province, to help him in unfolding any plan that will meet the great requirements which stand before us.

Now, I do not know whether, Mr. Chairman, an amendment is necessary, as a matter of fact, that is why I asked for your guidance. It seems to me that section 1 can be adopted without an amendment, but we will need to know how the problem will be solved, whether it will be a minister free of all other obligations or not.

I was not quite certain, Mr. Chairman, and I am thanking you for the leniency shown, and for your permission to permit me to discuss it at this stage, although I cannot see really where an amendment is necessary.

However, I want to express these things, and I would welcome an indication from the Government as to their intention in this regard.

May I also, Mr. Chairman, while I am touching on this subject, suggest further that the Bill be amended, and that

the Government agree to such amendment beforehand, to include in the set-up, an advisory committee, a provincial advisory committee, to the Minister of Planning and Development, and that such an advisory committee should be all-inclusive, and a broad committee, to include, as I indicated before, representatives of business, of labor, of all political parties, and every section of the population. I think this would give the assurance to the people of the provinces that the Government means this is a very serious thing, the establishment of this Department, and every section of our people will have an opportunity to cooperate, and give of their best in the planning and development that we desire for the post-war period.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to make the suggestion to the Government, and is not offering an amendment?

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, also hoping that the Government will see fit to express an opinion. Otherwise I shall be obliged to avail myself of whatever opportunity may be available to move an amendment. I have not it prepared now, but if necessary I would move the Bill be sent back to give me an opportunity to prepare an amendment, unless the Government agrees to such an amendment now, that is an amendment to have an advisory committee appointed along the lines suggested, and that the Minister be free of all other obligations.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr. Chairman, it would save time if I dealt with this now. Obviously no bill creating a department can either name the minister or define the way in which the minister will be chosen. This follows the regular course. The Government has, in the introduction of this measure, made it perfectly clear that it attaches the utmost importance to this Department, and is following the regular practice by thus creating the position for the Minister and a new Department. I may say

when the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) speaks of "a press report", no press report has been given by this Government to the effect he has mentioned.

It is for the Government to present the Bill creating the Department, before we deal with the question of the Minister. But I assure the hon. members of this house that we are fully conscious of this importance, and we will appoint a Minister who will be able to capably administer the affairs of the Department. But we will move along regular procedure, and move for the ministry to be created before we make any announcements as to the Minister. That is the only way it can be done.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL: (Niagara Falls) I would like to make arecommendation to this Department. I can envisage the time when the position of the Government may not be as it is now, and I would like to recommend that we have a standing committee of the house on planning and development, which would take care of the suggestion from the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and also would assist the Government in bringing down legislation at that time, make for a ~~safer situation~~. ~~speedier~~ execution of it C.O.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) As regards the suggestion, which corresponds to a certain extent with that which has already been made. I pointed out in my earlier remarks with regards to the intention of this Government, that it was our purpose to seek the cooperation of all the various groups in every community who are interested in post-war planning, and the mechanism existing already has that very thing which was proposed by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in mind. We propose to bring together all the interested parties, and there is a statute already on the statute books which provides for the setting up of a committee on rehabilitation, which tied in with this Act, can bring together all the various activities of the province.

May I assure the hon. members that the purpose is to

give the widest field to this, and at all times suggestions will be welcomed by the Government or the Minister of that Department, or the officials of that Department, but, at the moment, we are exploring new ground, and we propose to give it the widest possible study. There is a statute providing for the appointment of a committee to deal with any subject which may be recommended, and certainly the widest possible policy will be followed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. DENNISON: (St. David) Section 3 I would ask the Premier if this definition is broad enough to include planning boards already established, or which may be established by local municipalities, although they are not specifically mentioned, it does mention "municipal governments", and should this not be broadened to also include the power for this Department to act with any planning board which may be established in the large centres.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) In addition to specific references that it makes, it gives the very specific references and uses the wide term, "other associations and organizations and all public and private enterprise, with a view to formulating plans", and so forth. That will enable the widest assistance to be given to any group of plans for public development of any kind. I think it is drawn in the widest possible terms.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) There is a

typographical error in line 1, sub-section 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6 as amended, form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MR. A. BELANGER: (Prescott) Mr. Chairman, in section 6, sub-section 2, instead of "enquiry" should it not be "enquire"?

THE CHAIRMAN: That has been changed, sir.

Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number eleven.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The eleventh order, house in committee on Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils".

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I might explain, before the section is called, that this section is merely amended to add to the group of the ministry appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, to provide for a Minister of Planning and Development. It adds to the list which are already in existence. That is the only change affected by this Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Council Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) I believe the Prime Minister will agree that where it is provided that the Lieutenant Governor may by order-in-council prescribe their duties and the duties of the several departments, it continues to mean, "subject to the legislation constituting the various departments".

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Yes.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) There is only the one change?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) That is all, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Order number 12.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth order, house in committee on Bill number 41, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations", Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 41, "An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Section 1, sub-section "E" where the word "regulation" is defined, a further examination of the draft of that section indicates that an amendment is desired. I will read the proposed amendment which will be moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Frost:

> "That section 1, sub-section "E" be amended by the insertion of the word "all" before the words "the "members" in the seventh line."

Just giving the house a moment to pick that up, I will read the rest:

> "And by the addition to the present sub-section of the words following: 'And shall not include a by-law of a municipality or a local board as defined in the Department of Municipal Affairs Act'".

Just to qualify that, I will read to the house the definition of "local board" as contained in the Municipal Affairs Act:

> "Local board shall mean and include any school board, public utilities commission, transportation

commission, public library board, board of park management, local board of health, board of police commissioners, and any other board, commission, committee, body or local authority established or exercising any power or authority in any general or special act with respect to any of the affairs or purposes including school purposes, of a municipality or of two or more municipalities, or the operation thereof".

By way of explanation, the intention of the scope of the Bill before the house is that it shall apply to regulations outside of a legislative nature in the provincial statutes and it was not thought to encumber the registry system that would be kept here in the building, relate from municipalities, with a great variety of by-laws, or of the municipal bodies or boards, which were not governing boards under Government acts, for the purpose of the Government business, as distinguished from municipal boards on which the Government might have some representation.

With that explanation I hope the house will be prepared to accept the amendment I moved, seconded by Mr. Frost.

-Page 283 follows-

THE CHAIRMAN: Section number 1, (e) now reads:

"'Regulation' shall mean any regulation, rule, order or bylaw of a Legislative nature made or approved under the provisions of any Act of this Legislature by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, a Minister of the Crown, a department of the public service, an official of the Government or a board or commission, all the members of which are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but shall not include a bylaw of a municipality or a local board as defined in the Department of Municipal Affairs Act".

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, Paragraph (e) of Section 1 is extremely important because, of course, it defines the scope of the whole Bill.

I may say that I am glad to see it as wide as it is. I think that the machinery to be set up for the central filing of regulations is one to be welcomed.

I think I suggested to the Prime Minister some months ago that I thought Orders in Council should be more accessible. But by the amendment, by inserting the word "all" in the second line of paragraph (e) the effect, of course, will be that on any body where perhaps only one member is not appointed by the Government there will be no need to file a regulation.

Now, is it not possible that there may be very important regulations passed by such a body? I see the difficulty of drawing a line between what is important and what would be mere surplusage on the records. But I am wondering whether the Attorney General has considered fully the kind of bodies which properly should be excluded, and whether the word "all" is quite/right word to exclude what is not necessary.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think "some" would be better.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: The only answer to what has been said by the hon. member, as to whether there will be many regulations that will not be filed under this system of classification, the very

obvious answer is that there will be very important resolutions passed under provincial Acts that will not be included. All of these regulations which would be made by municipal bylaws, which, after all, are under provincial statutues, and of all the Boards referred to in the interpretation of local boards under the Municipal Act, obviously are very important, but there would be no great public convenience in having those centrally filed in this building, remote from the municipalities in respect of which they are applicable, and only applicable.

Now, in answer to the question which the hon. member raises regarding boards, of which all the members are not appointed by the Government, I want to bring the conception of the house, if I can, in line with a certain principal, whether it may be desirable to go further at some later date, it would appear to me to be as far as we ought to go at the present time, until we have had experience with this system, to try and deal in principal with matters that fall into the category of delegated legislation, that would be of the same nature and in the same category that might appear in the statute itself, if the statute had gone further and had done more by statute, and less to regulation.

Therefore, it is opposed by the Bill as printed to limit the scope of the Act to what may be termed delegated legislation by the Government itself, as opposed to boards on which the Government may have some representation or a local board.

I trust that will satisfy the leader of the opposition as to the intended scope of the Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, in view of the explanation of the hon. the attorney general, that it might be applied to all such boards where there is a representation or where the majority are representatives of the Government.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, on the suggestion of the member for West York, from the point of view of drafting, it might appear from first blush, to be a reasonable one; but the object is not

to suggest that this is the real distinction.

The Government does not make a practice of appointing a majority of representatives to a board and leaving it to other bodies to appoint minority representation.

The type of boards with which the Government would wish, and the House would wish, the regulation to attach under this Act are the type of board on which the Government has really no representation at all except one member to be a representative of the Government. There are some boards of that type, but not of the majority type.

Now, if the member will bring to my attention some type of board he would wish to include within that definition, I can assure the House we would be very happy to consider the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 be carried?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 be part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 be part of the Bill?

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, it may be loosely covered, -- perhaps the attorney general again will enlighten me, -- is it designed that publication shall be in the Ontario Gazette only, or that the public shall have access to the files?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I feel that if the Leader of the Opposition will consider the Statute as a whole, that he contemplates the publication in the Ontario Gazette is in itself inadequate, now, technically speaking, without this Act, I feel that in a strict legal sense, without this Act that would be true. But I think this Act provides for publication in the Gazette, and also for a filing index but it deals with the regulation as a whole, if they are not published.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 be part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 5 be part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 6 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 8 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 9 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 10 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 11 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I move that the committee now rise and report certain Bills.

THE CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Roland Patterson) Mr. Drew moves that the Committee now rise and report several Bills. Shall the motion pass?

Motion agreed to.

The Committee rose, and the House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. PATTERSON: (Chairman of the Committee of the Whole): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendment and certain Bills with amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the whole House reports certain Bills without amendment and certain Bills with amendments. Shall the report carry?

Report agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The first Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of the speech of the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of this session.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in felicitating, not only yourself, but this House

upon the choice of you as Speaker. We have in you a very distinguished, experienced and capable legislator, and the House is to be congratulated upon its choice and your acceptance.

On this side of the House we are proud to be associated intimately with the program upon which we fought the last provincial election and which is to be translated into early action as revealed in the Speech from the Throne. And we are also particularly to be congratulated upon the far seeing, hard working and energetic head of the Government. Not only from this side of the House but from members on the other side of the House he is to be congratulated. He has started well, and we know he will wear well. I congratulate the Prime Minister upon the address he so recently concluded to this House on this same subject.

The Leader of the Opposition has furnished us with a very studied and very well put together address containing much with which we, on this side, do not agree, but we feel we should congratulate the members opposite upon having such an industrious and young leader in the opposition.

Whilst in this agreeable mood, I will also take the opportunity of congratulating the former Prime Minister and now leader of the Liberal remnants, and remind him that political remnants well led may in the course of time become strong again. He himself said that he was almost persuaded to vote Progressive Conservative in the last election when he saw that item in our program which applied personally to his own property and would create a considerable saving for him. I think I can say that he will have opportunity still of voting Progressive Conservative both inside the House and outside of the House.

The hon. member from Bellwoods has brought his party into this arena with an energetic and earnest address, and I know he is going to have the whole-hearted support of his party and the whip of his party. I know the member does not like the term "whip" but he will recall in the last campaign I told him that he need not be worried about it.

because, if elected, he would be the only one to use it upon.

We have listened, Mr. Speaker to the first cannonading of the member for York East. I am sorry that she is not in her place at the moment, because I have a few remarks to address to her. Poignant and sharp as usual, she also is to be congratulated in her first effort in this new sphere of activity.

But, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the male members of this Legislature, I would draw attention to the spectacle of the action of this member on the first day of this month in this leap year, 1944, attempting to move not one, but many males throughout this province, proffering not love and affection but, glossed over somewhat in her address, regimentation and confiscation.

While there is much to be done to improve education in rural communities, I take exception to the black picture which she has painted of rural Ontario. If it were as bad as she has pictured it to be, surely we would not have so many outstanding citizens, including herself, from the farms.

The largest number in that group at Regina, of which she was a party, -- I think she was referring to it, -- out of the complexities of that conference, the farmers of Ontario know better, and they cannot point to one single farmer of the whole group elected here in Ontario.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, yes.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: I am talking about the actual stuff. You will find them all around me and on every side of me. I think the member for York East had better study another subject than agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested to find that the member for York East was looking to distant countries, such as Australia and New Zealand for governments. I do not agree that the best government in the world is over there. I think that here in Ontario is the making of the best government in this province of Ontario.

Now I am going to mention something which has been bothering me a little bit. I sometimes wonder how members of this House can be

expected to do very much intense work with the very inadequate accommodation supplied to the private members in this building. It seems to me that it is a great pity that there are not a great number of private rooms available so that members who wish to do business relating to their constituencies and parliamentary work in private may be able to do in close proximity to this chamber. I am told that if a member wishes to dictate to a stenographer outside of the Session he should call her to his desk in here. I wonder where a stenographer is supposed to sit, whether she must sit on his knee?

I have dealt with it before, but I deem it one of our most profound, if not sacred, duties to concern ourselves, as members of this house, with the welfare of the men and women of our fighting forces and , in particular, with the well being and proper treatment of the wounded and incapacitated and their dependents during the period of incapacity. There has been a practice in connection with the wounded and incapacitated men and their families which ought not to have been tolerated in this country, and which is so callous and unnatural that I am impelled to bring it to the attention of this House in the hope that by so doing we may assist in completely clearing up the situation which has not been wholly rectified yet.

In some inexplicable way, men wounded on the field of battle, men such as the prime minister has spoken of in England, the practice for the last two or three years has been that once they have been examined and found not fit for duty, to strike them off the roll of the Canadian army and place them in a civilian capacity. More than that, the effect upon the pay and allowance, particularly in the line of the privates so affected, and on the higher ranks moreso, has in most cases resulted in the pay and allowance being reduced to half, or less than half, of what the wounded man received on active service.

More than that, the wounded men, at once they are discharged, find themselves charged a dollar a day for hospitalization, although they are presumably under the care of the country which was glad to have them enlist and to go and fight on the field of battle.

I think I can illustrate it by one particular case, that of Lieutenant C. J. Catherwood, aged thirty-one, married, with three children, ages three, eight and nine. He went overseas with the Canadian army early in the war. Over in England he was very seriously wounded in a night operation while on very strenuous manoeuvres, losing one leg, and the other one was very seriously damaged, and the saving of it is still a matter of great doubt. He also received a number of other injuries, such as a fractured pelvis, hand injuries and abrasions. After being in the hospital in England for some considerable time, he was sent back to Canada in April 1943; he was examined in Christie Street Hospital, one of the best of such institutions in this country, and in May 1943 he was discharged from this army, although since May, 1943 he has been continuously on his back in Christie Street Hospital as an amputation case and has been getting less than his pay and allowances as at the time of his injuries; and he will probably be in the hospital for more than a year longer before it will be known whether or not his leg can be saved and what his ultimate future condition will be.

Quite recently under pressure the Department of National Defence or the Department of Pensions and Health did make certain changes, and said that up until one year after discharge the pay and allowances will continue, according to rank; but the treatment in the hospital must be continuous.

Now, in the case of Lieutenant Catherwood, he was discharged in May 1943. This provision is retroactive, but on the 1st of February only; so that his reinstatement is effective as of the 1st of February, 1944, and is for a period of one year from the date of his previous discharge. So that Lieutenant Catherwood, having been discharged in May 1943, will only benefit by the new provision for a period of a little more than three months, he will get the pay of his rank and the allowances as at the time the injuries were sustained. At the expiration of these three months, in May of 1944, he will again revert to the position of receiving for himself, his wife and family, less than half the amount of the pay and allowances at the time the injuries were

sustained in active service and in the course of his stern duty. Nevertheless this lad will remain in militaryhospital for a long time to come. Is this the sort of appreciation that we in the province of Ontario wish to show for men who voluntarily servedabroad and have been prepared to give everything in the cause to which their country is committed? In fact, he has said that it would pay him to have his leg taken off immediately, to save worry to himself and his wife and children.

It has been suggested here, why not have the stretcher bearers who go out on the battle field to pick up the wounded carry along discharge papers and issue them to the wounded men?

One month after the discharge of which I have spoken, despite the fact that the war still goes on, and despite the fact that the incapacity continues, these gallant men are not even allowed to wear their uniforms officially.

Can we in this province countenance that treatment of our young men? I mention another case, a well known young man of a Toronto regiment, the uniform of which is familiar to everybody here, in the platoon in Sicily last July, -- the Hasty-Petes, -- relieving them in the dead of night, going forward in the hope of cutting off a German retreat, but unfortunmately during the night they were ambushed by the Germans, and this man was wounded. He was taken back by his comrades and eventually sent to hospital.

I may say that the way he was sent travelling back was not in the best interests of morale. I think we should see that these returning wounded get proper receptions at the proper places and times. Arriving back more or less unheralded, in this hospital he, a month later, was discharged, and his pay and allowances altered, as I have mentioned and no longer is he permitted legally to wear the uniform of that proud regiment with the red badge of a veteran of a division, the insignia of the Eighth Army. And yet the war is not over, and he has been returned home only a matter of a few weeks.

I am sure that every member of this House will join with me in

protesting any rules or regulations which provide effects such as this without immediate remedy during the continuation of this struggle.

All members of this House, I am sure, will agree when I say that we denounce this type of treatment of all wounded in the army, and they should have pay and allowance to them and their dependents until they are discharged from hospital, and medical treatment, or can definitely be classified for final pension disposal.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the Medical Board shall not sit in absentia.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: I agree with the hon. member, who will probably have something to say along these lines later.

The situation would be improved if all these matters were changed and we could feel that it was remedied as far as possible and removed from political influence.

I make bold to suggest, — I saw yesterday in one of our newspapers that the Research Post was still open for General McNaughton, but it seems to me that this man who has led the boys for the last four years in this war would be the best possible man to assure them of proper treatment. Some such organization as that is very necessary indeed. So, Mr. Speaker, until these and many other wrongs are rectified I propose to return time and again to this subject in this House, until we can get for these outstanding citizens their just dues views from an appreciative nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been quite interested to find in this Legislature three members who spent their early manhood in what might be termed their adopted town in the same northern camp, where all the silver comes from. The hon. member from Nipissing (Mr. Casselman), the hon. member from Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor), and the speaker spent their juvenile age in that great country, spending a number of years pursuing their none jobs in harmony amid, and at times exciting surroundings; none of us at that time expecting any of the others to make little or big the politics, although all were engaged actively in Bush League practice, but I do not know that the line-up was not the same as it is today.

All of us witnessed the opening of the first road linking up

Northern Ontario with Southern Ontario; and we recollect very well when the first car stopped on that road, in rather a bad part of it, and the owner and the driver of the car was well known to us, and then to the amazement of the onlookers, including the owner of the car, it slowly but surely disappeared from sight, into the muskey, never to be seen again.

I am sure that the hon. the minister of highways will build firmer foundations for the roads yet to go into that country.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was on the Ferguson Highway.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: You are right but I think I am right in saying that the owner of the car was fully reimbursed as quickly as possible.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS: The northerners are hospitable and free in their manners, but are not given to accepting docilely outside or long-range interferance or control. When this is attempted by a Government they register their disapproval in no uncertain terms. It is said that the Government of the day caused dissatisfaction which resulted in the sweeping from office of all those representatives in the election of 1934, and in the election of liberal members throughout the north country. But as time went on the north again felt it was being neglected and not fairly dealt with and that the policies and actions of the liberal administration no longer warranted the approval of the north country. So in 1943 they once again registered their disapproval in a most emphatic manner. The members from the north are now almost without exception members of the C.C.F. party opposite, with one exception, the rugged, friendly and honourable member from Algoma-Manitoulin.

I have said that the elected representatives from the north were elected because of the disapproval of the people of the north, and not because of any wide-spread conviction on the part of the people of the north in a policy of State Socialism.

As I understand it, one of the planks in the platform of the C.C.F. Party is the nationalization of mines. I condemn unequivocally any such

proposal. I believe it would be most unfortunate for this province and for this country if such a course were adopted; and to my mind the hazardous and risky occupation of mining should be the last industry ever to come under a system of socialization.

Having so expressed my views as emphatically opposed to a platform of the nationalization of mines, I hope those members representing northern ridings in which mining is a predominating industry will have the same frankness when they speak in this house in recording their stand with respect to that particular issue.

If the people of northern Ontario are capable of showing disapproval of neglect, they also are capable of expressing their approval and appreciation. If this Government acts in the best interests of the north by its fraternity and cooperation with the north so sets his course, I feel satisfied that the people will record their approval when they have their chance. Therefore, although it will give me some personal regret due to friendships already established and I hope to be established within the next few years, I prophecy we will witness, when the next Legislature is assembled, the passing of the familiar faces of many members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne constructive references are made to construction and planning; and it is in connection with that and in relation to social security that I wish to take up the time of this house for a few minutes, with some remarks which I hope will be of interest; and while they may be technical in some respects, I do not apolgize for that when addressing this House.

Social security is a term which has now become almost commonplace in Canada. Some years ago it was not so well known but the persistence of President Roosevelt and his then new administration, commencing in 1933 and continuing for some years prior to the Great War to give to the people of the United States what he termed The New Deal, brought us in Canada in relatively close contact with the situation, despite the fact that during most of that period we were under a Dominion Government in Canada which was hoping that something would turn up to relieve the problem in which the Government found itself, due to economic and social problems

which it made no attempt, or scarely any attempt to solve.

To give one illustration of this, you will recall how in the Spring of 1936, the King Government constituted a National Employment Commission headed by the late Arthur B. Purvis, as Chairman. This Commission reported in July of 1937, and again in January, 1938, made a final report.

(Next page follows)

For a year and a half or more after the receipt of the final report, no perceptible action was taken thereon and the Government continued to wait for something to turn up to solve the problem of unemployment and social needs. Something did turn up -- a war -- and while that did solve the problem for the moment, but at what cost! It will be back on the door-step of all the Governments, both the Dominion and the Provincial, before very long now. So certainly the present is the time for formulating long-range plans if we are to be ready at home to deal adequately and fairly with this problem in all its phases.

So there is need for an immediate survey in Ontario. The objective of social security law is to eliminate poverty by fixing a National social minimum -- either for the individual, or for a family. I am one of those who believes that an over-all plan for social security is to be preferred to piece-meal legislation which later may not fit into the whole picture. Therefore, it is extremely urgent, whatever plan is evolved, that it be by common consent of both the Dominion and the Provinces.

We in Canada have had the benefit of seeing in print, the report for the United Kingdom known as the Beveridge Report and the Report on Social Security for Canada known as the "Marsh Report". The Marsh Report is the work of a Dominion Civil Servant at Ottawa and it is not unexpected to find that throughout he shows the tendency to prefer Dominion priority and Dominion regulations and control in the carrying out of the plan. I believe there will be sharp disagreement in this respect in certain features of the program.

The Marsh plan is divided into two main parts (1) universal risks and (2) employment risks.

Under the heading of universal risks there are sub-headings of insurable population on the one hand and all gainfully occupied (and adult dependents). These universal risks as they may be called are general social provisions and include contributory benefits, that is to say, medical care and financial expenses organized on an individual cost basis and contributory payments organized on a general income earner basis, providing pensions for

permanent disability, old age and retirement and widows and orphans, and there comes direct non-contributory state grants in cash for children about which I will have something to say later on.

Marsh hopes that the old age pensions' scale may work out at $30.00 per month for an adult and $15.00 a month for an adult dependent. That is, take the example of a husband and wife, both having reached the age of 65 years, $45.00 per month between them, and if one should die, then $30.00 per month thereafter for the one that remains.

With respect to children's allowances, he advocates $9.00 a month per child.

In regard to the health provisions the general estimate of cost is not provided, but some suggestion is made that the cost per capita may be between $16.00 and $24.00 per person per year, and we see the announcement from Ottawa that the cost is being assessed at $21.60 per capita.

With regard to cost of the children's allowances, Cassidy in his Book on Social Security and Re-Construction in Canada, 1943, suggests that there would be about three million six hundred thousand child beneficiaries if all children of 14 and under were included. Marsh proposes to include children up to the age of 16 or 17. Incidentally Marsh figures the total number of children to be involved under 16 years in Canada to be three and one-half millions. If all children were covered under this plan, approximately three hundred millions of dollars per annum would be involved in some form or other. by cash benefits as is advocated by some, by services and methods that will assure that the money gets directly used for the benefit of the children. I think a weekly periodical quoted a little ditty - not very long but illustrating what might happen to this money

if paid out just to the parents without any supervision.

Hush abye baby don't you cry
You'll get your nine bucks back by and by
Watch that horsey burn up the track
Your last month's allowance on his back.

Those four lines may present some argument.

Provisions by way of meeting the requirements of the worker who has a family to support cannot be approached via the wage rate solely without vitiating the rule and custom of "equal pay for equal work". The report proposes to deal with the family problem as I have stated by way of non-contributory cash grants.

Let us turn for a moment to the second part of the plan dealing with employment risks. Sub-headings constitute all normally-gainfully employed and under this heading it introduces such subjects as national investment program, training and guidance facilities, and unemployment assistance projects. Under the heading "employees" we find items such as unemployment insurance benefits; sickness benefits, maternity benefits available for insurable women wage-workers only; industrial disability, Workmen's Compensation provisions and extensions and fatal accidents, industrial.

Sir William Beveridge hopes and expects that unemployment in Britain will be kept below an average level of 8½% in the post-war period. If this is accomplished, he does not anticipate any actuarial or financial difficulties in carrying out the provisions of the great all-inclusive plan which he has proposed to the British Parliament.

The Toronto Welfare Council in 1939 published a pamphlet entitled "The Cost of Living". The Heller Committee for Research and Social Economics, University of California, also published information along similar lines dealing with the City of San Francisco. Comparison of the two scales indicates that the figures are probably reasonably accurate. It is recognized that there would be quite a range in these figures depending on where the individual or family happened to be located throughout Canada. However, I am going to give you a few

figures for what they are worth. The actual cost in Toronto in 1939 of living for a single woman or a single man on an annual basis is placed at $449.00, for a man and woman $800.00. for a man, a woman and a boy aged six $1,054.00, and to take another example, a man and a woman with two boys, aged twelve and six and one girl aged ten or a total family of five persons $1,473.00. Of course, these figures do not include any allowance for income tax. I think perhaps I might give one further example. A family of eight, father, mother and four boys and two girls, ranging in ages from 2 to 16, living in Toronto, is shown as requiring a minimum of $2,179.00 for living requirements and judged by those standards used in the research work in connection with social security.

Can this general plan for social security be undertaken in Canada successfully? It has been stated by those who have studied this problem that it will be conditional upon the maintenance of the National Income of Canadians at a sufficiently high figure. I believe it can.

Research ever since the beginning of this war, and much of it initiated by private concerns, has widened the horizon of opportunity and of material well being for all the population beyond anything thought possible a few years ago. Two blades of grass have been made to grow where none grew before. We are on the threshold of a great period of growth and new sources of energy. Believing that, how could I fear for social security minimums of this sort, or how could anyone but the most reactionary face up to this advance and at the same time say that this minimum existence is going to soften the nation.

Graham Towers, Governor of the Bank of Canada recently stated that debt increases sufficient to look after war and post war re-adjustment requirements can be handled without embarrassment in Canada. Mr. Towers states that we have two courses open to us in dealing with other nations when the war is ended. One of these, he says would be to specialize on what it could produce best and sell its surpluses to other Nations. I suppose it would be fair to say

that that objective has been the objective of Canada down through the years. The other, he states, is to build up a self-contained economy by subsidies for those products Canada consumes but cannot produce economically. He indicated that he favoured specializing and developing Canada's foreign trade. He indicated that he favoured the first plan, that was in specializing and developing Canada's foreign trade. There is something in the second course which commends itself also and in that connection I would just like to read an article published in the "Northern Miner" on February 17th, 1944 which I think illustrates the point very clearly.

"Prior to the war Canada did not use more than 20% of her non-ferrous metals within her own borders. During the war, under the stimulus of munition making, the percentage of metal used within Canadian borders has risen but this might be considered a temporary condition.

The plain fact is that Canada has produced very large quantities of copper, nickel, lead and zinc which have been exported to other countries for final fabrication. It is also a fact that it is in the 'processing' of any raw material that the profit and the employment lies. A ton of refined copper which brings to Canada $200.00 is transformed into machines, gadgets, wires, installations and whatnot worth $20,000.00. Even humble iron, changed into steel and fabricated, adds 20 or 30 times to its value. Zinc and copper, changed into brass, become valuable in a thousand forms.

The war is teaching Canadians something. It is teaching them that their heritage of raw materials is something to develop intensively, to the final stages. It is teaching them that other nationals

"develop arts and crafts which can transform the products of mine, field, and forest into final products, many of them artistic as well as useful. Countries in Europe with meagre natural resources manage, by their skill and industry, to invade the markets of the world with their special productions and to keep the national economy relatively healthy as a result."

Mr. Speaker, as I see this plan, once it gets into real operation, in the country, the cost over-all may exceed one billion dollars per year, and of this amount, the Government involved, may be called upon to contribute upwards of 60%, the balance of the contribution coming from the insured persons to the extent of 22 or 23 percentum possibly and from employers to the extent of 15 or 16 percentum possibly, the balance coming from miscellaneous sources. One single contribution by insured persons and by employers and one single tax by the State referable thereto, may be able to take the place of overlapping and haphazard and only half-solving methods previously employed. We must not forget that in the past, Governments of Canada, the Provinces and the Municipalities have contributed large amounts to meet relief and other welfare expenditures which should not again recur if the plan of social security is put into effect. On the question of contributions under such a plan, speaking very broadly, I would guess that the cost to every adult would be at least one dollar per week, or in other words, a man and his wife would contribute about two dollars per week during their working years for the protection and benefits which have been outlined and which, of course, could not be purchased for that premium except with the contributions both of the state and of employers in the particular fields calling for these contributions.

Everybody will agree that we ought to store and save in periods of plenty in order to provide for periods of famine. The well-known Bible story of Joseph, a captive in Egypt, interpreting the dreams of the Egyptian Emperor

and putting into effect a seven-year plan of conservation during a period of plenty can still have practical application. Certainly now is the time for planning.

A very important factor in the success or failure of the plans for solving unemployment will be the way in which Employment Agencies work. National Selective Service Personnel will be used no doubt in part, but I would like to see established a "staff college" for the training of key people for this work. It could be set up and amongst its students could be experienced soldiers. It would not be sufficient simply to train people to be skilled in finding employment for their fellow men and finding out the most suitable work, but also it will be necessary progressively to provide a list of qualified people trained along social service lines and skilled in human relations to deal with claimants and prevent this system ever reverting to the relief system of former days.

I have already stated that the Marsh Report prefers the Dominion as the senior for administering, not only the unemployment features of the Act, but for old age pensions, National health and children's allowances. It is pretty apparent that the Dominion Government is endeavouring to do this to get all the credit for it.

Miss Whitton in her book "The Dawn of Ampler Life" has this to say, and I quote:

> "This would mean an entire 'right-about-face' in the basis of the B.N.A. Act bringing Dominion officials directly into the field of service of children in their own home and families. It would drive a coach and four through the very structure of Confederation."

Mr. Sutherland, one of the Commissioners under the National Employment Commission has this to say:

> "Provinces legislate in respect to material resources, agriculture, mines, forests, factories, etc., and in respect to human resources in such matters as

"education, health, and labour, including hours of work, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, factory conditions, the health of workers, indigency, etc. Material resources and human resources are inextricably bound together in the economic structure. The material resources, and the human resources in the application of their minds and labour, whether to material resources, in trade, or in service, and all the ramifications of that relationship, constitute an indivisible oneness and consequently have been and should be governed in matters appertaining to that relationship within one jurisdiction. That status never has been successfully challenged." And she is, of course, referring to the Provincial status.

Speaking for myself - I am speaking for myself only - I am of the opinion that we in Ontario should reserve complete control over our education, our children's health, and maintenance and work out our own arrangements with the Dominion as to participation in the general scheme. It happens I favor very strongly family allowances, but within some arrangement such as I have just mentioned. The English speaking provinces have their problems and Quebec has its. There is no particular reason why in the early stages of this plan, we in Ontario, or the people of British Columbia, or of Nova Scotia, should be called upon to contribute to the costs of family allowances in Quebec as such, any more than there is any reason why we here would expect Quebec to contribute to the cost of our similar problems in the Province of Ontario.

It is well known that the Province of Ontario has not as high a birth-rate as the Province of Quebec, nor has any other Province in the Dominion as higha birth-rate. As a matter of fact, the birth-rate in the Province of Ontario has been too low. I hope it will improve. Our sister Province to the east has seen fit to set its course along

definite lines differing from Ontario in national outlook, in birth rates, and to some extent in social requirements and education.

I have seen, and I know the hon. the Prime Minister has seen, from the air the turbulent and muddy waters of the great Athabaska River where they join the Clear River, near which are the tar sand deposits, and we have seen those two streams moving forward for miles fairly distinguishable but gradually as they work north to the Arctic Ocean being assimulated until eventually miles further north they appear as one stream. If it is difficult for the waters of two such rivers to join and to co-mingle how much more difficult it is for races sprung from such different origins and pursuing different national courses to co-mingle. And therefore, the constitution of the British North America Act - whatever may be said against it - has been set up I believe with these difficulties very definitely in view and with provisions available to protect such a situation.

So far as I know, Quebec has not in the past sought financial help from the other Provinces for its own Provincial needs. I recall that for several years after the introduction of the Dominion-Provincial Old Age Pension plan, which called for contributions by the Dominion and the Provinces, Quebec did not pass enabling legislation in order to participate in the benefits notwithstanding the fact that for those intervening years, the Dominion was contributing and Quebec therefore, indirectly its share of the general cost for the benefits which were accruing only to the Provinces which had joined in the project.

One of the pressing needs therefore, seems to me to be an early understanding between the Dominion and the Provinces as to the respective spheres of each in this general social security plan and in the re-habilitation and construction work and a definite understanding as to the fields of taxation of the Provinces and the Dominion after the war. It is indeed fortunate that this great Province of Ontario has at

this time a Progressive-Conservative Government to guard and protect its rights. While I am sure the Government will not approach these problems in a niggardly or dog-in-the manger attitude, it will recognize the fundamental rights and needs of the Province and will place them in their proper perspective with the other requirements.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: (Grey South) I would ask the Prime Minister does he wish me to proceed now? What has he in mind?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) As I announced yesterday it was the intention to continue this evening and if the hon. member would prefer to adjourn till 8.00 o'clock this evening, I am sure that would meet with the approval of the house.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: (Grey South) Then, Mr. Speaker, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the motion carried?

Motion carried.

The House rose at 5.30 p.m. to resume at 8.00 p.m.

Jan 2/44.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY TORONTO MAR 3 - 1944 RECEIVED

SPEAKER: Hon. William J. Stewart.

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER: (Grey South) Mr. Speaker, in rising to make I hope some little contribution to this debate, I think I should follow the time-honoured custom of congratulating you upon your elevation to the position which you now occupy, and I think the members of the House pretty well agree that you will preside over our deliberations here impartially and ably.

I think I should say, too, to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, that I enjoyed their remarks very much. You know it is not the easiest thing in the world to make your initial address in this august chamber. I remember many long years ago when I was young and less mature than I am now, that I rose to make my first address, and got along pretty well for a few minutes, and then I do not know what the difficulty was, but I ran into a snag of some kind, and I will always recall the then prime minister, Hon Mr. Ferguson, supplied the right word at the right time. I do not know that in my estimation Mr. Ferguson ever done very many other things which stand out in my memory, but that one particular case certainly raised him in my esteem. So I appreciate the difficulties that the new members experience in addressing this chamber for the first time. They acquitted themselves exceptionally well, and they will find that the next time will be much easier, indeed.

I want to congratulate, too, my leader, who sits to my right, on the speech that he delivered in the House the other day. We, in this corner, have a very high regard for the integrity, industry and honesty of the one who leads this group, even though it only be a remnant of what it once was. It is not the leader's fault. I think we will all agree here, and I am sure the whole House agrees, that it was no fault of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon); it was just one of those things which happen once in a while for which there does not seem to be any plausible explanation, and it probably will happen

again sometime, and it may be that we will be on the right end of the stick the next time.

There is just one more thing I want to say in my introductory remarks. I understand that today the member for South York (Mr. Jolliffe), and the leader of his Majesty's loyal opposition, has attained another milestone along life's tempetuous journey, and I would just like to say to him in adding my congratulations to those who surround me that I do hope that now that he has grown one year older, he will be able to raise his voice just a little bit when addressing the chamber. We under the new seating up here, by way of seating, cannot hear the leader of the opposition, and when he rises to speak we can only, with great difficulty, hear him, so it is a bad combination, and now that I have congratulated him, he can reciprocate, I am sure, by speaking a little louder the next time, because down in this corner we want to hear what he has to say. We have no doubt that both he and those who sit around him have many good ideas that we can incorporate into the Statute books of this province either now or at some time in the future.

It is well, I think, for any legislature or any parliament that they have what is known as the "ginger group" or the "radical element" in it because those of us who have been here for so long are apt in our continuity of service to become more or less set in a bit of a rut, and there is nothing that will get you out of it more than a "ginger group" of those with advanced ideas, so that we can combine the conservatism of the past with the radicalism of the present, and get something in the nature of good government and good legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thoughts for some few moments toward the question of agriculture, and I do hope that in saying it, I will not be asked for my credentials, because I would have difficulty in supplying them tonight, thinking that no one would seek them. But I am a farmer, and exceedingly proud of it; so proud of it, as a matter of fact, that I find myself wondering at times why I ever went away from those quiet silent acres, and went into the tumultuous life that one finds in the political game. I think perhaps the difficulty is that the Tories in my riding kept putting up

candidates and I kept knocking them down, and it was so much fun that I hated to stop. Some day, of course, the inevitable will happen. Some day they will find a man to defeat me, I have no doubt of that, if I keep on going, and you can only keep on going in public life so long; there is a limit to everybody's endurance, there is even a limit to the electorates' endurance, and it may come sooner than we expect, although, that is not worrying me at the present time. I will say that.

But, in respect to the industry of agriculture, it is my intention to speak specifically about the farming industry tonight, and wind my thoughts around the problems that confront that industry, and touch on age-old subjects, as I proceed.

I personally make no apology at all for discussing and re-discussing/problems that beset the basic industry of the agriculture, because I am persuaded of this fact, Mr. Speaker, that unless men who know the soil and who know the problems of the men and women who toil upon that soil, we can never expect to raise the status of the basic industry of this province and in this country; and I am persuaded of this, further, that the basic industry in Canada, which is agriculture, that the status of that industry must be raised before there can flow through the veins of national life in this country the proper trend of prosperity that is due the people of Ontario and the people of Canada.

When one seeks to discuss the agricultural industry in a provincial house, and the problems that are found around that industry, one immediately goes up against these very red and potent problems, and that is, that many of the things which we think will correct the abuses of agriculture can only be remedied in the Federal House at Ottawa. After all the provincial government has its hands more or less tied when it comes to solving the problems of agriculture. I thought that was ably demonstrated the other day when my colleague - former colleague, at least, from East York (Miss Macphail) was patting the Minister of Agriculture on both cheeks, words of love, almost - professionally speaking, of course - and I just got

to thinking that back in 1930 and 1931 and 1932 and 1933, the same minister was minister of agriculture, and we sold our hogs and got $3.60, $3.20 per hundred, and our cattle for about the same price.

Now, it was not the fault of the hon. Minister of Agriculture that our prices were so ruinously low in those days, nor is it the gift he possesses that makes it possible to say tonight that the prices the farmers receive are much better than they were at that time. I think the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is taking such a realistic view of the agricultural industry, is all to the good. I think it has come about because of two reasons; first, he sits in a government that is a bit re-vamped. I do not know how anyone could do very much for agriculture in the stagnant conservatism of 1934. But, let me assure you that the new brand we see on the treasury benches is an improvement; it would have to be; any change would have to be for the better, and so the hon. Minister of Agriculture is pepped up by the new surroundings in which he finds himself.

Then, on the other hand, I think he is encouraged in his work by the fact that agricultural people in this province are in a much better state of organization than they were in those days, and he can feel with some justification that when they say to him, "This thing should be done." or "This should not be done." he can believe that they are speaking, not only for themselves and the few who surround them, but for the great majority of the farmers in the Province of Ontario, and that gives great strength and great encouragement to any minister of agriculture. I do not want to detract from the very pleasant relationship that now exists with the minister of agriculture, but I cannot help pointing out that there is so very little that we can do actually in this province to raise the standard of agricultural industry, and I think the hon. mininster at the present time is making up for the events of the past, and doing all that he possibly can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on just two or three of these things that outside the pale of this legislature, and I hope you will pardon me in so doing.

I think one of the basic causes of what agricultural

depression there is in this province and in this country, is the fact that we pay subscription to this age-old fact - economic fact - that surplusses of the world markets set, and set absolutely the prices of the major part of that product that is sold at home.

Now, to me, Mr. Speaker, that is a state of affairs which must be corrected, and one need not look very intently at the picture to perceive the reasons why. When we go on to the world markets with our beef, with our hogs and with our mutton, and our eggs and our butter, we meet there competition in similar products from all quarters of the world, from countries in the world who have pasture the whole year round, countries with a climate where they can have two or three crops in one year, countries where they do not have to stable their cattle, and where their hogs fatten on the pasture - I wish the hogs here would fatten on the pasture, but they do not - and that is the sort of competition we have to meet.

Now, we cannot as Canadian farmers continue to beat that competition andto maintain in Canada a standard of living that befits those who are employed in the agricultural industry. I do not think there is any argument on that point. We have to devise some way, whether by stabilization front, whether by government subsidies, whether by government picking up the products when surplusses appear - I do not care how it is done - but in some way, shape or form there must be a remedy for that situation, andthe farmers of Canada should not be expected to take the world's prices for the result of their toil on our Ontario and Canadian acres.

Then, too, there is the other thought that I would like to touch upon for a moment. The trouble again with agriculture is that we have purchased all the things that we require for making things grow on the farm and all the furniture and other essentials required in a farm home - we have had to purchase these from behind the shelter of a tariff wall where protection was afforded the manufacturer of those products, and the farmer has paid for his protection, in the purchase of his implements

of production and things for his home, and at the same time, while we faced that proposition in the purchase of our products, we were expected, under the law of supply and demand, which is as obsolete as anything which could be anywhere - to go on the world's markets and compete with the world and buy in a sheltered market at home.

These things just do not add up, and the wonder to me is that the farmer has survived so long under such conditions.

MISS MACPHAIL: He is a tough fellow; that is why.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, you only need to look at me to realize all that.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: What protection do they get?

MR. OLIVER: There is a suggestion, and I think it will become a reality, that a floor is going to be put under farm prices. I think a floor properly constructed and taking all things into consideration, would be a source of security to the agricultural people. There is no doubt that. A floor put under farm prices should not be any old kind of a floor. I mean you have got to have a floor under farm prices that takes into consideration the total cost in the production of that product. You have got to have a price that will the farmer and his family a decent and respectable standard of living in this Province of Ontario. Any other floor price is just a winking at the problem; it is just coming near it, but never coming to grips with it.

Then, I wanted to point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, to the farmers of Ontario one thing that is going to have to be done if we put into effect a floor price. I think we will have to have controlled production, accompanying a satisfactory floor price. I do not think that the one can get along without the other. I think we will have to bring into effect into this province and this country some measure for the control of production. I am not alarmed about taking the liberties of the farmers away in controlling their production. I much rather would/have a reasonable price, a price into which costs have been put for a smaller amount of production than I would to have a ruinous price for a large tonnage of production.

But I think the farmers are gradually coming around to that position. There was a time when it was most unsafe to say that anything in the shape of controlled production was even a long way ahead. It may be that for many years to come we will not yet control production. Well, when one thinks of the ravages of war in the countries overseas, when one thinks of the great need for food and for agricultural products in those war-ravaged lands, one can conceive; if he has any vision at all, that there will be a great need for years to come, perhaps, for all the products of the farm which we can produce, and it will be, I feel, the duty of the farmers of this country to produce those products, but it should be a very real and humanitarian thing to do.

But, after that period is over and we fall back into normal channels of trade, just as sure as we get floor prices we give the farmer a reasonable price for his products, then just as sure will some measure of control have to be taken over production of those products.

Then I want to touch upon another subject that is very warm just now. I see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has gone out; perhaps he will be back in a moment. It is suggested we are going to take over the stock yards down at St.Clair and some other street here in Toronto.

As my leader (Mr. Nixon) pointed out the other day, when the election was on it was held out that this would be an effective means of stopping speculation and manipulation which went on at the stock yards. I do not know how my hon. friends got around to make the farmers feel that it would stop speculation and manipulation of the stock yards. I could not get around to all the people and tell them that there was nothing in it. So I assume many farmers did believe that by the acquisition of the stock yards on the part of the government, they would be free from manipulation and speculation that has gone on there.

Now, of course, we are down - the election is over, and we look at this thing in a serious light and we find there is

not much in it. We are only knocking at the outer door and the taps are very feeble at that - just very feeble. Whether we take the stock yards over or not will not matter a plugged nickel to the farmer and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) knows that now. If it had not been that it was one of those solemn promises that are made during election time I think I would, even at this late date, suggest to the minister that he should hand this serious problem over to the committee on agriculture, let them examine it, and in due course they would receive the obvious answer that it would not help the farmers at all.

Now, just let me point out that the real trouble at the stock yards and the packing plants is not when you open one door, but it is when you go through three or four doors. You have to go a little further in before you find the real trouble. The representatives of these packing houses are out through the country buying cattle and shipping them direct to the plant. They never go through the stock yards at all, and if the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) had wanted to put any life at all into this iussue he would have said that all stock should go through the yards and then if there was any merit in it, it could be seen at a glance, but the position now is that the packers are buying quite a percentage of their total requirements in the country and sending them direct to the plants, without going through the yards at all, and many drovers and some shippers, I guess, are sending them direct to the plants. So that it is not any use to take over the stock yards. They are a declining feature of the food issue so far as the farmers are concerned, and if we proceed many more years the way we are going, the need for the stock yards will be out-dated, and they will not be used at all.

The trouble at the packing plants is still -- after this promise is going to be made - the manipulation and speculation, because after the Bill goes through and after the law is duly made the speculation and manipulation will remain, and that is what is hurting the farmers, that is making him very mad in the

country at the present time.

I say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that these buyers from the packing plants are breaking the market at the packing plant and they can make or break the market at will. They can lay off buying today, andtomorrow allow a surplus of agricultural stock to accumulate, and then they can - and they do - go in the next day and buy it at their own prices, and that, in my judgment, is one of the greatest difficulties the farmers have to face. I would say it was even more important than taking over the actual plants themselves; the farmers lose more money in the speculation and manipulation that goes on while these cattle are being bought on the yards than he does in the excessive charges for processing in the plant itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something that I do not believe we can do very much about in this province except along those lines. The only answer to that I see is that the breeders of cattle and the shippers of hogs and sheep in this province become so organized along commodity lines that they can say to these big plants, "You can take this stock today at a certain price, or you can do without it, whichever you like."

Only when the farmers are able to have that kind of bargaining power will they be able to break the monopolistic control that is unquestionably present at the packing plants in the Province of Ontario today. Then, there is one other way that it seems to me we might do something, and that is by decentralizing the industry. Every hog I produce on my farm in Artemisia - and it is not few - goes to the cooperative plant in Barrie. I doubt if I have shipped a hog to Toronto in four or five years. All the cattle I can get them to take at Barrie go there as well. If this question becomes more difficult for farmers then the government can give a very sensible lead in giving financial help and moral support to the building of packing plants on a smaller scale throughout this country, where farmers will at least know they are getting a square deal. I think perhaps we have not gone into that question as much as we should. The hon. Minister of Agriculture is in his seat now, and I know he will say in the early days of the Barrie packing plant, they were beset with

many perils, that the road they travelled was one of many obstacles. That is true. There was a time when, as the older members of this House will remember, that we thought the first cooperative packers in Barrie were going under the hammer, but new life was ejected into that organization, and we hope that before this session is through, the hon. Minister of Agriculture can give us a picture of what that plant is earning today. I think it is a plant we can all be proud of, whether we are farmers or whether men in the position of guiding the industry from the government benches.

These are the things we must bear in mind as we move forward along the road of reform of agriculture. I want to congratulate the hon. prime minister on his speech the other day in connection with research. I have been for many years fascinated with the progress that has been made in this particular direction, and the information that research has given us has been doubled and trebled many times over by the advent of war-time necessity for finding things to do things that are not so urgent in days of peace.

We can use that tremendous energy for good; the research council, our universities - we can use all these agencies in the post-war days to find extended uses for the production of the farm, as well as of the woods and other sections of the country.

But I am reminded, as I speak tonight, that you can make certain parts of gasoline from wood, and that wood is also a part of the substances that goes into the make of synthetic rubber. There is scarcely any finality to the possibilities of research as applied to agricultural industry, and I hope the day will come in this province and in this country when through the medium of research we can do away with the ugly surplusses, by making full use of agricultural products, and thus solving a question that is bothering us so much today. I do not think that is outside the realm of possibility. I think the advance of research may solve some of the problems which beset us in respect to agricultural industry. I leave that as it is, but

I wanted to point out to the members of the house that research has its place in furthering the processes of agricultural production, as well as along other lines.

It is a fascinating story, as the hon. prime minister told us the other day, how so many products are now being made out of wood, and out of our forests and I think it will not be outside the realm of possibility to say further that many more products will be made from the production of the soil which we can use and enjoy here in our own country.

Then, I am sure that the older members of the house would not want me to sit down without saying something about Hydro, because I have made a good many speeches in this House, and I doubt if one of them has concluded without some reference to Hydro, particularly as it affects the rural sections of Ontario.

I was very glad to hear the government's decision - or I should say the Hydro Commission's decision - to reduce the cost of power to $39.00 in every municipality, so that no municipality would have to pay more than $39.00. That is a fine step in the right direction; there is no question about that.

But I have no hesitancy at all in congratulating those who were responsible for initiating that movement. In my own riding I had some municipalities which were paying $65.00. Two or three years ago there were two of them paying $90.00 per horse-power for electrical energy. This will mean that none will pay over $39.00. It is certainly a mighty step forward, and I want to say to the commissioner who sits in the House tonight that I know he will not allow that $39.00 figure to be the final figure. It seems to me that as you lower the price of Hydro to the municipalities, and thus to the consumers, that the consumers, in gratitude, will turn the use of that Hydro to wider and wider services, that they will use much more Hydro than before, and consequently you have there the element which will serve to reduce the cost of power further and further. So I say to the commissioner, "Do not for a moment let the figure of $39.00 be your final figure," but let us keep pushing the price down until it gets down to, say $29.00, instead of $39.00, and then we will have in this province equal opportunity in all parts of the province to draw industry, to maintain and sustain them.

and we have not got that now.

Now, I want to come back to a little later in my remarks to link it up with something else I want to say, but for the moment I want to say a word about rural rates and the inability at the moment to get Hydro on the farm. I am not laying any claim at all on the shoulders of the commission. I know where the troubles lies. We cannot get releases of metal from the Metals Controller at Ottawa. They are, I presume, being used for even greater purposes than any Hydro on the farm.

So that we may have to be content for the moment with what we have already received. But there will come a day, perhaps sooner than we expect, at the moment, when metals will be released, and when extensions can go forward into rural areas, and there are still many areas in this province that are to be served by electric energy. I want to leave this thought with the commission tonight, when that period opens up, that I have always thought there was a little too much - what shall I say - my leader (Mr. Nixon) tells me "rigidity" is all right to use in that connection - but I feel the commissioner will get my point; I mean, if a man lives just a hundred rods past the "two to the mile", he cannot get Hydro whether or no, and we should make an effort in the days to come to see that Hydro gets on to every farm, even though the farmer is a little bit off the beaten path, and does not fall squarely and entirely within the boundaries of the regulation itself.

Back in 1934 I went to the commission - and I say this because there are so many members who can carry the gospel back home with them - back in 1934 the price of Hydro was two and one-half, a service charge and three to the mile, with a twenty-year contract.

This was prohibitive, as far as I can see. The farmer was not going to get much Hydro in while those regulations remained. Progressively, through the years the service charge has been reduced to a dollar, the clause which read "three to the mile" now reads "two to the mile", and the contract is for five years rather than twenty. There has been much progress made along that line and I do not want to add anything further except

to say that there is a change at the moment which is believed to be helping rural consumers in respect to rates, and I am at a tremendous disadvantage in disucssing this problem, because down in my riding we had a fixed rate before, and now we have a forced rate, so, I cannot criticize too strongly.the recent move toward levelling out the rates, but I understand in certain sections the price the consumer has to pay is much more. I do not think this will need to be debated any more at the moment. We will have an opportunity before the session is over to hear one on the government benches speaking for Hydro again, and I trust he will give us the picture as it really is.

I now want to speak for a moment or two, arising out a remark of the hon. prime minister the other day, when he spoke about the "decentralization of industry."

That has always been a very pet subject of mine and I think a pet subject of every man in this House who comes from a rural riding, and who knows the towns and villages in his riding are having a hard time to remain as they were. Every man who represents a rural riding knows that it is becoming more increasingly difficult to keep boys and girls back on the good old farm where they ought to be; it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain the population in our small towns and villages. Many of our villages are becoming - well, they are just not there any more; that is about the size of it. That is not a nice story to tell. It is tragedy in rural Ontario; it is a situation which has gone on over the years, and we have failed in our efforts and our young manhood and young womenhood are going into the larger centres of population. That has to be turned around some way, and because of that I welcome the words of hon. prime minister.

In my judgment, we have been over generous to the hub of the wheel and we have forgotten all too often the spokes which support it, and unless your spokes are virile and strong, the hub will deteriorate, just as surely as we sit in this room tonight.

So we have to find an answer to that problem and it does

seem to me that as the hon. prime minister suggested, the decentralization of industry would build up most of those small rural communities and would be one of the best things we could do in this legislature.

We have to, first of all, have a stable priced agricultural industry, for the protection of the farm. I think that is of primary importance. One of the reasons the boys and girls will not stay on the farm is because they cannot make a good enough living on the farm. Another reasons they will not stay on the farm is because the little centre around which they live has not the form of sultural life that they want and should have; it has not the form of entertainment that they enjoy, and that they should have, and my ideal of a rural community is to get farm prices to the place - and I think we will get them there; I think the forces of farm organization you can see growing every day will some day come into their own, and the farmer will have a stability they have not known before.

And there it is. If we get farm prices on a stabilized basis, if we get Hydro down to a price where our small towns can have some of these industries which will come here in abundance, I think, after this war is over, our problem will be largely solved. I can see a picture of the industrialists from England and other European countries wanting to come to this province of Ontario after the war is over. I can see them wanting to come to this new land of ours in which they believe they will have opportunities to live in peace and comfort and safety, a land in which they will think and know they can be happy, a country which they know has a future before it, and is going ahead and not backwards.

It seems to me that after this war we can look for an influx of branch plants of industrial concerns, and I do hope the hon. prime minister sees to it that he does all within his power to see that the opportunity is afforded, whether it is through Ontario House in London or as through one of his departments here - to do everything he can to see if there is any way under the sun where he can plan for these industries to be

distributed throughout this province, and if there is anything that can be done, definitely it should be done, because if each community had an industry which would sustain that community, around which a community large enough could be built, then that is an ideal situation.

If we have towns in the farming sections that are big enough for theatres, big enough for cultural outlets, that are big enough to have inducements and entertainment, and if we have a community that is big enough to have a good library, a place where farm and town people can meet on common ground, and there is no prejudice between the city people and the town people and the farm people nowadays, that will create an ideal situation.

There was a day in your memory and mine when there were prejudices raised up all the time between the people of the farms and villages, but that has gone completely, and if we had a sustaining industry in this town, something we could build around, a nucleus for community life, we could keep the people on the farm, and make for a very fine citizenship in the province of Ontario, and would be enabled to stand the shock of a depression, if one came, much better indeed than by chasing them all into one large metropolis, as has been our habit in the past.

Now, for a few minutes I want to speak and touch lightly upon two or three subjects.

The hon. prime minister - and I hope he does mind my taking his name in vain so often, but he gives us the leads and we must go on from there - he spoke to you about the health measures being put before the special committees in Ottawa. I think we will health schemes in Canada before very long, and an all-embracing one - because I think the people are demanding it. I do not doubt for a moment that this government and this province will be found ready to cooperate on a sane and sensible basis when we know what it is all about, but I just want to say to the hon. minister of health that we have in the county of Grey a peculiar problem with respect to health. He will find in his archives some place a record of a survey I had made some year or two ago of two townships in my riding of South Grey, and we found there was a prevalence of goiter in those localities. I have not got

the details with me tonight, but if my memory serves me correctly, every school child was examined in these two townships, the village of Markdale, and the township of Artemisia, and again, if my memory is correct, I think it was found that one-third of those children was suffering from goiter in some form or another. I do not say it was in an advanced stage, but they had it.

(Page 322 follows)

Now, that is a very serious matter. I think the Minister knows now that Grey County is one of the counties that is susceptible to that disease, more, perhaps, than many other communities in the Province.

When that survey was completed we sent it up to the medical association of the County of Grey; and it has been sent back and forward between the medical association of Grey and the department.

I would remind the minister, if he knows any way by which this matter could be brought to a head, he should do so in the interests of public health. I understand that the treatment for goitre is one that is mild in itself and easily taken, and effects a cure, as I understand it. If that is the case, then he will have my complete cooperation in the further progress in the reduction of the disease in any part of Ontario.

I want to say a word to the hon. gentleman at the end of the line, who looks so comfortable, the minister of highways. You know our part of the country is usually a snow belt, this is a very poor year to talk about snow, but next year it may be a lot worse, and it takes us a long time to get ready. But, seriously, Mr. Minister, I think your department will have to assume seventy-five per cent of the cost of snow ploughing in that snow belt up there before the people are going to get the service that these modern days demand.

I think that after this war is over people on the county roads, back from the towns, will want to get their cars out in the winter time; and fifty per cent of the cost, as it is at present borne by the county, is too great a financial responsibility in the belt that has a great deal of snow.

I think the minister will probably agree with that statement, because we have found up there in the past that you cannot interest councils to any great extent in the clearing of snow off the roads when they are obligated to pay fifty per cent of the cost.

I do not know what the minister will do. Certainly I do not think it is necessary to pay seventy-five per cent of the cost of the

removal of the snow, but after the war is ended, when we can get some rubber, we will want to drive our cars.

I have talked this matter over with the minister in his office, and I want to thank him for the interest he has taken in it. I am aware of the difficulties which it possesses.

Years ago, farmers never sent for a veterinary surgeon unless the old cow was pretty sick. His visits to the farm were few and far between. But they tell us, now, that we have taken all the mineral substances out of the soil, and if we do not give the pigs every two or three days, when they are young, a dose of something, or if you do not give the cattle a safeguard against blackleg, you are going to have something go wrong.

There is a certain number of diseases that beset farm animals to-day that are common to all herds. These diseases the farmer knows how to treat. He has the instrument with which to inject this serum into the animal. He knows the symptoms that the animal possesses when it needs this needle.

What I am trying to say is that I wish the minister would give some attention to this, that we could get these specific remedies for the specific and common diseases, and have them some place where the farmers could get them at cost.

I remember the day when there was blackleg in cattle. The gentleman in the center will be aware of this. I never got a smile of recognition at all. But, seriously, Mr. Minister, these pellets used to cost five cents a piece, and now they cost twenty-five cents each. And the serum for pigs and cattle costs five dollars a bottle, — that is about the price of other things about which I do not know.

I do not know if you can do anything about it or not, Mr. Minister. I do not think the veterinary would mind that, because you can hardly get a veterinary in the country nowadays, anyway. These two illnesses have to be looked after, and the farmer could give the treatments himself, if he could get the necessary supplies

at cost. I ask the minister to give this his consideration.

Now, I want to say just a few words that are a wee bit out of my own line; but I had a trip through northern Ontario sometime last summer, and had the opportunity of seeing a great section of that country.

We have many families of our own relatives living in the riding of my hon. friend from Algoma-Manitoulin. I do not think it is because of him that some of them are not progressing too rapidly.

AN HON. MEMBER: In spite of him.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Yes. The thought I wish to leave with the House is this, and the Minister realizes the situation. I remember those farmers around Blind River selling steers for $20.00 to $30.00 a piece, for which we on our own farms would get $50.00 and $60.00 each. Those cattle were sent down to Toronto and processed; and in many cases were shipped back to Northern Ontario.

AN HON. MEMBER: In other words, taken for a ride.

MR F. R. OLIVER: For a long, long ride.

It seems to me that the Governments of the past, — I will take my share of the responsibility that comes my way for that, — of paying too little attention to the agricultural needs of the great belt called Northern Ontario.

It seems to me that the live stock interests of the north would be served if we put small storage facilities with two small plants in the north country, where these cattle could be processed and where the meat could be put into cold storage, and where the great transportation costs could be eliminated. It seems to me that the north country would be the better for that; and I think it would help us from northern ontario to just get a picture in our minds of the requirements of the north.

I think the minister of agriculture pretty well understands the situation, but I want to point out that we in this corner will give him all possible assistance in doing whatever his judgment thinks would be best to improve the agricultural conditions of

northern Ontario.

There is one other thought I would like to leave with the House. We talked a moment or two ago about the packing houses, and about the big combines. I am very interested in a type of work that they call Cooperatives. I am actively —

HON. MR KENNEDY: You stop at cooperatives and do not go any further.

MR. F. R. OLIVER: Oh, surely. I can see in the future cooperatives growing to the extent so that some day you will not be worrying about who owns Canada Packers or who owns the big implement establishments; but the farmers will be making their own machinery and processing their own products in their own plants. That is as it should be.

Cooperatives have had a rather hazardous journey this far. They have been troubled by many diseases that were hard to throw off; but I think that during the last seven or ten years we have seen a growth in cooperatives which is little short of marvellous. I think they have gone over the hump, and I think they have provided the answer, in ninety per cent of the cases to the threat of monopolistic control of the necessities of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone within three minutes of the allotted time. These are the tings I believe about agriculture, and there are men in the Government ranks who believe the same. There are farmers around me in this group who feel that these things will have to be done before the country can be well again.

And, now, this is the only nasty thing I have to say in my address, and that is that my friends to the right cannot get a patent to these remedies for agricultural ills. They belong to all of us, and many of us have very deep seated convictions on these matters, and we would not sell out for anything. And if my friends to my right get it, it must be only transplanted. I mean, there is not any use in any one part in this House saying that they have the cureall for the ills of agriculture. Every farmer in this House has the answer to the

agricultural question. And we intend to pursue it, whether in office or out of office; and we will do all we can, and no power this side of heaven will stop us from doing the things which we have begun.

I want to say to the prime minister, before I sit down, that we have often, of late weeks, been called the ones that have the power to make and break governments, in this small corner, -- this ugly, forlorn remnant of a once great party can say "Yes" or "No", and you go out, Mr. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has said that he is not going to govern in fear. I do not think anyone can govern well if he is in fear. And I can say that in this corner the green light will be on if in the opinion of this corner is being done is in the best interests of this country. You can go forward with measures of reform which have in their substance a better life for Ontario.

The only time you will see the warning of the red of dagger will be when you try to put something through this Legislature which we think does not reflect the calm judgment of the members of this House and which is not for the good of Ontario. If that happens, there is only one course. But I know that the Prime Minister has in his make-up what it takes to bring commendation, as well as that which brings condemnation. And there is no reason why this House should not live its full allotted time. The complexion of it at the moment does not jar me at all. I think we have here the substance out of which beneficial legislation can be made, if we find a common ground. And we have got to find a common ground in these days. We are not going to play politics. This is not the time, if there ever was a time, when politics should be played, this is not the day; the day is too over past, and the duty is too great for any petty manoeuvring of that kind. What we want is good legislation for this province; and we will support you to the limit in getting it upon the statute books of Ontario. So that you need not rule in fear, but you can watch your legislation and make sure that it has the trade-mark of good and sound legislation. Thank you.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS; (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, almost every other member who has addressed the House in this debate to the time honoured custom of complimenting and lauding both the newly elected Speaker and those who speak in regard to the Speech from the Throne.

So many times has this been done already, and so well has it been done, that I feel that any words of mine could not add anything to what has already been said. May I, therefore, associate myself with what has been said in this connection, knowing that you will not misunderstand it as in any way being disrespectful to your high office or to yourself, if I do not carry on any longer with these phrases. They have already been said, and I associate myself with them.

There obviously has been nothing said about the last speaker, and it is a choice moment for me to avail myself of.

I consider myself very highly privileged to have sat here this evening and to have listened to such an excellent address, so constructive as that just delivered by the member for Grey South.

Of course I have listened to equally good addresses from other parts of the House, and I have almost made up my mind that on every subsequent occasion when I come into this House I will have some application membership cards to sign up these advocates of the C.C.F. program.

If the words that I hear mean anything, I certainly should not have any difficulty in getting them to sign on the dotted line. Perhaps the thing that has impressed me most, as one of the new members, in this Legislature, up to the present moment, is that with these general expressions of a burning desire to do these grand and noble things that we hear so much about, for the common people of the province, the thing that I cannot help marvelling about is that they have not been done long ago. We have not had the chance. We tried very hard, but perhaps we were not possessed of the persuasiveness shown by the hon. member for Grey South, for example.

I am not a bit surprised that nobody succeeds in defeating him. I would not like to pit myself against him. He talks with such

earnestness and seriousness, and such meaning and constructiveness that I know quite well he is well beloved by the people who have chosen him as their representative in Grey South.

Will all of these things that have been said, in the main, — perhaps I had better put that in, — I agree entirely. The phrases and the general expression of a desire to do something worth while for the people of the province. I agree with it all; and from that standpoint I do not intend to say anything further to-day. Neither am I going to try to go through the whole of the Speech from the Throne. I must confess that in the aspect with which I am going to deal to-night, that is referred to in the Speech from the Throne, I am grievously disappointed. The Speech from the Throne seems to me to be savouring very largely of too great a desire to please all people, without actually touching any of the fundamentals which determine the standard of the livelihood of the people.

I am amazed that so little has been said about labour. I think it is fortunate, in a sense, that I have the honour to follow in this debate, the member from Grey South. I agree entirely with what he said about the importance of agriculture and farmers. I am quite certain that the member from Grey South will also agree with me that, great and important though farmers and agriculture are, labour too is just as important.

I am quite certain that I am on safe ground when I say that, the two greatest factors in this Province, in this country or in any other country, are those who produce the food we eat and those who weave and make the clothes we wear, those on the farm and those in the factory are the two greatest groups. So that I am on safe ground, I know, when I link up this great force of labour with the great force of agriculture. Without them there would be no light, — none at all.

We could sit here and talk from now until doomsday, but if the people on the farms and the people in the factory did not, every day, year in and year out, do their part or their share, all our talk would be just so much waste of time. They are the people who matter; and

I think everything that we do in this Legislature should be governed entirely that the things we do are going to have an effect on these two great forces in our Province.

I am just going here to-night to deal with the question of labour. I do not think I am going to touch any other part of the speech from the Throne except that one.

The member from Grey South, when he looked at us just here in his reference to farmers, was somewhat disappointed that we did not smile. Well, maybe, when I look down into that corner when referring to labour, I won't receive any smile either.

I must admit that for more than a year the party, the political party in this country upon which the present administration is drawn, has been spending a great deal of its time trying to woo labour. They tried, and tried very hard, to create a halo for themselves, as far as labour is concerned.

I do not know exactly whether my period of time is strictly correct about a year, but I do know that they started off with a great band down at Port Hope, and they travelled from Port Hope to Winnipeg, where they endulged in the same kind of language. And I noticed that in the account of the Port Hope conference the matters dealt with, as far as labour is concerned, is claimed by the Globe and Mail of September 7th to be very outstanding. It says: "Foremost in the statement of policy is a blunt advocacy that by "Dominion-Provincial agreement, or failing such agreement, then by appropriate legislation, jurisdiction affecting industrial labour relations be vested in the Dominion".

In sections covering freedom of association, collective bargaining guarantees and penalty provisions, together with suggested organization for conciliation service, conference leaders stated the committee had drafted, in effect, a Canadian edition of the Wagner Act.

As I have said, they went to Winnipeg, and after they got over the difficulty of choosing a leader, -- which is not always an easy job, -- there again this policy emunicated in Port Hope, was adopted by the Winnipeg convention of the Conservaties on Friday, December 11th.

Everything, from that time until the present has been done by the now, I must call them the Progressive Conservatives who win labour to its side. And right up to the last provincial election, we saw that a gigantic effort was being made. And we find in number five of the twenty-two points we have a most positive, definite assurance of what the Progressive Conservative party in Ontario, if elected, would give the worker. It says that they will give workers and employers the fairest and most advanced labour laws, -- not just labour legislation, you see, not just what ordinarily people speak about, but this is going to be the fairest and most advanced labour laws. And they are going to do it by empowering an Ontario labour committee to outline a plan based upon the study of labour laws of other countries, with a view to adopting and enforcing labour legislation. There is no doubt at all about the langunge of that Fifth point. Whatever doubt one might have had about it being put into operation at that particular moment, there was no doubt as to what that Fifth item meant.

Well, I am not a bit surprised, not a bit surprised that the Conservatives of this Country made such a gigantic effort for more than a year to win labour to its side, remembering the state that the party had got itself into, remembering that in none of the governments across Canada had this one time great party anything more than a remnant. I am not a bit surprised that they strove to create the impression that a new era had dawned.

I was one of those who was prepared, if they did get elected, to give them a real chance. I was quite prepared to give them the chance right up until February 22nd, indeed until about half past three or twenty minutes to four on Friday, February 22nd. And when I heard his honour, the Lieutenant Governor read from the Throne the Speech he did

and come to that part dealing with labour, my hopes of any goodness coming to labour was immediately blasted; and I concluded there and then that as far as labour in this province was concerned, it was being given just another good old run-around.

I said I was not a bit surprised that the Conservatives should strive to convince labour that the Conservatives were now on their side. The record of the Conservatives, to say the least of it, is pretty bad, pretty bad. But when I saw this program, this propaganda that was coming out, I really began to wonder who are these people? And, after February 22nd I began again to check up to find out if the people that I thought they were were really that kind of people. And in checking up since February 22nd, I find that I am under no misapprenhension as to who they are at all, so far as labour is concerned.

The fact that the leopard had added a spot does not change the leopard. And the leopard in this particular case did not have the extra spot on him, it is true, but he was the leopard, just the same. And that particular political leopard I find, on looking up the record, was sending tanks to Stratford. This is not new to those who are in labour and to those in this House. I believe there are only about three members in the House who were members when the administration of that day did send tanks to Stratford.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister) They were not tanks, of course, but still --

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: I must confess I do not know where they got the tanks from to send, but all I can go by is from the record in the Fort William Times-Journal of November 22nd; and if they were not tanks, don't blame the tanks, but blame me. It says here five machine guns equipped baby tanks. If they were not baby tanks, let it go by saying that they send five machine guns equipped vehicles.

At any rate, the administration of that day, which was a liberal administration and not a C. C. F. administration, -- all I know is that the administration of that particular day took steps to send

this military force into Stratford for the purpose of intimidating, Oh, we won't describe it as any stronger than intimidating the workers who were demanding better wages.

Now, these workers, — I think I ought to put it on the record, — were not demanding like we as legislators get, — I mean I can sit here on Friday afternoon for an hour and get $20.00 for it.

HON. MR HUNTAR: When you get your final cheque you will be surprised.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: That final cheque will be a little more than the tanks they sent to Stratford, because I find on the record that these people were striking for better wages in a furniture plant and in a poultry plant; and the record goes on to say that even a man's skill in poultry plucking could only earn $2.00 a day. I wonder what the unskilled was earning. I leave it to the imagination of this House what a high standard of living people were having, skilled ones at that, on two bucks a day.

A very great socialist was once asked in the old country, — his name was Kier Hardy, — in a public meeting. Can a man be a Christian on a pound a week. Here Hardy's reply was, He could not be much else, could he?

I think you will agree with me that people who were getting $2.00 a day in Stratford were not people who could have a very wild time. They did not spend much time in frivolity, and yet they had the temerity to demand a better standard of living and better wages. And the attorney general of the administration of that day had a Welsh name, but he was not Welsh. One named Price, which is a very Welsh name, was the man who was responsible for the sending with the consent of the administration of that day the soldiers, seventy of them, to Stratford.

But, then, that is September, 1933, a long time away, I suppose. We have all grown up and improved, and everything in the world has been so grand. But we can come forward a few years, can't we, and there are several members in the present Legislature here just what was going to happen to the C. I. O., in 1937, in Oshawa.

I can well remember, — as a matter of fact, I do not know how the hon. members can sit so comfortably as I see them sitting, and know that the terrible man who was responsible for this C. I. O. coming into Oshawa is here. Here he is, look, he is sitting here quite comfortably. But members of this Legislature were willing, sure, they were willing, to use any force at all. Why, they agreed to raise a little army, didn't they, in order to prevent the C. I. O.

Oh, there is no doubt about it, they were going to drive the C.I.O. out of Ontario. Well, may I say this, that I think that the driving only encouraged the determination on the part of the workers to see they were not driven out. Even since 1937--as a matter of fact in 1941, at a little place out here in New Toronto, the workers in a canning plant, the Campbell Soup Plant in New Toronto, they too had the unmitigated impudence to go on strike for better wages. How dare they! That was the attitude in the Legislature because, again, here go the Provincial Police out to New Toronto. Now, it is true that the Attorney-General of that particular incident and the Oshawa incident--his name was not Price; it is true that it was not a Conservative administration. This time it happened to be a Liberal administration, and I am forced to come to the conclusion, which is not a new one as far as I am concerned, and with very great respect to gentlemen sitting amongst the members in this House that I admire immensely--it would be discourteous of me to mention any names. I will do it another way if it is required. I will slip them a note. But I am forced to the conclusion that when it comes down to brass tacks as far as either farmers on the farms or workers in the factory are concerned, that there is not the slightest difference between the people who have ruled us in the days of Stratford or the days of Oshawa, whether it be Conservatives or Liberals who happen to form the administration. Now, I repeat that up until this particular incident on February 22nd, I was willing to give them a chance. You see, they had demonstrated, had not they, that they were the leaders from one end of the country to the other. This supposedly rejuvenated party unquestionably in their own words, were the leaders. Everybody was out of step and out of tune, whether it be the Federal Government or whether it be the Legislature of Ontario. The only ones that could do anything and know how to do anything, were this supposedly rejuvenated party. But the manner in which they have handled this problem of labour as far as the speech from the throne is concerned, tells me that leaders = they are in very truth, but it is leaders of buck-passing because all they have done is to try to keep their skirts clean of this question of labour. That is all. And that is nothing new.

Twelve months ago in this House there was a discussion on this very same problem of labour--the very same--and they skidded around most adroitly in order that they would not have to touch this thing called labour. It is easy enough to stand up on a platform, as their chief salesman is doing at the present time, from one end of the country to the other--it is easy enough to stand up on a platform and declard in general terms that labour shall have the rights to choose its own union, but when it comes down to putting that thing into a clause, it is a different problem altogether.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since the member was not here I perhaps, so that you will not be incorredt, might remind you that the party now in power did take a very positive stand on this matter and it was not the government that put the Act into effect. I do trust, in view of the course that the debate is following, that the member will be logical and move a want-of-confidence motion at the end of this discussion.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): In reply to the Prime Minister's point just raised, Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that when I get through I am quite definite that he will find there was no necessity to even say what he did now. I am quite certain. I am just wanting to get my approach to this kind of thing simply because I want to get the thing straight.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not calling you to order, the hon. member for Ontario, but I must say I do solicit all co-operation. I think you will keep the debate on a higher plane if you refrain from asides. Please do not have asides, if you will.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I would like to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, the reason for my approach to this question in this particular way. I have already read out from the fifth point of these twenty-two points in which they are so positive about what they are going to do in the part that deals in the throne speech with the question of labour, labour relations code, collective bargaining code, in the last paragraph of that portion of the speech dealing with labour and it says this: "A few days ago the Dominion Government adopted a National Labour Relations Code limited in its application to war industries. This Code

will supersede any Provincial legislation dealing with the subjects covered in this Code so far as war industries are concerned, and my Ministers are of the opinion that it will be in the best interests of employees, employers and the general public if this Code is extended in its effect to all industries within Ontario. Legislation will therefore be presented to you which will give effect to this decision.)

Now, in view of the wide disparity between what you sought the suffrage of the electors on, and what is said here in the throne speech, I should mention that it is perfectly correct for me to find out just what the situation is and analyze the whole thing as best I am able, because this code, this Federal Order, the Ontario government is not compelled to accept it. I know. I know the Ontario spokesman has never indicated that they are compelled to accept this. It is a purely optional thing as far as the Ontario government is concerned.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt but I do wish to keep the record clear. I was most emphatic in the declaration that this code being a Dominion code under the War Measures Act supersedes any other legislation which would conflict with it.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South): Is this a point of order?

THE SPEAKER: Mr. Drew addressed me on point of orders. I ascertained that. I conceded him the right to rise to a point of order and I again solicit your co-operation in refraining from asides and interpolations. If you have any corrections to make, do, but please quit the cross-firing from side benches.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I will just continue. What I was actually pointing out is this: no matter what the earlier difference was, it is merely to keep the records straight. The speaker has said that it had not been indicated that there was any necessity to accept the Dominion code. I was pointing out to him that I did understand it was necessary, that it over-rode the field, and we were extending this to the whole field by the legislation that will be introduced here to make it uniform.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the point has been made. Am I not permitted to make any comments about the

point that has been made?

SEVERAL Hon. Members: Sure, sure.

THE SPEAKER: If you can proceed with your address, I will be happy.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I am very desirous of helping you in a difficult task and I hope I always shall, and I am quite sure that you and I will get along together in the manner in which we both intend to get along and the whole thing will proceed very happily.

THE SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Having heard the point just made reinforcing the point I was making, I move on from that particular point, having shown the wide disparity between promise and practice and the fact that the practice was not compulsory which means that it was left to the good judgment of the government as to whether they should adopt it or not, I say---

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, after all, these debates are being recorded and I had thought that my English was simple enough. You are placing it on the basis of what was said here. Not only I but the Attorney-General (Hon. Leslie Blackwell) has made it clear as has also the Minister of Labour (Hon. Charles Daley) that this code does over-ride any other law insofar as war industries are concerned, that we have no choice but to accept it; that we were informed on the very day we took office of the intention to introduce such a code. When it was introduced we immediately announced out intention of covering the balance of the field in the non-war industries. Surely you heard what was just said. We made it clear the code is not optional but necessarily applicable to all war industries as it says in that order-in-council.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): I rise to a point of order. The Prime Minister has three times interrupted the hon. member from Ontario in what is an effort to explain his own position rather than a point of order. The Prime Minister has had ample time to explain his position and will again. I suggest that if the Prime Minister will just be patient, he will find that the hon. members understand the order and its scope.

THE SPEAKER: I submit, Mr. Jolliffe, that is hardly a point of order. Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I do not know how long I am going to go on but here goes again. So I did not intend to do this at this particular juncture, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be better in order that hon., the Prime Minister, can sit for a few moments at least comfortably, I would like to point out to him on page 3 of this new order, section 4, it says this: "If a provincial legislature applies these regulations to any employee..." that very wording indicates that it is optional. Now, it is not optional as far as war industries are concerned. But there are employees in the province of Ontario not working in war industries. I know just what the government has said. I know what the Hon. Minister of Labour has said in regard to the code, this Order. I am not talking about something that I happen to have heard. I have taken the trouble to get the records so that we will get the whole record straight. So that this point of this Order being applicable to all of the people in the province has only become applicable because of the fact that the Ontario government, through the Minister of Labour, (Hon. Charles Daley) made the announcement of its intention to make it apply to all workers in the province, and for no other reason.

Back in April, a little less than 12 months ago, I was trying to point out when the interruption started, when in this legislature there was under discussion the very same thing that I am trying to discuss now, the hon. members opposite--at least some of them; they were not all here then, but some of them were in the opposition--would not even have members chosen from among their number to sit on a committee to discuss or have anything to do with this question of labour. I was just going to remark, which you do not like and I will refrain from doing it.

THE SPEAKER: I am referring to asides of the members interrupting.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I was so anxious to help you, I thought you were referring to me. The Premier, who a little less than 12 months ago was the leader of the opposition at that time, referred to the committee in a press release, referred to the committee established by the then Liberal Legislature as a device to escape the necessity of having to introduce any collective bargaining. Now, that is in the records, and as a release by the hon., the member for High Park.

In coming again to this number 5--now, I know they call it a commission here whereas the previous administration called theirs a committee. I am not well up--I am like the hon. member for South Grey (F. R. Oliver)--I have nobody with the knowledge of the leader of the Liberals who can advise me which is the right interpretation or right phrase to use, so I have to sort of plod along on my own. There may be some difference in the commission that the Conservatives intend to set up under their fifth point, and the committee that the Liberals set up. Frankly, I do not see any difference--if yours was a device to escape the consequence of introducing collective bargaining,--I cannot see that the thing in this fifth point is anything else but a device and I think I am right in my conclusion in that respect because I find out that the hon. members opposite have not introduced any collective bargaining but have taken somebody else's under protest. I say again that on this question of collective bargaining that it is one of the most urgently needed things in this province at the present time. This is only a war measure, this Federal Order. There is nobody going to disagree with that statement because it is just a statement of the practice. That is amplified by the fact that the Federal government has made it only to apply to war industries. We are anxious to know--very anxious to know--what happens about this question of collective bargaining when the war ends.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Lincoln): Why don't you wait until the Bill is introduced?

THE SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Well, I don't know, I am a sort of impatient individual.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Lincoln): Too bad for us to have to work overtime here.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): And because I am somewhat impatient, I am particularly anxious for the days that are ahead to make sure that we do not have any more Stratfords at $2.00 a day and that we don't have any more Kirkland Lakes and that we don't have any more Galts, and inasmuch as you so positively and definitely declare what you are going to do at a time, mark you, when everybody interested in these policies in any part of the country knew that the Federal government was handling and investigating this problem of labour. Last April even while you here in this legislature

discussing a collective bargaining Bill (Collective Bargaining Bill) the National War Labour Board undertook to conduct an industrial probe to discover the reasons for the industrial unrest and the question of collective bargaining. So that when you came out with your twenty-two points and number five in particular, you knew then that the Federal government was handling this particular problem, was investigating it. The Minister of Labour shakes his head. Well then, I say everybody else in the country excepting the Minister of Labour knew that the Federal government was handling this problem of labour. And now the issue has been shirked, completely shirked. The administration has sought refuge. Instead of maintaining its positive and assertive attitude, the administration has sought refuge in this Order. I want to say most emphatically that when the Minister of Labour announced that it was the intention of the government of Ontario to make this Order apply to other industries in the province that he at that time said that he did not know what the code was. We have not seen the code. Those were the words--"We have not seen the code." I am quite certain that it does not indicate very startling leadership when something is applied that they have not seen.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Lincoln): The two congresses approved of it.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): I would like to reply to a point of order. This is for the purpose of the records too. If the member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) read the statement of the government he should be fair enough to this house to state that there was a reservation contained in the code's announcement by which the government would have the opportunity of satisfying itself that the code was satisfactory before being introduced and I would appreciate if you would clear that up instead of making this statement about it.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): Is that a point of order?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Certainly it is.

THE SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): The statement has just been made, Mr. Speaker, that this code has been accepted by the two congresses. I must most emphatically contradict that statement.

All that has happened is that two statements have been made by two presidents of two congresses, but up to this present moment the membership of those congresses have not as an entity expressed its point of view in regard to the acceptance of rejection of this code.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Lincoln): Whose point of view are you expressing?

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I am expressing the point of view of one of the largest trades unions in the Dominion of Canada and in order that I shall convince the hon. members opposite about that I would like to read this telegram. It is addressed to myself:

"The UAW-CIO representing the largest group of organized war workers in Ontario strongly protest the proposed action of the government in adopting the Federal Labour Code as suitable legislation covering Ontario. The new code neither meets the demands of organized labour nor fulfills the pre-election promise of Premier Drew who promised model collective bargaining legislation for Ontario. The Federal Code does not make bargaining compulsory. Does not compel employers to recognize trade unions. Does not make company sponsored unions illegal. Does not require a company to bargain in good faith. Does not protect employees right to organize. Does not protect the position of collective bargaining agencies all ready certified. The old conciliation boards which have proven to be failures are included in the Act. This conciliation board procedure caused the Kirkland Lake strike. We are hopeful you will be able to impress the government sufficiently to make them conscious of the fact that the adoption of the Federal Code will throw terrific responsibility on our union leadership to prevent serious disorders in plants. The government adoption of such a code for Ontario will only indicate to our union either the lack of appreciation of the problem on the part of the government or a case of deliberately breaking a pre-election pledge to the people of Ontario." Signed George Burt, Regional Director, UAW-CIO."

As far as I am concerned, I will always accept the expression of opinion of the membership of a union in preference to any statements that are made by leaders of unions, who, perhaps, when they

make the statements may not have had the opportunity of consulting the membership, and that is precisely the situation as far as the two heads of the two congresses are concerned. I am quite positive that when the membership of the union registers its opinion in regard to this that it will back up the statement or the telegram I have just read. So I am not merely expressing my own point of view; I am expressing the point of view of the membership of the CCF-CIO, and I am happy to say, too, I am expressing the unanimous opinion of 19 trade unionists who sit on this side of the House. As far as the statement that I made regarding the announcement of the hon., the Minister of Labour (Hon. Charles Daley) announcing the intention of the provincial government to accept or make this legislation apply to all of the province of Ontario, in which he said at that particular time that they had not seen the code, I have no other comments to make on that, because that is precisely what the press release from the hon., the Minister of Labour (Hon. Charles Daley) said.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is precisely what the press release did not say.

THE SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): If you allow me a moment, I would like to find the press release here.

THE SPEAKER: I will.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I did not have to look very far or very long. This release that I am going to quote was contained in two other Toronto papers, but I have chosen this particular one because I am quite certain that the hon. members opposite won't be so inclined to contradict the publication which is their political Bible. I am quoting from the Globe and Mail, Saturday, February 19, 1944, and it says this, Mr. Speaker:

"The Ontario Government 'has no choice' but to accept the Dominion's labor relations code, but will pass the necessary legislation to bring all industry under its provisions, Labor Minister Charles Daley said yesterday at Queen's Park. The Dominion code relates only to war industries. Mr. Daley's statement followed a Cabinet Council session.

Mr. Daley revealed that the Province had drafted its own Labor Relations Act for presentation to the Legislature, but in

view of the action by Ottawa, the act would not be introduced now.

The Dominion Government has chosen to disregard our recommendations which were supported at the time of the Dominion-Provincial conference by eight of the nine Provinces," said Mr. Daley. "They have passed a code limited in its application to war industries. Although we have not received a copy of the code, we are informed by newspaper reports that it will apply to 2,500,000 of the 3,500,000 employed in industry in Canada."

Now, that is where I am taking the statement. I will read the rest if you like quite happily, but I do not think I need go on.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): You better read it all.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Do you want it all read?

THE SPEAKER: Go ahead with it.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): The last words were about 2,500,000 of the 3,500,000 employed in industry in Canada.

"Under those circumstances we have no choice but to accept this code for which the Dominion Government must assume full responsibility.

'Believing as we do that any code of this nature should apply to all industry, we will pass the necessary legislation to bring all industry in Ontario within its provisions,' the Labor Minister continued.

Withhold Drafted Bill:

'Because of the uncertainty as to what the Dominion Government intended to do and our inability to obtain information which we had requested from them, we drafted a Labor Relations Act for Ontario which was ready for presentation to the Legislature next week,' he said, 'It would be impractical, however, to introduce such an act applicable only to those industries not described as war industries 'as the same may be changed by Dominion Order-in-Council from time to time.' This would have caused endless confusion and administrative difficulties to the detriment of both employees and employers.

The act prepared by the Provincial Government, therefore, will not be introduced at the present time, and necessary enabling legislation will be passed to give the most effective possible

administration to the labor code which the Dominion Government has adopted."

Thus ends the reading of the first lesson from the Globe and Mail.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Lincoln): Very well reported.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): And the report of the Daily Telegram and Evening Star was just the same.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Continuing point of order, may I remind that does not preclude in the enabling legislation, insofar as non-war industry is concerned, the clarifying of any weakness in that code and I do not think the member should represent the fact that we intended to introduce a code covering war industries but every industry if it has disabilities that we could cure by our own legislation.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): I object.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, may I ask you a question, please.

MR. SPEAKER: First let me clear the air. We were getting along very happily for two weeks. Let us try and continue the attitude we had for two weeks. I think the hon. member, the Attorney-General (Hon. Leslie E. Blackwell) is pointing out to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Arthur Williams) that he was commenting on something that he would anticipate would happen and not fact. Let us discuss facts.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question respectfully to you? I would like to understand very clearly whether it is going to be in order for me and other honourable members on this side of the House to rise on a so-called point of order every time we think something has been omitted which, in our opinion ought to have been said and take up the time of this House explaining our position on a difference of opinion with the honourable member who has the floor. I submit, Mr. Speaker with all respect to you, that the interruptions we have heard are not points of order at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, I ask you to pursue your happy course, and I might say that has not been confined to one side of the House only. I think you have had your share of that yourself and I do say if a point of order rises and is not properly taken, I will rule it out. I trust that points of order will cease to be raised

and let us get along with the discussion.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I feel, Mr. Speaker, compelled because of the interruptions--though personally I do not mind them except that it makes your job all the harder--but I am compelled to refer again to the reference that I was making when the point of order of interruption arose, and it was this, Mr. Speaker, that I declared that when the hon., the Minister of Labour, (Hon.Charles Daley) announced the government's intention to have this federal order applied to all of the industries, all of the workers in the province, that he said at the time that he did not know what was in the code and then I was challenged to read--my word was doubted about it--and then I was challenged to read this particular item which I have read, which is a press release of the hon. the Minister of Labour (Hon.Charles Daley) and I stand by that statement, Mr. Speaker, and feel that the points that have been raised are just mere interruptions, although I am not questioning your ruling one/little bit.

I think I understand quite clearly the uneasiness that exists on the government benches in regard to this question of labour. The concern that they have endeavoured to convince labour/for more than a year, that they had for labour, does not seem to be measuring up so hot just now and therefore I can understand the desire on the part of the honourable members opposite to try and retain the glamour that they have striven to convince labour that they had for labour, but it is not going over so good. I am convinced--and I am convinced because of another portion of this article from the Globe and Mail that I read out, the portion that referred to the statement of the hon., the Minister of Labour (Hon. Charles Daley) that they had their own labour code prepared. I think here I am doing credit--maybe I am not entitled to, but nevertheless I am going to stick my chin out and give the members of the government credit for having a labour code consistent with this particular fifth point, that it is far advanced. I am quite certain that these are days when leadership is necessary. I read to you a telegram, though I read it earlier than I intended to do--I read to you a telegram of opinion from the membership of a big union in Canada in regards to this Federal Code and I do think that if there is legislation prepared by this government

of Ontario that that legislation should be put on the table here and I submit, Mr. Minister, if you have got it, it can be brought here in 10 minutes and let this house examine it as to whether that legislation is the fairest and most advanced in order that the whole of this House can battle for the improvement of something that the Federal government has brought out. If you are not prepared to show that degree of help then I can only conclude that the fair and advanced labour legislation that you say you are going to give to labour just is a statement and will remain a statement. I make that as a challenge. Now, you can send a note in 10 minutes, the thing can be back here if it is existence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have gone much over my time, but there is an important phase of my remarks on this question of labour that I still want to deal with, and the part that I want to deal with particularly is, first of all, to clear up any doubt about the fear of advanced labour legislation.

The federal government called a Dominion-Provincial convention on the question of labour and I believe at the time the hon. premier was not in the country and representing it was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture--

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): One minute; I am sure the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) wants to be accurate, at least on some occasions, and I want to tell him that I was in the country, and it was at my request that the conference was called.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): I would not deprive the hon. premier of that bit of credit if he wants to take it up to himself. All I know is, even though he believes that I want to be fair on some occasions--I want to assure the hon. premier that I want to be fair on all occasions, and that insinuation is not unnoticed by myself.

Well, whoever called the convention, or the conference, the Dominion-Provincial convention--whoever suggested it--all I said was that a Dominion-Provincial conference was held, and that the hon. premier was out of the country and representing him was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture--

SEVERAL Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): All right, the record is wrong then; maybe it was the Hon. Minister of Labour and I believe the Hon. Attorney General. I am not quite sure about whether the Hon. Attorney General was present, but I am positive that the other two were.

SEVERAL Hon. Members: No, no.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): May we get this quite straight. I was in the country and those who were present were the Hon. Attorney General, the Hon. Minister of Labour, and not the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Well, it was that particular

time, at the time of this convention, or conference in Ottawa--whoever was present--they did have a code submitted to them.

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker--

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order?

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Yes, for the purpose of the record may I say that we did not have a code submitted to us at that time.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Well, suppose I read this, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhat incomprehensible, if there is not a code presented, because I think you will agree when I read this--

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): That is what we thought.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): This says:

"It will give Ontario a chance to protest."--that is the heading of the article, and this time it is from the Toronto Daily Star, which would account, of course, for the heading. But we will go on:

> "This will give Ontario a chance to protest:
>
> "Prime Minister King has replied to the Ontario Government protest against any limitations on the scope of the proposed labour code by telling the province that an opportunity will be given to answer an official protest. Hon. T. L. Kennedy, acting Premier, said this after a Cabinet meeting to-day."

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): I wish to rise again to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is a plain error on the record. This was very substantially after the conference was held at Ottawa.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): That is what I am saying; that is what I am saying, man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it might be well if you allowed the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) to complete his address, and then if it contains anything that is not a statement of fact, it can certainly be brought up at that time.

I would also like to say that I am not hard of hearing, and I heard one remark this evening, and I want to make it emphatically clear to the hon. members of this House that I am the speaker of the House, and not the speaker of the

government. I would like to have that clearly understood.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, as a member of this legislature who happened to be on his feet and speaking while you were making that remark, I want to assure you that I am quite satisfied--I am perfectly satisfied--with the fairness that you have shown me during my efforts here this evening, and I am sorry, very sorry, that such a statement was made. I do not know who made it, but if it was made, I am extremely sorry, I would like you to know that I did not make any such statement as that, and I would not like anybody to get the impression that I, being on my feet, made any such statement, because I do not want to be convicted of something I never did. I get convicted of a lot.

May I go on with this article, starting at the second verse?

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): You notice that I finished the first verse by reading that "Hon. T. L. Kennedy, Acting Premier, said this, after a Cabinet meeting to-day." and the day was December 7th. Now, I will go on:

"A draft of a proposed code will be submitted to the province and any objections to it will be considered by the Federal authorities,"Mr. King told the province.

"We have not decided what we shall do if the Federal code is adopted in the proposed form,"Col. Kennedy said. "As we see it, however, it is impossible to limit a labour code to war industry. There will be chaos when workmen from war plants and non-war plants get together to discuss relative conditions in their plant. We are agreed with the Federal authorities on the terms of the proposed code, and the only point of divergence is in its scope."

If you never saw one, how do you know what the terms were? That is not in the article, of course, the article includes:

"We are agreed with the Federal authorities on the terms of the proposed code and the only point of divergence is in its scope."

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): I am very sorry, but I certainly have a point of order there, because the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Arthur Williams) says, "If we never saw one, how could we agree?" May I remind him that my statement about not seeing the code was directed to the time of the conference at Ottawa. The period he is now speaking of was several weeks later when the code had been sent from Ottawa here. That was the first one we saw. That is for the records.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Well, so there was a code, and they are agreed, and this time I will get it right, Col. Kennedy said, "We have agreed." and he was the Acting Premier. He said, "we are agreed with the Federal authorities on the terms of the proposed code." He said, "The only point of divergence is in his scope." Now, that was in December. I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of reading the Code that was in existence on December 7th--a draft of it--dated December 7th. This one which is the one that the Ontario government, through the Minister of Labour, has indicated it is his intention to implement through all other workers in the province, --this one was not in existence. This code was not in existence on December 7th, but there was a code in existence, and I had the opportunity of reading and studying that Nazi doctrine that was in existence on December 7th, and you never saw nor heard nor read any document purporting to relate to labour in any other lands than countries like Germany, or Italy or Japan. And yet Col. Kennedy, the Acting Premier when that code which was in existence on December 7th,--that was the one that Col. Kennedy said, as the Acting Premier, "We are agreed with the Federal authorities on the terms of the proposed code; the only point of divergence is in its scope."

Now, because of that, I want to relate it again to this fifth point. Hon. members of this house have not had, perhaps, the opportunity of reading the code that is now before the workers of the province or the Dominion of Canada, and the previous code which was in existence on December 7th. They may not have had the opportunity of looking at either of them. We

have. Our 19 trade unionists have had the opportunity of studying it, and have had assistance in our studying. And when we find that this government, through its acting premier, indicates its agreement with the provisions of that code of December 7th, I cannot help but conclude that it has no relation at all--no relation at all--to being the fairest and most advanced labour legislation. The kind of thing they were willing to accept was the kind of thing that I say could only be found in countries like Germany, Italy, or Japan.

Now, this particular code, I think it is my duty to try and point out some of the things in this code. I am referring now to the federal code that the Ontario government has indicated its attention to make apply to the rest of the workers in the province.

Right at the start,--I think I have said this once, but I want to say it again--this is only a code for wartime; it is not a code for peacetime, but a code for wartime, and because there is so much in it I am going to criticize, I want to again give credit where it is due by saying that there are some sections of this code that are rather good; but I doubt very much whether the "rather good" sections are good enough to stand up against the very bad sections. There are some things in the definitions that we are not satisfied with, and without going into those, may I say that on page 3, under the heading of, "The Rights of Employers",--oh, I beg your pardon, "The rights of employees and employers.", on page 3, Section 4, subsection 1, says:

> "Every employee shall have the right to be a member of a trade union or employees organization, and to participate in the lawful activities thereof."

We do not like that section because of the sleazy way in which they deal company unions. That "employees' organizations" is nothing more nor less than a direct incitement and encouragement to subversive interests in Ontario--

SEVERAL Hon. Members: No, no.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario)--and certain company unions, in order to sabotage general trade unions. We do not like that. We would have no argument at all if the clause

read, "Every employee shall have the right to be a member of a trade union and participate in the lawful activities thereof".

I know you will join with me in getting a good laugh out of the second paragraph:

"Every employer shall have the right to be a member of Employer's organization and to participate in the lawful activities thereof."

So now we can give the green light to the manufacturer's association, and tell the employers that it is perfectly permissible now for them to join the manufacturers' association.

However, that is only a bit of window-dressing, of course.

Number 3, which is a very serious clause, is one to which I would like the hon. members to pay the closest attention. It says:

"Where bargaining representatives have been certified under Section 8, the bargaining representatives of the employees' employer may"--"may"--"in accordance with the procedure hereinafter set out, enter into negotiations with a view to the completion of an agreement between the employers concerned on the one hand, and the trade unions or associations on the other hand."

We in the trade unions had endless arguments and debates in all kinds of directions about order-in-council 2165--you know, the one which deals with "the workers shall have the right to join unions of their own choosing, free from interference by their employers."--

AN HON. MEMBER: You seem to have memorized that.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario):--and we used to "go to town" on that order-in-council, but we found it was not mandatory, because it contained the word "may" instead of "shall".

So another order-in-council was passed, number 7440, which was the genesis of the cost of living bonus business. Some workers in various parts of Canada were receiving a cost of living bonus at the rate of $4. 60, whereas other workers were only receiving 90 cents. How come the difference? Some

employers--and thank God there are some employers in the Dominion of Canada who are decent, and I am very glad of that; we had the happiest relations with some employers, through our dealings with trade unions, and nobody is more appreciative than us to see there are decent employers--and they started out by paying the cost of living bonus when order-in-council 7440 came out, but the indecent employers, the irresponsible employers, did not start paying the cost of living bonus until just lately, when the Government brought out another order-in-council, in which they said the cost of living bonus shall be paid, and then they started at 60 cents, while others had been paying the whole cost of living bonus from the commencement. In other words, there was a condoning of the irresponsibility/or of the indecency of other employers, by not compelling them to pay the full cost of living bonus, because these orders-in-council were not mandatory, because they contained the word "may" instead of the word "shall".

We find exactly the same thing in this subsection 3 of number 4:

"Where bargaining representatives have been certified under section 8, the bargaining representatives or employees' employer may"--I suppose that is a typographical error; it should have been "shall"--but the fact is, it is "may", and the rest of it does not amount to a row of pins--not a row of pins.

We come to other sections in the Order, Section 5, which if it is going to be accepted as a guide to future elections or if we are going to support it in this legislature, we really are supporting something which does not exist in our own particular case. Here it says, in number 1 of section 5:

"The employees of any employer may elect a bargaining representative by a majority vote of the employees affected."

Well, we are elected, not by a majority vote of the electors affected, but we are elected by a majority vote of those who vote. But that is not the principle here. If you get out of a plant of 100 employees, 70 of them voting, even though you get a majority in favour of a bargaining agency of the 70, the remaining 30 of the 100 who have not voted, are taken automatically

as voting against the bargaining agency. Why should people who do not cast a vote--why should that attitude be construed as voting "no"? And yet that is precisely what that clause does.

We do not subscribe to it in that particular sense. From Section 1 to Section 10 is nothing more nor less than provisions of collective bargaining; from number 10 to number 38 is this lovely conciliation board procedure, taken practically out of the industrial disputes investigation act, and put into this federal code. The industrial disputes investigation act, insofar as relating to labour disputes, has never functioned satisfactorily, never. The endless delays, and the "stalling" opportunities given to employers has caused the severest irritation amongst workers, and yet here it is provided for in exactly the same way. And even after you put up perhaps with the irritations and a conciliation board has been set up, and has rendered its decision, if you still contain yourselves for 14 days after the conciliation board has rendered its decision, you are just back where you started, because the decision is not binding. There is nothing compulsory about it. So you have gone through all the course of this procedure, and have arrived at a blank end.

Sections 38 to 44 are beauties. They are beauties. I do not know whether we have a Hitler masquerading down in Ottawa or not, or whether Hitler himself was smuggled over to this country to help draft these penalty clauses, but from number 38 to number 44, it smells awfully of Hitlerism.

And the worst of these penalty clauses is this, that they only apply to the workers--only to the workers; they do not apply to the employers, in no sense at all. In other words, after you put up with all of this procedure, after you have fooled your way around a labour relations board, you merely end up in a dead end, and if you do anything you are punished, and the employer is allowed to go scot-free.

In these penalty clauses, if they go on strike during the process of conciliation, during the process of negotiations, the employee is fined; if the employees are members of unions, the union is fined, and if the union happens to have union

officials, the union officials are fined. In other words, they have got three strikes on us before we start. But the employer can fool around to his heart's content and he gets off scot-free --scot-free; I am not a bit surprised that the UAW-CIO said that this order was by no means satisfactory. I am quite certain that when the voice of other branches of organized labour is heard, they, too, will declare themselves equally emphatically.

Now, I come back to what I said some little time back in my address, when I asked the hon. Minister of Labour--I asked the government--in all sincerity, "Even if you have not got prepared legislation, for heaven's sake let us have the leadership. We are boasting often we can be an example to the rest of the country, let us show him now; let us have some portion of legislature, and let us discuss it here in the house, and let us get something better than this, and let us weld ourselves together, and fight for that something which is better."

In this connection, I associate myself entirely with the closing remarks of the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. F. R. Oliver) when he, too was urging that we do everything in our power to do the best we can for the people of this province. I am in entire accord with him in that sentiment, and I know I am expressing the view of the members of our group in this House. I do not care, believe me, members of the government,--I do not care who gets the credit, as long as the people get the benefit.

We are not sitting in the seat of government, unfortunately, but as I said even though I have been patient, I am patient enough to be patient a while longer and to wait for the day when we will be there, because that is a fore-gone conclusion. We shall be over on the other side, smiling, as presently as I see some members of the government smiling now, and I expect we shall have the irritations and be as uncomfortable some of the government have obviously indicated they feel to-night.

If, however, we sat on that side of the House, we would not have waited for seven months before getting on with this job. We do not have to wait as a matter of fact, seven minutes, because we are in a position to-night to present, if we were but the Government, legislation that is fair and that is advanced, and it is prepared. I have a copy of it here. It is not a question of making a statement, a press release. The thing is here.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Let us have a copy, -- could we have a copy?

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: Yes, of course you can. May I reciprocate in a sense, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs asked me if he could have a copy, and I readily agreed. And I say, may I have a copy of the one you have got? A copy prepared of the Labour Legislation which the hon. Minister indicated he had got. May I have a copy of that.

HON. MR DUNBAR: I shall be happy to supply such a copy, if reuired.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: We are in that position and if by chance the Government is not in an equally favourable position, I beg of them because of the seriousness of the situation that they endeavour to secure this labour legislation, not this kind of thing from Ottawa, and then endeavour to say that that is Ottawa' responsibility. You have a responsibility in the province of Ontario as a Government. Your responsibility it to give leadership to the province, not merely to say, We would have if Ottawa had not bucked us, or had not upset the apple cart.

It does not matter what Ottawa does in this respect. Let us have the leadership, and let us have the legislation, and I am quite certain that if it is that kind of legislation that labour wants, labour inside this House and outside of this House will battle a hundred per cent to make the Federal Government accept this better and fairer and more advanced liberal legislation.

Despite all the interuptions, Mr. Speaker, you and I, I think, and the most of them have enjoyed it all the better, probably.

I want to thank you before sitting down for your very great courtesy and

fairness in handling this troublesome situation.

I hope that when some member on the other side replies I shall endeavour to be in my seat and I shall endeavour to contain myself, even though I am impatient, impatience without making these little speeches under the guise of points of order. Nevertheless -- th

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you questioning the rulings of the Chair?

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not impute to me any speeches because of my rulings on points of order.

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: If any statement I have made have questioned your points of order, I shall be very happy to withdraw them.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: I should like to sit down, Mr. Speaker, with the question directed to the Minister of Labour. Will you, please, Mr. Minister of Labour, let me have a copy of that legislation which you said you had prepared.

HON. MR DALEY: The answer is, No.

MR ARTHUR WILLIAMS: You won't. Very well, I can conclude but one thing out of that. I do not know whether I am going to be out of order at the last moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling was not to impute improper motives in a speech.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: At the last moment I do not want to be out of order. I was going to say that I can only conclude, because of the negative answer given me by the minister of labour that they have not got the legislation; but I won't bother about that.

But I do hope that, with all the good feeling that appears to exist in connection with this thing, and with all the evident difficulties and little troubles that seem to surround it, I hope that for these two great forces in this province, -- here I am associating myself again with the remark made by the member made by the member for Grey South, that we will not leave any stone unturned, no matter whatever the federal Government will do, that we will not leave any stone unturned in

order to get the greatest advantage for the greatest number, and the greatest number are the little people of this province, not the great ones. That, I think is a very commendable object, and I thin hope we can enlist the support of this House. It is, I suppose, odd for me to be making an appeal of this kind to a Government that ought to be, so far as labour is concerned, moving along these lines. But I hope those are the lines along which we can move in order to get these things which the people have been told so long they shall have, but which they are still without. And if we do give it to them in these days of trial and difficulty so that in the days of peace which lie ahead they can look with some degree of easiness, not physical easiness but mental easiness to days which are not going to be as arduous in the future as in the past. Then, and only then, will I be satisfied that a Government of the province of Ontario has given the leadership that the people of this province desire.

MR. H. H. STEWART: (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the members to take out their watches and look at them. The voice of Kingston has not been heard in this Legislature for four years due to the neglect of action of the former Government in not giving the people of that constituency an opportunity to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of our former member, the hon. Mr. T. A. Kidd.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to endeavour to establish a record for brevity in this debate. Unless other members may expect to speak and suddenly decide to withdraw.

Many find varied addressed have been delivered here, all with the main and distinctive promises of cooperation and unity.

We on this side of the House, and we hope those in His Majesty's loyal opposition and other loyal groups in this House, do not believe in lip service, but do believe in progressive action. If this is so, the members of this Legislature will be given the opportunity, as the session advances, to demonstrate their sincerity in assisting to give the people of this province the finest and progressive legislation in

its history, as the Speech from the Throne indicates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is not the shortest speech on this occasion, the above challenge is open to all members of this House.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister): I now wish to move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps before the motion is carried the Prime Minister will let the members of the House know the nature of the business to-morrow.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) We probably shall not have any opportunity to continue the debate until Monday. I assume, on the basis of Bills which are before us, that we will not have time to continue the debate to-morrow.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I do not object to what the Prime Minister has said. I was going to suggest to him that even although some of the members may wish to get away early to-morrow, it might be useful to this debate if we were to go on a little while. Having regard to the fact that there are many new members of the House that would like to take part in this debate I make that suggestion.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I think we will take all the time that can be used, without allowing the people to lose the week-end. I assure the leader of the opposition we will do all we can to carry the debate through rapidly.

I move the adjournment of the House until to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister moves the adjournment of the House until to-morrow afternoon. What is your pleasure.

The House stands adjourned until to-morrow afternoon.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Speaker: The Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, March 3rd, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
MAR 4 - 1944
RECEIVED

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting of reports by committees?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

MR. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Strange, from Brantford, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An act respecting municipal health services", and that the same be now read the first time.

Mr.SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Dennison, seconded by Mr. Strange that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An act respecting municipal health services", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Third reading.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a bill intituled "An act respecting municipal health services", first reading of the bill.

MR. MILLER (Algoma-Manitoulin): Could we have an explanation from the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison)?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply for the purpose of extending to any municipality in the province the right that was given by the legislature to the municipality of St. Joseph's Island, in 1942, and in all respects the bill follows that act reasonably closely. It is worded, of

course, in such a way that many municipalities or groups of municipalities wishing to submit the matter to a vote, and receiving a two-thirds vote of the electors in the municipality, may pass a municipal doctor legislation.

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An act to prevent the publication of discriminatory matters referring to race or creed", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An act to prevent the publication of discriminatory matters referring to race or creed", and that the same be now read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a bill entituled, "An act to prevent the publication of discriminatory matters referring to race or creed", first reading of the bill.

MR. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Would the hon., the Attorney-General explain please?

HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, this bill is directed solely at the advertising of any description or the publication or permitting the publication of advertising in any way reflecting on race or creed. The bill provides penalties and provides a procedure before the court by originating motions whereby the Judge, in addition to imposing penalties, also has the power to make an order enjoining against such publications.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister); Third readings.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Prime Minister with respect to a report appearing in the Globe and Mail of to-day, a report stating that the Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour will be proceeding to Ottawa to-night and stating further that the Ontario Government feels there are several sections of the new Dominion Labour Order-in-Council which should be given careful study, with a view to

making certain amendments, and further stating that it is understood the ministers will make strong representations to the Dominion Minister of Labour.

I am, therefore, asking, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. Prime Minister could confirm or deny the accuracy of the report, and whether he could indicate at this time if the government would be willing to accept an offer from us, a tender of the assistance of perhaps two members of this group, with a view to consultation on this very important question, and to conclude my question, perhaps the Hon. Prime Minister would be good enough to indicate at this time whether such an offer could be acted upon to-day before the ministers go to Ottawa, if they are going, and whether a consultation and co-operation which is so desirable between the province and the dominion might be extended further as between the parties of this House.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer the first part of the question. The Ministers are going to Ottawa to-night. The statement was given, as I understand it, by them. The arrangements were made after the receipt of the last draft of the Code, or rather the Code which has been adopted by the Dominion Government, which I had not previously seen. They are going to Ottawa to-night. I have no further comments to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I have but one desire, and that is to preside impartially, but there are rules of the House we must observe, and which I may submit for your consideration. Any member desirous of rising before the orders of the day, should come into my office at a quarter to three. I have no request to-day from anyone. I extended the liberty to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), which I was happy to do, with regard to his enquiry, but I trust the hon. members of the House will co-operate with me and let me know at a quarter to three if they desire to rise before the orders of the day.

The next order is orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading. First order: third reading of Bill No. 30, "Enacted to amend the Law Society Act", Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I move that the act to amend the Law Society Act be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves the third reading of Bill No.30, enacted to amend the Law Society Act. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill No.25, "the Wartime Housing Act", Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Ottawa, South): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No.25, "The Wartime Housing Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunbar moves third reading of Bill No.25, "The Wartime Housing Act." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third orders. Third reading of Bill No.29, " An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act", Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Kent, East): I now move third reading of Bill No.29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves third reading of Bill No.29, "An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be entituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth order. Third reading of Bill No.31, "An act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act", Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Kent, East): I now move third reading of Bill No.31, "An act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves third reading of Bill No.31, "An Act to Amend the Provincial Land Tax Act." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth order. Third reading of Bill No.33, "An Act to amend the Surveys Act", Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Kent, East): Mr. Speaker, I do now move third reading of Bill No.33 "An Act to amend the Surveys Act."

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves third reading of Bill No.33, "An Act to Amend the Surveys Act." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth order. Third reading of Bill No.34, "An Act to Amend the Public Lands Act", Mr. Thompson.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Kent, East): I now move the third reading of Bill No.34, "An Act to Amend Public Lands Act",

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves third reading of Bill No.34, "An Act to Amend Public Lands Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh order. Third reading of Bill No.37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944". Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): I move the third reading of Bill No.37,"The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Doucett moves third reading of Bill No.37, "The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth order. Third reading of Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development", Mr. Drew.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do move third reading of Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development."

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves third reading of Bill number 39, "An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth order; third reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils Act", Mr. Drew.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do now move the third reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils Act". Shall the motion carry?

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves third reading of Bill number 40, "An Act to amend the Executive Councils Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth order. Third reading of Bill number 41,"An Act to Provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill number 41, "An Act to Provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations."

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves third reading of Bill number 41, "An Act to Provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations." Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: THird reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the orders.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I now move that you do now leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, and the House resolve itself into the committee of the whole to consider such resolutions.

In connection with the resolutions, I beg to inform the House that the Hon. the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject of the resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves I do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider such resolutions. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House resolved itself into the committee of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: A government notice of motion number 6.

"Resolved,

That during the period between the 1st day of April, 1944, and the 31st day of March, 1945, a subsidy shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to every person who produces sugar beets in Ontario under contract with a person engaged in the business of processing sugar beets into sugar and sugar by-products, the amount of such subsidy to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council at an amount not exceeding $1.55 for each ton of sugar beets."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Government notices of motion number 7.

"Resolved,

The Minister of Highways may direct payment out of the Highway Improvement Fund of an amount equal to such proportion, not exceeding seventy-five per centum, of the expenditure made in constructing, maintaining, replacing or improving a bridge or culvert under the jurisdiction of a county in accordance with a plan approved by the proper officer of the Department of Highways, as he may deem requisite.

That the Minister of Highways be empowered to direct

payment out of the Highway Improvement Fund of such greater portion than fifty per centum as he may deem requisite of the salary and expenses of a township road superintendent; and

That where in any part of Ontario without municipal organization the Minister of Highways has arranged with road commissioners under The Statute Labour Act, or with any person who is the owner of land therein or of any equity or rights in or relating to any such land, for the construction, improvement, maintenance or repair of any road situate therein and designated by the Minister, the Minister may direct payment out of the Highway Improvement Fund of an amount equal to such proportion of the cost of the work as he may deem requisite."

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the motion be adopted?

MR. W. LYNN MILLER (Algoma-Manitoulin): Could we have an explanation from the Hon. Minister on this last section, "That where in any part of Ontario or any municipal organization"? Perhaps the Hon. Minister might clarify that.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a statutory notice required to be given before the Bill comes into committee where it is discussed, if that is satisfactory to the hon. members for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller).

Shall the resolution be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the committee rise and report such resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The committee rose. Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report the House has considered certain resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, chairman of the committee of the whole House, reports that the committee has considered certain resolutions. Shall the report be accepted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House go into a committee of the whole House to discuss certain Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that I do now leave the chair and that this House go into a committee of the whole for the consideration of certain bills. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House then resolved itself into the committee.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order number 12.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth order. House in committee on Bill number 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act".

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): Mr. Chairman, I move that in section 1 the word "under" be inserted after the word "over" in the second line.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 as amended form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

MR. CHARLES A. STRANGE (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has given any attention to clause 5 D of this section? The intention of that clause seems to me to be, first of all, to prevent a member of the council from sitting on a board or council that is his own employer, and, secondly, to prevent a member from voting for and using his influence as a member to obtain his own appointment to the position of County Roads Superintendent, and by deleting the words after "in any capacity", it would be possible to carry out both of these intentions. At the present time, the way it is worded it only takes care of the first intention. That is, to prevent a member of the council from sitting on a board, that is actually his own employer. Has the hon. Minister given any consideration to that?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: That is taken care of in the Act.

MR. STRANGE: It is?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): May I ask the hon. Minister if any attention has been given to the recognition of Professional Engineers Act of 1922, with regard to subsection 5 A?

HON. GEORGE A. DOUCETT: I may say, in reply to the hon. member from Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall) that that has already been taken care of, and we will come to that later.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether in the amendments of the Act his Department, and he himself took into consideration the submission of the corporation of the city of Toronto concerning certain sections of the Act which in the opinion of the municipality places undue charges upon the city and if any attempt has been made to amend the Act in the manner proposed by the city of Toronto.

HON. GEORGE A. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I might say that this question has to do with suburban roads, and there is no change in the Act which would set out any special privilege for the corporation of the city of Toronto or any corporation in the province of Ontario.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I further ask the hon. ministers whether an opportunity was given to the corporation to present its briefs and its requests to the hon. minister prior to the presentation of the amended Act.

HON. GEORGE A. DOUCETT: I might say that this is a matter which has been considered for years. It has been brought up at different times and we have many suburban areas in the province of Ontario, and they all seem to be very well pleased with the present Act. We have had no request other than the one mentioned for any adjustment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, having received these answers from the hon. Minister, I feel that some consideration should be given to the opinions and wishes of the corporation of the city of Toronto.

It is true that I am still conscious of the problem as a former member of council, and I think that it is permissible to retain that consciousness when leaving the city council when coming into the House.

Whether the hon. Minister agrees to the submission of the city, the fact, however, is that there is this prevailing opinion that the city of Toronto has been compelled to pay increasing amounts for the maintenance of roads more than 100

miles outside of the city of Toronto, highways that go through incorporated towns and cities in the province.

The amount so extracted from the corporation of the city of Toronto is increasing beyond all reasonable proportions, in the opinion of the council of the corporation, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that since this Act is being basically amended, that the corporation be given an opportunity to appear before the proper committee of the legislature and present its case, at least. No one ever did - and I am sure no one ever will - consciously charge the city of Toronto with being anything but magnanimous toward other municipalities in the province.

SEVERAL HON. Members: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: And I think that the city of Toronto has more than borne its share for the maintenance of these roads.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask your guidance, and I assure you that I will accept your guidance. If Mr. Speaker had been here, he would sympathize no less than you, because of the opportunities he had in the past of dealing with this serious problem to our city, and I wish to move that the Bill be referred back and that the Corporation of the City of Toronto be given an opportunity to appear before the appropriate body of this house and present its point of view.

Now, I shall be thankful to you, Mr. Chairman, for suggesting how this purpose can be achieved, namely, to give the city of Toronto an opportunity to appear before this House deals with the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to extend the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) every courtesy possible, but as this Bill does not deal, in this section - and I understand in any other - with the suburban matter he was discussing, he was plainly out of order. It was only through the courtesy of the Chair that he was permitted to speak on the matter, and it is not for the Chair to suggest how this matter should be brought before the House. That is before the Corporation of the City of Toronto, and the hon. Minister of Highways, and I cannot permit this matter to be discussed at any greater length today, and I am sure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.

Salsberg) will appreciate that fact.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: May I say a word in reply to that, Mr. Chairman? I gave the City of Toronto every opportunity. A deputation composed of the Mayor and the Board of Control appeared before me and I gave them all the time which they wished to explain this matter, and make their protest, and I understood they left my office very well satisfied that I had explained to them the whole set-up, and also suggested a certain solution which might be carried out, and they are one of these days going to meet with some of the members, and perhaps the County Suburban Roads Commission, and discuss this further.

MR. DENNISON: (St. David) May I ask the hon. Minister another question on this Bill? This does not deal with any particular city or request that certain municipalities have made in the past year. One, I believe, is that the section dealing with the length of time a man may sit on these bodies, which is now five years, should be reduced to three years. That was one point.

Another was that there should be some appeal possible where a municipality does not agree with the decision of the Board or the Department of Highways, that there should be some appeal possible before the amount goes into the tax rate.

That is the second question, and if I may ask a third question, it is, that the Bill as it now stands prevents a reeve or an alderman, or any one of a municipal body sitting on any of these boards, but it does not stop a member of this House from sitting, and if the intention is to keep it out of political interference, and free from political interference, and it would seem logical, if you are going to bar the local representatives from sitting on this board, the provincial representatives should be treated in the same way.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I might say, in regard to the first question, that I have had no request for any change, such as has been suggested in the personnel.

Secondly, the Government have nothing to do, under the Act, with money which they spend, other than approve of the appropriations as set by the Commission, and to your last question, regarding a member of this House sitting, that was never brought to my attention, and I do not think there is any member of this House, certainly none that I know of, sitting on a commission, although there may be.

MR. AURELIAN BELANGER: (Prescott) Mr. Chairman, we might as well decide one thing at this period. Are we going to follow the procedure of this House, as laid down in the rules and regulations, or are we going to discuss in the committee of the House all the aspects of a Bill, which should be done on second reading? Here we are discussing a Bill section by section, and I think the members who have representations to make, such as have been made this afternoon, should study the Bill at leisure, and prepare their amendment under the section to which it belongs, and bring that amendment before the House so that we would have something definite upon which to enter a discussion, and if there is no particular section, then at the end of the Bill they can add an amendment, adding another section, but there will be no end to the discussions in committee if we are going to allow what is going on this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I passed 5 A of section 2, which I wished to move an amendment to, and I ask the consent of the hon. members so to do.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: With the consent of the committee.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, with the consent of the committee. If you will give me time I will get around to that.

5 A: I wish to move an amendment as follows:

"Every County road superintendent hereafter appointed

"shall be a professional engineer, registered as a civil engineer under the Professional Engineers Act".

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that we shall revert to section 2, sub-section 5 A?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sub-section 5 A of section 2 as amended reads:

"Every County road superintendent hereafter appointed shall be a professional engineer, registered as a civil engineer under the Professional Engineers Act".

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: This was the sub-section, Mr. Chairman, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall), and which I believe the Minister said was carried out in the Bill.

The amendment was made available to me, but perhaps not to the other members, and that is probably why the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Overall) raised the question, which was an entirely proper one, and the Hon. Minister might have pointed out to him that the reference later in the Act was not in the Bill which the member had in his possession.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN: (Welland) Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in reading this Act I am impressed with the number of times, in referring to the county and the township, that they say "shall do this", and "shall do that", and "shall do something else", and yet we find down here further along in this section, when it comes to the part where all these "shall's" are present, - "upon receipt of these 'shall's' being presented, which are satisfactory to the Minister" - then the Minister "may direct payment" - he "may" or he "may not".

It seems to me this puts the municipalities in a very, very dangerous position. They come to an agreement, ---

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: May I ask the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Brown) to what section he is referring?

MR. BROWN (Welland): Section 5. And I think it will come out again in sections 22 and 30.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are referring to section 5, sub-section 2?

MR. BROWN (Welland): Yes, sub-section 2 at the present time, of section 5. It says:

> "Upon receipt of such statements, declarations and petitions and the approval thereof of the proper officer of the Department, the Minister may direct payment to the county treasurer out of the fund of an amount equal to fifty percentum of the amount of the expenditure which is properly chargeable to road improvement, and in all cases of doubt or dispute, the decision of the Minister shall be final".

Now, the county will have made up their budget, and the township, also, and we find later on they are not sure whether they are going to get payment. It seems to me that the word "may" should be changed to "shall", so that every person knows where they stand, and when they agree with the hon. minister in every way, that they will be sure that they will get their money.

Then it says, as I read before, "in all cases of doubt the decision of the Minister shall be final". It seems that it gives the county or township or any municipality no right at all. They must do exactly as the Minister says, and they are not sure even then if they are going to get any pay in return.

-Page 375 follows/-

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: (Lanark): It is first to approve the plan, of course.

MR. HOWARD W. BROWN (Welland): Could I ask the hon. minister is there any assurance that the county or the township will be protected. Is not it entirely in the Minister's hands who he might pay or does not?

If he has enough money —

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): I think that is very far fetched. I said the corporations have the right to submit to the Government their appropriations and when that isapproved this money is expended under the supervision of the Government's Municipal Engineer in case of counties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to move an amendment to sub-section 2. This I might say is not in the Bill but a copy of it has been delivered to each of the leaders. Probably it will not be in the Act that you hold, but insert "or in the case of a bridge or culvert an amount not exceeding seventy-five per centum", after the word "centum" in the fifth line.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) Read the whole section.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark) All right.

> "Upon receipt of such statement, declarations and petition and the approval thereof by the proper officer of the Department, the Minister may direct payment to the county treasurer out of the Fund of an amount equal to fifty per centum of the amount of the expenditure which properly chargeable to road improvement and in all cases of doubt or dispute the decision of the Minister shall be final"

It has only to do with bridges or culverts.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York South) The rest of the sub-section does not go out then, it stays in?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the section as amended form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 6 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 8 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 9 form part of the Bill?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): Mr. Chairman, sub-section 2 reads:

> "The Minister may direct the payment to the corporation out of the Fund of an amount not exceeding seventy-five per centum of the cost of constructing, maintaining, replacing or improving any such bridge over twenty feet in span in accordance with plans approved by an officer of the Department designated by the Minister."

Now, that has to do with bridges on boundaries or bridges taken over in the municipalities by bylaw or by an order of a judge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 9 as amended form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 11 form part of the Bill?

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York South): It is a very long section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to have it taken up by clauses?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South): I do not know that that is necessary. It has eight sub-sections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Give you whatever time is required.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South): It is all right for me; I was just wondering about others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 11 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 12 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 13 is amended.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark) Section 13 substitutes the word

"arrangement" for the word "agreement" in the eleventh line. This has been necessary to make it consistent with the word "arrange" in the first line.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York south): I do not follow that. I am afraid the minister will have to give a clear explanation. It is certainly not clear from the amendment I have.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): It starts off in ~~sec~~ 35.

> "The Minister may arrange with the Department of Indian Affairs of the Government of Canada for the construction and improvement under the supervision of the Department of Highways and in accordance with the requirements of the Minister of a road in any township or any portion of a township constituting an Indian reserve where such road forms an extension of or connecting link in a county road system and for the payment, upon the certificate of the Minister, of fifty per centum of the cost of any work done under such agreement ....."

Just change the word "agreement" to "arrangement". Is that quite clear?

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York South): Yes, except the Minister has not mentioned, what I understand to be the case, that the House has not been told I think that his amendment also changes the wording of the category paragraph of Section 33 of the Bill. It may not be of any importance —

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: (Eglinton): It is substituting —

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York South): I know that new words are substituted.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant) The point is well taken, I think.

THE HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark) I said to substitute the word —

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE (York south): The point is that section 13 as now amended on the minister's ~~obvious~~ motion will read, as I understand it, not as it appears in the Bill at all but as follows: (13) Section 35 of The Highway Improvement Act is repealed and the following

substituted therefor and then follows the new section 35 which the Minister has just read. I would just like the hon. members to be clear about that.

HON. GEORGE M. DOUCETT (Lanark): Well, I might say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I understood that is what I said that 13, subsection 35 would be repealed and the following substituted therefor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 9 as amended form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 14 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 15 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 16 form part of the Bill?

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): I would like to ask the Minister has he had any requests for a change of that percentage? Now, as I understand it, it is the same percentage as was in effect on suburban road areas before the province received all of the gasoline tax and now the cities and towns receive absolutely no remuneration from the province for the upkeep of their streets and yet suburban roads they are compelled, according to this set-up, to pay their twenty-five per centum as compared with the township's twenty-five per cent, the county pays, and fifty per cent from the province. Now, I was wondering if any municipalities have made any representations to the Minister in regard to the changing of that. Some municipalities feel that they receive nothing for the wear out of their streets from the province although the province receives that gasoline tax and then in return they go to work and build this suburban road area, which they pay part of the cost.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark) That is nothing new at all; quite old. Might I say this -- I would like to keep the record straight in regard to suburban commissions. There is nothing to say that a corporation is compelled to enter into an agreement regarding the up-keep of certain roads. It is more or less by choice.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): The corporation can at any time abrogate the rights.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): It is not quite as flexible as marriage. You cannot get divorce.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Lanark): This carries right on. If there is suburban road area they must carry on with it.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): Yes, they first enter into an agreement in the case of Toronto and other cities. They appoint two members, set up commission and the county in which they are situated, two and those four appoint their fifth man.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): If they want to keep out of it what do they do?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): I think I explained that.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Once they are into this they are in for keeps, I mean. This must carry on - supposing they started years ago in the horse and buggy days. There is no way they can get out of it.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): It is a matter of agreement between county and city. They can terminate an agreement if they wish.

MR. HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): I want to know how much notice must they give?

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): You would have to get the agreement and read that. Agreements of suburban commissions may vary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 16 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: SHall section 17 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 18 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 19 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 20 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 21 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 22 form part of the Bill? Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 23 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 24 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 25 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

MR. W.L.MILLER (Algoma-Manitoulin): You are going pretty fast, Mr. Chairman, and I am burning my fingers turning over pages, and I am not raising a point at all in criticism of this, I can assure the Minister. It is only information I am seeking. I wondered if he could clarify that section 25. Some change there about terri_tory without municipal organization.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): I might say in reply to the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Miller) that this is to make the Act under the Highway Improvement Act. As you know, unorganized territories was under Northern Developments and this is a new Act whereby we may grant money in lieu of statute labour in statute labour country or subsidies in organized counties. It does not change the present set-up any more than it does make it legal. The Act has never been changed since the Northern Development was taken into the Highway Department.

MR. W.L. MILLER (Algona-Manitoulin): It may be slightly out of place here but I have thought in view of conditions in some of the unorganized townships and in organized townships throughout the north you could instead of having the municipalities spend the money that they had to spend in connection with their bylaws, that the department would arrange for machinery to be used. That seems to be one of the matters that has aggravated a great many people in the north respecting road work in municipalities. They spend a lot of money in these municipalities but they do not get anywhere because nearly all hand labour. Whereas

a few miles away the highway work is going on with modern machinery and it seems almost foolish to think of men attempting to do road work in these days much in the same manner that they did years ago. It seems to me - and I admit it has n ot much to do with this particular section - it seems to me we ought to give some thought to the utilization of modern machinery, the department machinery, on some basis, to the benefit of the municipalities. Whether they pay some charge for it on a rental basis or in some method so that the money would not be wasted to the extent it is. This is no criticism of the department in any sense. It is just an entirely a new change in the procedure, the manner of doing the road work in townships organized and unorganized that I would suggest.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Lanark): I am very happy to answer that question of the hon. member from Algoma (Mr. Miller) and, of course, that could not be embodied in the Act but it is something that I touched last week in speaking to the engineers of the Municipal Road Department of the province of Ontario. I explained that and that is the policy I hope we will carry out in the near future and at as early a date as possible where we can cooperate with the municipalities in the northern section of the province where they have not sufficient to buy machinery for themselves, that we will work out some system of cooperation between different groups.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 25 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 26 form part of the Bill?
Motion agreed to.
THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 27 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 28 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 29 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 30 form part of the Bill?

MR HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): Mr. Chairman, to bring this up again, I think this shows exactly what I was meaning a little bit earlier in number 4 about payment here. "The Council of a township may apply to the Department for authority to construct a sidewalk or footpath on the King's Highway or a county road and the Department may grant such authority, and upon completion of the work may approve thereof at its discretion, and upon such approval being given the council may make application in the form prescribed by the Minister for, and the Minister may authorize the payment to the township out of the Fund of an amount not exceeding fifty per centum of the cost of the work."

Now, in these days when we have so many people walking on the highways and when there are these suburban areas, the township or county may wish to build a walk along there and it seems to me they get no encouragement of the Department except just to say we may do this or may do that but there are ten loopholes from the time they get permission to build the road until the sidewalk is paid for. It seems to me the Department should take more of leadership in this and give encouragement to the building of these walks along the highway rather than giving so many loopholes to stay in.

The HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: (Lanark): I think the hon. member is a little like myself, he has not any legal training and he is taking the wrong interpretation. There is not very much change in the wording here but we have taken forty per cent and put in fifty per cent. The Government did not pay fifty per cent in the past. Might I say I do not think there is a municipality in the province of Ontario that has got approval of sidewalks that has not it paid for without any trouble. You would suggest that probably the department have been very tough in these matters but I do not think that is the case and I hope that we will stick. We are certainly approving of bylaw and we permit them to build but you would not say that municipalities would have the right to build a sidewalk any place they desire.

MR HOWARD E. BROWN (Welland): No. What I say if they are given

permission they should meet up with the Department's demands and when they do this there is no alternative but what the Department would pay their share.

HON. GEORGE H. DUCKETT: (Lanark): Well, that is the fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 30 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 42 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill as amended be reported?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Jolliffe (York south) that a further section be added to Bill No. 27 as follows: "Section 43 of the Highway Improvement Act is amended by adding the words 'Legislative Assembly of Ontario' after the words 'Municipal Council' the fourth line thereof.

That would make Section 43 read as follows:

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in the Municipal Act or in any other general or special Act of this Legislature or in any municipal bylaw a person who is a member of official of a municipal council or a member of the Legislature shall not be a member of any commission appointed under Section 42."

If that motion is in order I should like to briefly give a reason for this motion. I do not feel very strongly on this matter one way or the other and in view of the fact that at the present moment I do not know of any member of the Legislature being the member on any such body, this might be the logical time to make the amendment. There have been instances in years past when members of the Legislature have been members of these bodies and there has been considerable criticism of that fact and plenty of suggestions of the manner in which roads were built and because people hired to build roads of that fact and members of this House have been criticized very severely who suspected they were using their position in the House to extend the roads they wanted extended and build roads they wanted built and hired people they wanted hired, when these bodies should be set up with a view of looking after the interests of the whole

area. This set up a whole area road program and therefore the interests of the whole area, in my opinion, should be the guiding motification behind the members of any body set up under this act and apparently section 43 was put in exactly with that thought in mind that members of the local municipal body should not be sitting on the commission because they would be wanting to assist their municipality to get roads and others might be left out. To avoid that they put section 43 in the Act to prevent any one municipality being represented specifically in the set-up. It seems to me that should also apply to members of the legislature and I hope the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will agree with the thought. As I say, I do not want to give any instance, but I have instances I might name and this would be the logical time to make the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dennison moves, seconded by Mr. Jolliffee, that a further section be added to Bill No. 43 as follows: "By adding the words 'or a member of the Legislature' after the words 'municipal council' in the fourth line of section 43. All in favour of the amendment say, "Aye"; all opposed say, "No".

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The House on committee on Bill No. 43, and Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. 43, and Act to amend The Apprenticeship Act. Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

MR. R.D. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre) : Relative to that section 1 I wonder if the Minister would give us some information of the status of individuals already engaged in these trades covered. Will there be certificates set up because I had in mind similar legislation covering stationary engineers, when certificates were granted without examinations to those engaged with the result that certificates covering the plants they were employed in was given without examination and when they were allowed to lapse these same engineers were unable to pass examinations to take out the certificates that they had been originally granted. What I mean is, an engineer in charge of a plant requires second-class certificate or given a second- class certificate. If it was allowed to lapse he would then be required to write an examination, with the result that he could not for

his life. Now, I would like to know if there are facilities set up requiring everyone engaged in the trades this legislation will cover, will there be facilities set up making it compulsory for them to write the necessary examination?

(Page 387 follows)

HON. MR DALEY: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. members, request, I am sure that this would have to be pretty flexible to get it into operation in any designated trade. I mean it is not the intent in this to work an injustice on anybody. It is only to take effect when the employees and the employers themselves tequire to have that particular trade designated, and then it would be a matter of putting it into effect by Order in Council.

I am sure that it might be for the advantage of a man engaged in a trade; but he might, in some circumstances, find it difficult to write an examination; I think he should be protected. I think the regulations will be quite flexible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Section 1 carried?

MR. A. A. CASSELMAN: Before this is carried, I would like to ask the Minister what provision is made for the examination?

I am sure all of us are desirous of getting people qualified to do their work, particularly if it is of a responsible or hazardous character. But I do not want to see anything done which will be a matter of descrimination, or for people to be discriminated against except by their own fears, at least.

This is a question that is a little different, rather, but the other day the Minister explained that representations had been made to him, I presume by employers and employees organizations with a view to getting this amendment made.

I would like if the Minister can or will explain to the House as to what protection there is going to be, to make sure that this is not going to be used as a means of discrimination against the man who might otherwise qualify. He might have all the necessary qualifications, but through prejudice or some other means, there might be discrimination used against a man getting his certificate, and, in other words, cheating the man out of his employment, and not allowing the man to use his qualifications in earning his own livelihood.

HON. MR. DALEY: So far as I am concerned no condition such as that would be allowed to prevail. The regulations must cover the

qualifications. Different trades would have different qualifications; and those qualifications would have to be designed in conference between the employers and the employees and the Department to build a set of regulations sufficient to qualify a man for a certain job, and then would have to be approved by Order in Council.

I mean there would be no way for a Board to sit down and settle any regulations such as you are fearful of.

There has to be a matter of common sense used in drawing them up whereby all parties interested would have to be considered. I think the same thing prevails to-day in other types of industry. This Bill is simply to take in other types of Industry that want to be in of their own accord, not because of any pressure by anybody.

I should say there might be types of industries which should be discouraged from coming in, and not encouraged. But there might be some types that should be covered in this way. I cannot visualize any difficulty such as you suggest.

MR. J. B SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I see a danger of this Act being used for discrimination. We have heard a lot in the past about closed shops and people working in particular factories. This is what this would amount to. It says, "requiring all persons engaged in any designated trade, other than registered apprentices, to hold a current certificate of qualification, and prohibiting the employment in any designated trade of persons who have not complied with this requirement."

That is going a long way towards making a closed shop; and it is done, It seems to me, in a somewhat arbitrary way, that the Industry and Labour Board, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may prevent the employment in any designated trade all persons other than registered apprentices and holders of certificates of qualification.

I want to know what machinery is going to be provided to protect the persons who might be discriminated against, who are seeking employment to prevent their gaining employment in such an industry because rules and regulations have been made arbitrarily, and have been made unnecessarily severe to meet the requirements, and are not impartially

administered? What machinery have we to make sure that every individual is going to have a fair trial, and if he has necessary qualifications that he is not going to be discriminated against. What is there to make sure that the person is within those designated, and what machinery have we in the Act to make sure that the people are qualified for the position?

HON. MR DALEY: I think to compare this with the closed shop is stretching things pretty far.

MR. SLASBERG: It closes it.

HON. MR DALEY: No, it does not. A man who has mastered his business has certain qualifications. In drawing up the regulations there is no machinery now other than the Industry and Labour Board under whom this would perhaps function, to draw up these regulations. And it would not prohibit any person, provided he had the qualifications. But if he did not have them, if he wanted to be a plumber, and if the plumbers chose to get in under this, he should have the qualifications of a plumber in order to secure plumbers' rates and the general conditions that go with the plumbing business.

I am not suggesting that plumbers should begin under it, but this certainly does not discriminate against anybody, if he had the qualifications and if he has the certificate.

But the regulations that make it necessary for him to secure the certificate would be sufficiently easy, I would say, so as not to discriminate against anybody; because they would be drawn up with the in conjunction with the people interested, the men, the employers and the board.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Hon. member for Hamilton has the floor.

MR. R. D THORNBERRY: (Hamiltlon): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister this question. He has mentioned plumbers, for example. In any trade a man who is seeking his livelihood as a tradesman in that trade will secure such a certificate immediately this Act goes into effect? Those men are now gaining their livelihood by working at their trade and it would be unfair to ask them to pass an examination. Probably some of the lawyers in this House would have trouble in passing

an examination after they had been out of college for some years.

These men may be quite qualified as tradesmen, but might have some difficulty in passing an examination. I would like to ask if those who engaged in the trade will get certification when this Act is passed.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is a fair question, and is one to which I have given a great deal of consideration. I do not think you have anything to fear.

As I mentioned earlier, we appreciate that there may be men , good mechanics who come under this regulation, but who would not be able to answer certain questions which would not bother some better educated person. That would be a matter for using common sense, by the people in the industry.

MR. B. E LEAVENS: (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what body or group of bodies would set up the regulations what qualifies the candidate? Those of us who have been in work know the discrimination that may be shown against the man who may be qualified.

I would like to see something here that would prevent that from arising from prejudice or other influence, where certificates would not be given where a man might be perfectly qualified to work at that particular trade, or in that position.

HON. MR DALEY: To that question I would say you must have some faith in your fellow beings. I cannot see how we could design a thing that would take care of a difficulty like that. It certainly would not be the intention of this Act in any way to make it possible to discriminate against a man who is qualified.

MR ROSCOE ROBERTSON: (Hastings East): Mr. Chairman, I can understand the expression of fear which has come from members of the House. I am not afraid that it might lead to a closed shop, but I am afraid that it may be used as an instrument for an open shop, and that is really the difficulty I have in mind. We have had, unfortunately, a lot of sad experiences in the past in efforts to organize the unorganized plant

where authority less severe or less strict than this has been utilized to withhold certificates, to use the granting of a certificate as a means of intimidating apprentices and others from joining a trades union.

Now, I do not for one single moment imply any ulterior motives to the Hon. the Minister of Labour in presenting this bill. But I was wondering whether the Minister could tell us who it was that made the demand upon him for the enactment of this amendment. Perhaps that would explain the purpose of the Bill more clearly. If it is proper to ask this question, who is it who made the presentation to the Government for this amendment? And, second, if I may Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the organized trade unions of this Province, will according to their usual custom, present their annual legislative proposals to the Government, -- I think it is coming very shortly any day now, -- whether it would not be proper to discuss this matter with the duly elected representatives of the trade unions of the province who will come to the Government, prior to the adoption of this amendment? I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister consider this suggestion of perhaps holding the Bill over until the representatives of the trade unions of the Province will make their appearance and discuss the whole thing with them prior to its enactment?

HON. MR DALEY: In answer to the hon. member's last question, that union activities or closed shop or open shop be considered, I am sure I never gave any one of them any thought. I am not trying to design legislation to prevent men from being union men. In fact, my stand has always been that I encourage men to be union men. But I cannot see how I can hope to develop legislation that might in the long run be of some benefit to the citizens as a whole, if I have to consider along the lines you have suggested that this Bill might be considered.

Under the broadening of the apprenticeship scheme that is coming up, sponsored to some extent by the Federal Government regarding the rehabilitation of soldiers and the opportunity to be given to them to learn trades and one thing and another it was felt that there should

be some measure, in certain lines, if it is considered advisable in the people interested in it, that they should have some certificates of qualification.

I have no hesitation in telling you who it was who interviewed me. I am told many things. People come to me with suggestions and if I think they are worth while I may prepare a bill. In this case, it was the garagemen who came, many out of the many thousands of them in that industry, all holding certificates. And their representation was Province wide, that we should make it compulsory that men going to take your car to repair it should know what they are doing. That was to protect the public. They know that if they have a man to repair their car he has a certificate that he is a qualified man. That is the way this thing developed.

I agreed with them, and I thought that if a man operates a garage repairing cars, it might be a very good thing.

Even though we approve of it, even though you give your consent to this Bill it does not mean that they will take it up, -- I am not sure of this. This is what they wanted but before we consider it we will have to have definite representation province-wide, according to the information they gave me it was province-wide, but I would want to know more about who the people were. There were union people there who approved of it. It is an important piece of legislation and worthy of the consideration which you may wish to give it.

MR JOHN H. COOK: (Waterloo North): I think the Minister might set at rest a good deal of uneasiness, if he compares this Act with an Act already in Force, The Engineer's Act. There are three public servants operating that Act. If he could assure the Legislature that the three persons that would operate this Act are three public servants and that they have all the qualifications, there would be no uneasiness in regard to this Act in the House.

MR. B. E LEAVENS; (Woodbine) The Minister says it was the Caragemen and the garagemen only who approached him in regard to this. Why leave it wide open? Why not confine it to the Caragemen?

MRS. R.M. LUCKOCK: (Bracondale) Mr. Chairman, I feel if I go as a working person to earn my bread and butter it should not be nezessary for me to have a certificate in my hand. If you were a trained mechanic in a garage, if you were looking for a job in something that you were not trained for, I feel that it is up to employer to judge all my abilities when he hires me after I have talked it over with him.

I think a Board is a very dangerous thing. I do not think we have any right in this country to set up a Board, when I a working person have just my toil and my ability for sale to an employer.

MR. A. WILLIAMS (Ontario): When the Minister mentioned the garage operators, it was no surprise to me, because I knew they were applying. It is likely that they will have a few men in their garage, most likely a foreman, with certificates that they are prepared to work on Chrysler or Ford or other cars. I can see some very good points in the bill, even in the garage business. But the great danger is that mechanics who never were mechanics and have but a wrench and a hammer, hang up their signs; but they are not really automobile mechanics. It is one of the poorest paid trades in the country. They employ anyone who applies. It is all right as long as it is not a journeyman's act and is kept as an apprentice act.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE(York South): I rise to draw attention to the wording of paragraph (bb), and I suggest that the Minister or the Industry and Labor Board may find themselves in some difficulty because the power given is an unqualified power.

The paragraph reads: "requiring all persons engaged in any designated trade, " etc.

There is no limitation provided for, either a limitation of geography or a limitation of time. The Minister will undoubtedly find that the conditions in industry in any skilled trade vary a great deal in one part of the province from another. He might find that in one part of the province it is much more feasible to require a mechamdd to hold a certificate than it would be in another part. There are very different conditions in a hamlet or town from what there are in a city.

I am wondering whether the Board would be able to draw the line. I do not think the wording of the section will permit them to draw the line.

Secondly, I think the wording of the section is rather sweeping when the board is empowered to require all persons in any designated trade to hold certificated, and prohibit others.

Would it not be well for the minister to allow a reasonable time within which people already engaged at a particular trade, and perhaps a very essential one, should be allowed a reasonable time within which to secure the ne cessary certificate?

I am sure that there are in this province now plants where there are some very skilled men who, at least, during the war years, have done skilled and responsible work without holding the certificates which are customarily held by those doing these jobs. I am sure the minister knows that to be the case.

I am afraid he may find the section so wide and the difficulties so great that they may decide that they could not do anything at all, except in one or two very narrow and confined occupations.

(Page 395 follows).

DD1

HON. CHARLES DALEY: Well, in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), my position on this Bill was simply that from the representations made to me, and looking into the future, I thought it was a good piece of legislation and I would suggest in view of the representation of the various members here that this would be a good Bill to turn back to the labor committee which has already been set up to bring in some--

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: That is a good idea.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: I am certainly not trying to force anything in labor matters to this House which does n ot meet with the approval of the House, and if there are some questions which can be ironed out by the labor committee, that would meet with common approval, I think it would be well to send the Bill back to the committee. I propose, Mr. Chairman, that it be referred to the labor committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee recommend that this Bill be referred by the House at a later date to the labor committee?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the committee do now rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes. Mr. Speaker in the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole house make to report one Bill without amendment, and that Bill No. 43 be referred by the House to the labor committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the committee of the whole house reports that the committee passed one bill without amendment, and that Bill No. 43 be referred by the House to the labor committee. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: Order No. 16.

CLERK OF COURT: Sixteenth order; second reading of Bill No. 44, "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944", Mr. Kennedy.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY: In moving the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to give the reasons why this Bill was brought by the government before the House.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: That is fine.

HON. THOS. L. KENNEDY: I will give it in a very disconnected form, because I am going to ask that this Bill go down to the agricultural committee, of which I hope to have the first meeting on Wednesday morning at half past ten, and from that committee some amendments may or m ay not come.

Well, there are no actual figures available for the year 1943 about the proportion of sugar that we have, but I think we can safely assume that one-half is cane sugar and one half is sugar beet sugar.

Before the war, before we lost some of our possessions, thirty-seven and one-half percent of the sugar of the world was beet sugar. As a rule, the southern countries have cane sugar, while the northern countries have beet sugar.

The cheapest place to produce sugar in the world was in Java, and a year before the Japanese war we were able to get from them three millions tons of sugar, the cheapest sugar ever made in the world. We were able to get from the Phillipines one m illion tons of sugar. Both of these things have been lost to us now.

On the beet side, Russia and the Ukraine, particularly, was the largest sugar beet growers in the world. They produced well up to two and one-half million tons per year. That is lost to us now, because while your guess is as good as m ine, I assume that the Germans perhaps destroyed these factories, or if they did n ot destroy them they took the machinery back to Germany so that they could make beet sugar and the Russians could not.

Before the war England produced five hundred and forty thousand tons of beet sugar in seventeen factories. Now, they are giving a sixteen million pound subsidy to their sugar beet growers for their sugar.

Now, they have not built any more factories but they evidently stepped up the acreage they have and they will pay nineteen dollars per ton for sugar beets. That is, nineteen dollars per ton is paid the English farmer for sugar beets.

In the United States, under the Sugar Act, the Federal Government gave sugar beet growers three and one-half dollars per ton. Last year, at the beginning of 1943, they stepped that

DDS had stepped that up one dollar, to four dollars and fifty cents per ton, and this year they have stepped it up another dollars, so now they give a federal subsidy of five dollars and fifty cents per ton.

I presume that everybody knows that the prices that I am quoting are on the sixteen percent beet, which is the usual content of sugar beet. If it goes up to twenty or down to ten then the price goes up or down, accordingly.

Just recently, in the last two weeks, so short was the United States stock of sugar that they said to these people, "We will only make available to you six percent less sugar than you had last year," and that six percent means a tonnage of three hundred and fifteen thousand eight hundred and seven_teen tons. That is what the United States has less than in the year 1943. And, all in all, it is estimated that while the trading part of the sugar was five million tons, this year the trading will be only two million, about three million tons short, and, therefore, we will have to get down to the two million tons instead of the five million tons.

Now, I might say in passing that England has purchased all the available sugar in the British Empire, from ever position. Now, let us come to the Canadian position. In 1940 we imported from Empire countries about eight hundred million pounds of sugar - in rough figures - and from Cuba about fifty million pounds of sugar. The reason for that is this; that there has been a one cent per pound preference from Empire countries and, therefore, we are getting m ost of our sugar from the Empire countries.

There are four sugar beet growing areas in Canada today. There has now been started a new area which is in the province of Quebec, for the first time this year. It was built by the Quebec government. There is one at Chatham and one at Wallaceburg in Ontario and one back in Manitoba which was built by a company but its bonds were guaranteed by the Manitoba government, and then there is one in southern Alberta, one of the finest of sugar beet growing countries in the world.

We imported into Canada in 1 940, that is the last year we have figures on, raw sugar from the British Empire of nearly four hundred thousand tons, and from other countries about one hundred and twenty-eight thousand tons, and refined sugar we

DM imported from the British Empire seven thousand tons, and from other countries sixteen hundred tons, a total of approximately five hundred and thirty-six thousand tons. This left the balance to be grown in Canada.

The price of sugar was set at Montreal at five dollars and seventy-five cents per hundred pounds, and freight rates have a bearing on that. Now, concerning freight rates, Manitoba has an advantage of seventy-six cents a hundredweight on sugar, over one hundred, which means about one dollar and sixty cents a ton - I have n ot worked it out exactly, but it something like one dollar and sixty cents per ton for the farmer for his sugar beets.

There is another thing which comes in, and that is that Alberta and Manitoba have also been able to make a better deal for Japanese labor for thinning out their beets. They have arranged for large forces of Japanese to go to the sugar beet country, and you k now the sugar beet is a great labor protector, and they have been able to grow beets a little cheaper than we have here and n ot only a little cheaper, but they are getting a higher price on account of the freight rates from Montreal.

Therefore, it came to us last year that we had to do one of two things, either subsidize the sugar beet growers in this province or run the risk of closing out the two splendid factories which we have in western Ontario. So, as a stab in the dark, we decided to pay a subsidy of fifty-five cents per hundredweight. At the beginning of last year it rained and it rained and it rained a little more, and very sugar beets grew. Money was saved by not planting our crops. I was one of those who saved a lot of money by not putting my crop in the soil, as many of you well kn ow.

The factories all over Canada made representations to Ottawa that they should have a subsidy, but Ottawa refused to give it to them, but reduced the excise tax on sugar by fifty cents per hundredweight, which meant about one dollar and twenty-five cents per ton on sugar beets.

Now, on looking into this picture, it is hard to kn ow just what to do. I have tried to look at it from the farmers' point of view, and as you hon. members will understand I thought it would be a good thing to help the farmers' wives - I do not know about the wives of the hon. members of this house who are farmers, but

I know at home my wife complained about the sugar shortage.

You who live in the cities have a different picture. You have, we will say, five people in your family living in the city and they get a lot of their meals out and they buy a lot of cakes from the bakery. We in the country do not do that. A family of five in the country - and I want to agree with every word the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) said about the farm homes - but we have five at home and each one eats twenty-one meals at home out of the sugar rationing we have, and I suppose because of working on the farm, they probably eat more than some of you do in the city.

Then we havebeen taught to bake our cakes. We do not buy them; we bake our cakes. So, therefore, a family in the country does not get as much sugar for home consumption as a family in the city. With that in view, I thought I had a great idea, but it seems I went off on a tangent, and it was not such a good idea. However, in some ways I still think it was.

In any event, I wrote this letter to Mr. Noble, of the sugar administrator's department, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Noble:

The Ontario Government is considering whether it is advisable to establish additional bonuses for the growing of sugar beets for the manufacture of sugar in Western Ontario. As a province, we think we should manufacture all the sugar we can in order to save railway costs and conserve shipping and railway equipment. To that end, I am prepared to recommend to the Government that we give a higher subsidy for the growing of sugar beets for the year 1944.

As this subsi dy will be provided with the money of the people of Ontario, we feel that any additional sugar that is secured by this bonus should be turned back to these people in the form of more sugar for canning. This is a fruit-growing province and we have had more complaints regar_ding the lack of adequate sugar for canning purposes from the housewives of Ontario, than on any other single subject. Would it be possible to secure from you a ruling that any sugar in excess of the nineteen million pounds manufactured in Ontario, in 1943, that may be

206 secured as the result of the bonus in 1944, shall be placed at the disposal of the housewives of Ontario to help with the canning of fruit?

Yours very truly,"

I was proud of that letter when I wrote it, but it did not turn out so good. Here (indicating) is the letter I got from Mr. Noble about two days later:

"Dear Mr. Kennedy:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th instant.

I am afraid it would be impossible to make an arrangement whereby any increase in the production of beet sugar in the province of Ontario in the present year would be placed at the disposal of the housewives of Ontario in addition to the regular per capita allocation for home canning.

Other provinces producing sugar would have a just cause for claiming discrimination. The expected record production of Alberta this year is due, among other things, to the fact that the retail price is higher than in Ontario. A new sugar factory will be in operation this year at St. Hilaire, Quebec, which will be owned outright by the Quebec Government. The Manitoba Government guarantees the bonds of the Manitoba Sugar Co. Ltd.

Taking these facts into consideration, I believe you will agree that claims for special consideration by any one province would n_ot be defensible.

Yours very truly,"

That letter is signed by Mr.S.R. Noble, Sugar Administrator. Then I had to go home and make my peace with my wife as to why she could not get more sugar for canning.

We wanted to get our sugar beets up to nearly the same price as the others so we entered into an agreement with a company and two or three times we thought we had it closed, and then we finally did close with them.

We said to the company, "To the growers we will give two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars at a rate of one dollar and fifty-five cents per ton. If you can get the company to carry on with that bonus, in case there are more beets produced ...

than the two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars will supply, that is, the one hundred and forty-one thousand odd tons of beets which are used, our money will be used, but anything over that the company will have to pay the subsidy."

The growers were able to get the company to agree to that. There are two reasons why we made this subsidy payment. One is it is a pure war expenditure - a pure war expenditure from the province of Ontario to increase the sugar production in the province of Ontario and the Empire as well, and one to emphasize to the farmers themselves and the public at large that in growing sugar beets the farmers are making a direct contribution to the war.

I do not want to see the factories close up.

Now, the growing of sugar beets in the farmers' lives is a good thing. Sugar beets are good for the land. You feed the land, you clean the land and after the sugar beets are taken out you have an ideal field to grow your crops. And in the farmers' lives, as you who are farmers know so well, we tried to build ten months of the year up with work. If you grow two crops it takes you about six months of the year; if you have three it may use up eight or nine months, but we try to grow twelve months of the year, and the sugar beet crop fits into that scheme very nicely.

I want, Before I move the second reading of this Bill later, to read a letter which I received this morning. It is on the letter-head of the Ontario Sugar Beet Produces Association, and reads as follows:

> "On behalf of the Ontario Sugar Beet Growers' Marketing Board and the sugar beet growers of the Province of Ontario, I wish to express to you their appreciation of the generous and sympathetic support given the sugar beet industry.
>
> We feel that without the support of the Province of Ontario the contract price for sugar beets in 1944 would have had little appeal to the beet growers of this Province and probably would have resulted in the closing of the factories at least temporarily.
>
> We are glad to report that negotiations with the Canada and Dominion Sugar Company have been completed and we feel that the contract is one which will have an

DDS

appeal to a much larger number of growers than was the case in 1943.

May I thank you personally for your kindly interest in the sugar beet industry."

Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I am doing so that in the committee on Wednesday morning - the agricultural committee - they may go very fully into every part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Kennedy moves second reading of Bill No. 44, "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment, I might explain that after dealing with a few second readings on Monday we will proceed the debate on the speech from the throne which was adjourned yesterday.

I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the House do now adjourn. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House stands adjcurned until Monday at three o'clock in the afternoon.

- - - - - -

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY TORONTO RECEIVED MAR 7 - 1944

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 6, 1944.

SPEAKER: Hon. William J. Stewart.

- - - - - -

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petitions have been received. From the Corporation of the city of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the establishment of a retirement fund for employees of the Ottawa Civic Hospital.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Leaside, praying that an Act may pass prohibiting the annexation of any part of that municipality to any other municipality for a period of five years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I should like to direct the hon. prime minister's attention to an item which appeared in an evening paper on Friday last, bearing a Canadian Press bye-line, and reading as follows, and I quote:

> "While the Ontario Government plans sweeping revisions in educational taxation, it is not likely that a Bill will be introduced at the present session of the Legislature. This was learned today from a

source close to Premier Drew. This source said the result of the investigation of the subject will be laid before the Legislature, however."

Would the hon. prime minister be willing to comment on this news report, and perhaps tell the House just when we can expect a full statement as to how the Government plans to implement its announced intention to relieve the municipal taxpayers by taking over fifty percent of the cost of education?

I should add that several days ago this question was discussed at the Toronto District Labor Council where delegates expressed alarm over the drastic reduction in social and welfare services in Toronto. It was pointed out that these reductions already amounted to something like $378,000. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that other muninicipalities in the province are being similarly affected in the preparation of their budget. I have no desire whatever to harrass the government on this matter. I think, however, that a statement by the hon. prime minister today as to his intention would greatly help to clarify the situation, and give hon. members of this house and the people of Ontario some inkling of what the government has in mind.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, this matter will be discussed, as I have already said, at the proper time, when the subject of education is under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) Third reading.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order, third reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT: (Lenark) Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Doucett moves third reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act". Shall the

motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling an answer to question No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Third order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for the consideration of the speech of the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: (St. And ew): Mr. Speaker, it has been customary, until now, by all those who have participated in the discussions on the Speech from the Throne, to express a feeling of felicitation to everybody. I confess that I was deeply impressed with the sincerity of these felicitations, but I am wondering if it is customary to continue then until the Debate is ended?

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that all the kind things said by the Leader of my Party, (Mr. MacLeod) are shared by me - or I share them with him.

I just want to say a few words to you, Mr. Speaker, and to some of those who have participated in this debate. To you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I assure you of every co-operation; in fact, I am authorized to state on behalf of t is group that, in order to facilitate the discussion, we will place no/ more speakers in the debate. This will also expedite the business, I am sure, Mr. Speaker. However, I refrain from throwing it out as a challenge to other members, who may experience a great deal of difficulty in quieting down the more vociferous of the followers. So I leave that entirely to their own consciences.

To the hon. the Prime Minister, I wish to say that his opportunities are great indeed. He has the opportunity

the like of which very few premiers and heads of governments in this House have had. Under peculiar circumstances, his government has the opportunity to govern in a new way, and, if I may say so, in an unpartisan way, with the support and cooperation of the more diverse groupings than ever existed in this House. I know his task is not easy, and I concur with the expression of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) who has on behalf of both of us assured the government of our readiness to cooperate with them in every possible way, in the achievement of legislation desired and needed by the people of this province.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has a very weighty responsibility. I am sorry I did not speak on the day when he received congratulations on his birthday. I would have extended mine as well, but I wish to say that as a young man he has a responsibility shared by very few in the past in this ancient legislature. He represents a group entirely new in the House, and a group that is new as a group. He leads a group of labor, some farmers, and progressive representatives of a new type, and I want to say that I am, despite some differences, quite proud when I look across and see this large phalanyx of that new type of representative in this House.

I want to congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and extend to him the most sincere wishes for the successful leadership for the very important group in the House.

Insofar as the spokesmen for the Liberal group are concerned; I want to say in all sincerity I was deeply impressed with his speech, and that of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), who followed him.

I have enjoyed all the speeches of the representatives of the agricultural section. There is something in their

speeches that differs from all others, something earthy, something simple and impressive. That holds good for the speakers on agriculture who spoke for the opposition, the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) In fact, I was so impressed, that I was inclinded to be helpful to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and help him solve the riddle he placed before us when he said there was no possible explanation for the decline of his group. But he is not here. But from the attendance on the liberal side, it looks like a rout, not just a decline of the group to-day. However, this help I want to extend to him may perhaps be given on some other occasion.

There has been a great repercussion to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams), and I want to say that I, too, find ground for a critical approach to his speech, but I think that, as compared with the speech of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) ~~and~~ the speech coming from the member for St. Patricks (Mr. Roberts), my neighbouring riding, should perhaps receive more criticism than was given the speech of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams). I was seriously disturbed by that speech, and I hope it did not express the views of the Government, particularly his reference to the cooperation of the two nations in our state. I felt that the remarks were rather damaging to the fabric of national unity at this time. I do not agree with him that the people of Quebec and the people of Ontario cannot cooperate and live in harmony and build together a united Canada. I disagree that they can no more mingle than the Athabasca and the Clear Water rivers, to which the hon. member so eloquently referred.

I think we should recognize that Canada is a bi-national state, and that the future welfare of this country, Ontario included, depends upon the degree of understanding and unity that will be forged between Ontario and Quebec.

Again in respect to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams); he, of course, had a very important point of view to contend with, that is, irresistable temptations, but I do not know what temptations the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) had, which caused him to speak the way he did.

History shows a possibility of the cooperation of people, and I will not in this house cite examples from the Soviet Union, but I hope I will be permitted to cite an example from Switzerland, where not just two nations unit into one state, but three, and lately they have added a fourth. You have Germans, the French, the Italians, and latterly they have added a Roumanish group, recognizes all languages, and it was my privilege to be in Switzerland before the outbreak of the war and to see with my own eyes the harmony that prevailed in that state and the unanimity with which they come to grips with all national problems.

As for the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams); I said I could understand the temptations he had before him, of "getting things off his chest", and telling a few things that I am sure he has longed to tell for a long while. Mind you, I will in no way attempt to compare myself with a man who is endowed with all the talents of his nation. I hope shortly to have the provincial leader of our party, who is also a welshman, in the house, and match them up, but as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) said, at the St. David's Day banquet, his nation consists of speakers, orators and leaders, and I would say also of those with great dramatic ability, and he has certainly displayed great talent in delivering that speech. By the way, I perhaps should not miss the opportunity of pointing out to the hon. member for Ontario

(Mr. Williams) that I was deeply impressed with the fact that he, as guest of the St. David celebration, shared honors at the head table with none other than Mr. Gladstone Murray. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if it is in the interests of welsh national unity to share the table with Mr. Gladstone Murray, against whom all just criticism was levied in this house, - and I joined in it - then perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) might agree in the interests of Canadian national unity, that we, too, can sit together with others at the same table at this time.

Now, what he said was absolutely true, when he dealt with Stratford, and other experiences of the past. I suspected him of having me in mind when he spoke of the few people in the house who remember Stratford. I remember Stratford, indeed; in fact, if it was simply a matter of reminising, and getting things "off the chest", I perhaps could go the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) one better, maybe two better, and maybe three better.

It was my privilege to be associated with the labor movement for quite a while, and I was connected with the movement at the time of Stratford. Yes, I could even remind the house of Hespeler, where not only were the strikers denied a hall -- when I came down on invitation to address them on one cold wintry afternoon, on a Saturday, we had no hall to meet in; men and women, natives of Hespeler, had to assemble outside -- and I could remind the house also of the fact that whole strike leadership of Hespeler -- natives who were striking against a company controlled in Montreal -- that the entire strike leadership was arrested and kept incommunicado away from Hespeler until the strike was broken. I was there.

And, of course, we could go back to a lot of other experiences. I could remind the house of the time when it was unsafe for a miner in Sudbury to even speak to anybody connected with the labor

movement, unsafe because hw would lose his job, and I, and those with me, met people in the darkness of the night, in private homes, when there was no sign of democracy in Sudbury, but I am glad to see that today Sudbury is changed. I will come to that in a moment.

I should remind the House of the time when the national leader of my party, and a number of his colleagues were arrested and thrown into jail, and statements were made that the movement was destroyed "root and branch", and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the hon. member for Ontario, (Mr. Williams) that if there is cause for complaint, that members of the movement with which I am associated, have more cause than any other group in this house. We never got anything but the "big stick". But, of course, those who proclaimed the destruction of the movement "root and branch" are forgotten now. Their names are not known, while Tim Buck tod ay, as far as the public is concerned, is the most popular man in Canada, and a man who attracts greater attention than any other single person in any political party. It was not up-rooted "root and branch".

I could also remind the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) of his good constituency, of Oshawa.

I was priv ileged to help those worked in understanding some of the elements of Trade Unionism, and as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) knows, I was there when the C. I. O. came in, on the request of the Oshawa workers.

But the important thing - and the important remark I wish to make about that speech - is that it serves very little purpose, but me rely reminisces and stresses those grievances of the past, from which he, and a greatmany hon. members of this house suffered. And there were many.

One important thing in our speeches, and I regret it was not sufficiently stresses in the very important speech by the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) - as I say, one important thing in the speeches is the element of positiveness, the element of

"what are we going to do now", and the fact that we must judge people, leaders and parties, by what they will do now, and what they will do in the future, rather than by what they have done in the past.

If the British Labor Party were to be guided entirely by past experiences, and past prejudices, if you please, they would never agree to sit in the same government with the present prime minister as the head. British Labor has had more than one occasion to oppose and complain bitterly of some of the past actions of Prime Minister Churchill, but it would be a disservice to a British Labor,and a disservice to the war effort if, because of those experiences, British Labor would not now, as it does, co-operate with Churchill, and cooperate with the conservative party and with the liberal party in giving Britain the kind of war government that it has, a government that units all the British people, communists, labor, liberal, and conservative.

And it is from that point of view that I think I wanted to make these remarks about the speech, not that there was anything of a misrepresentative nature or character, but to emphasize this point, that we of the labor movement must learn now to judge people and parties on the basis of their policy, on the basis of what they are doing, and is required in the interests of the war and the post war period.

And it is from this angle that I wish to make my contribution in this debate on the speech from the throne.

I have already stated that this the twenty-first Legislature is remarkably different from that which we have had in the past, and made it is so, possibly, by the period in which we live. We have had in the past an upset when a farmer government was elected. But it was not as fundamental as is the change now. We have always had farm representatives in the house, and I hope they will continue to be here in adequate numbers. But what we have today is an

entirely different picture. We have thirty-four members of the C.C.F., and two of the Labor Progressive party, so that despite differences, we have thirty-six representatives of a new type, representatives which are expressive of the political aspirations of the people. They represent the labor-progressive portion of the province, a new type of representation.

But let no one think that this was an accident on August 4th. It was nothing of the sort. Any such a conjecture would only lead to fateful errors and policies that would perhaps be very harmful to those engaging themselves in it, and to the province as a whole. Those who misunderstand the meaning of August 4th, will resort to high-pressure campaigns to misrepresentations, to divisions, to slander, and they will create discord, and thus weaken the unity of the people and bring harm to themselves, and injure the influence which this province can bring to bear in the shaping of a national policy for victory, for a lasting peace, and for post war security.

If we read correctly the meaning of August 4th, and if we draw the right conclusion from the composition of the house as it is at present, we will come to some very constructive conclusions. First, we will conclude that the Ontario electors gave us all -- that is all of us -- a mandate to so lead this province that it will play its full share in winning the war, and in achieving lasting peace, and guaranteeing economic security for all people, after the war has been won. That mandate was given to all parties.

Secondly, no one party has a clear majority of the electors behind them, and all parties were selected on programs and election pledges which bear marked similarity, insofar as the war effort, victory, and post war objectives are concerned.

Third, that the general agreement which exists on major objectives, and the composition of this house, demands to make possible a high degree of cooperation to achieve the common ob-

jectives of the people of Ontario.

However, if anybody should misread the democratic expression of the Ontario people on August 4th, they may, consciously or unconsciously, inject issues which may defeat the democratic wish of the people of Ontario, thus creating confusion and division, which will do immeasurable harm to Ontario and to Canada now and in the period after the war.

And so the rise in the C.C.F. is not necessarily an expression of wishes for socialism in the scientific and classical understanding of that term, and we, therefore, see no reason why the question of socialism or private ownership should be raised. I have been a member of a party that represents the political movement in Canada which for a quarter of a century, away back before the founding of the C.C.F. championed the cause of independent political action, Ours is a movement for socialism, and we believe that socialism is the highest form of democracy. We are, furthermore, confident that ultimately this higher form of democracy will be arrived at democratically by the whole of the majority of citizens. We consider the rise of the C.C.F. mainly -- and the rise of trade unions and other labor groups -- as the expression of the desire of the people for reform, for advanced social legislation, for extended public ownership, and for a post-war period free of the haunting fear of unemployment, poverty, and hopelessness. We endorse the demand for these reforms; we are a part of the movement that seeks to achieve them. We do not think, however, that the achievement of these reforms would transform Canada into a socialist Canada, but we believe that by uniting ourselves, and these reforms properly placed, can and should be achieved.

In Britain there is a great deal of similarity between the political divisions in that house -- the British House of

Parliament -- and the relationship of forces in this province and in this Legislature. In Britain we find cooperation between the conservative and the liberal party, and all other groups, and we believe that without sacrificing anything from the reform progressive platform, similar unity can and should be arrived at in this province. In fact, we agree whole heartedly with the present policy of the British labor policy, even to the maintenance of a political truce that is maintained in Britain today, and it is from this point of view, Mr. Speaker, that we welcome the pronouncement from the hon. prime minister and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the leaders of the other groups, of their readiness and desire to cooperate at this Legislature for the achievement of progressive legislation, and for the attainment of a kind of leadership that will meet the needs of the people of Ontario in the present period.

There was some fear expressed that the Legislature has become a sort of glorified county council. I believe that the people of Ontario do not want the Legislature to be that at all. From the elections and the composition of this house, are guaranteed that this Legislature will not be a "glorified county council", but will be a house of parliament for Ontario, where big issues will be dealt with in a big way, and where great possibilities will be realized, and will not be missed in this period of our history.

Ontario is, after all, the key province of the Dominion. It is a province that is not all conservative-minded as some people want us to believe. Ontario has a glorious past in the fight for progress and democracy. It is the home of William Lyon Mackenzie; it is the place where the battles for representative responsible government were initiated and led.

It is the province where labor fought for its right to organize, and within the shadows of this house of parliament there took place tremendous demonstrations at the time of confederation and immediately after for the right of labor to form unions. Ten thousand strong gathered in this park around these buildings when the then publisher of the Globe challenged the right of his printers to form a union, and the right of labor to organize was achieved in this province. This province also is playing a very important leading role in the war effort of the nations today. But in view of that, we believe that this province now can set an example of unity and cooperation for the rest of the country in the attainment of the essentials at the present time. We believe that this house should and can lead in measures that will lead to the attainment of war production and war morale, and meet the climactic battles that are about to be fought by our forces and the forces of our allies in the very near future.

(page 416 follows)

We believe that this Parliament, in tune with the great past of Ontario, can assure national policy in that general direction as well. And we believe that Ontario through this Legislature can, and should demonstrate in an exemplary fashion how a post-war construction can be carried through to make Ontario what the boys have been promised, "A place fit for heroes to live in".

Then, I want to emphasize Mr. Speaker that this can be done not by the usurping of power or the usurping of rights which belong to Federal or other Governments, nor can this be achieved by the formation of internal alliances, or by the formation of alliances with forces outside of the Province which have their own axes to grind, nor by ganging up on the Federal Government to achieve their own purposes in this country. I submit it can be accomplished only by all parties uniting for the post-war period.

The question arises whether this House is the place to discuss these things, whether peace or war can be determined in this House. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that while these great national and international problems cannot be determined from here, they can be influenced from here.

I want to say that this Province can influence the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government can play a very important role in influencing policy for war or peace in the British Commonwealth of nations and in the family of the United Nations.

And I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to do that, because I am convinced that we in Ontario will never solve the post-war problem in isolation from the rest of Canada, no more than Canada will solve its tremendous problems in isolation from the rest of the world. But it can be done.

We have expanded industrial activities. Whether we will have work, whether our forest products will be marketed, whether our farm products will find a ready market or not will depend upon the peace which will be achieved and the possibilities of the post-war period.

In our desires to really solve the problems of the development

of the people of Ontario, agricultural, industrial, labour, etc, we are in duty bound to insure policies in the direction of the achievement of lasting peace.

Let me quote for one moment not from a socialist theoritician but from a hard headed British banker, the hon. Rupert Beckett, the chairman of the Westminister Bank of London, in his annual report reviewing economic conditions in Britain, he said: "Much, however, will depend upon the character of the peace settlement. If peace is established with the appearance of durability, the possibilities of recovering not only for ourselves, but for the world at large, will be greatly stimulated and will be rendered more favourable than at any time during the past quarter of a century."

That is true, and we share that view. That is true, not only of Britian, but it is equally, if not more true, also of Canada.

We are proud of the fact that Canada leaped forward industrially a quarter of a century in the last four and a half years. So it did. It has become a great industrial country. Our industrial outputs have increased. We must realize that whether the large plants will be continue to operate and employment will be found, or these new plants will begin to dilapidate and become idle, will be determined not solely by us here, but will be determined by the outcome of the war/ and by the collaboration after the war.

Some people say, Well, what guarantees have you that such cooperation is possible? The movement which I am associated with, the party I am a member of, in unison with other sections of people maintain that such a possibility has now been created. We look at that historical conference as a turning point in human history which is not as yet fully appreciated.

It would perhaps be taking time unnecessarily to elaborate upon the significance of the Teheran conference that the Leader of the House in my party has so splendidly elaborated in his speech. I wish, however, to elaborate on this point, that the meaning of the Teheran conference must sink in deeper than it has.

That only secured a means of collaboration, which, in turn, means the possibility of solving the great problems we will have at home. It is the turning point in human history. The alternative for that would be havoc, disorganization and insecurity, and no prospect for the utilization of our productive resources to the full, providing employment after the war.

I do not want to quote much, but a couple of words from the last speech of Winston Churchill, the Premier of Great Britain, may not prove amiss. He said in his speech some weeks ago, the following, and I quote:-

"The question is asked, I have heard, if the good relations attablished at Mosco w and Teheran have proved durable or if they faded during the weeks that have passed.

"Does the Pravda statement, for instance, or do the articles which are appearing in various organs of the Soviet Government imply a cooling off in Anglo-Russian or American-Russian friendship and a rebirth of suspicion of her western allies on the part of Russia?

"I feel fully entitled to reassure the House on that all-important point. None of the ground made good at Moscow and Teheran has been lost. The three great Allies are absolutely united in their action against the common foe. They are equally resolved to pursue the war at whatever cost to a victorious conclusion, and they believe that a wide field of friendly cooperation lies before them after the destruction of Hitlerite tyranny.

"It is upon such prolonged, intimate and honourable association that the future of the world depends."

(Page 419 follows.)

We say, therefore, that in the deliberations and in the legislative work in this House we should bear these important events in mind and workin particular, in harmony with those decisions and in accordance with the possibilities that they open up. I should say that this need not be done by blindly following Ottawa, any more than it can be done by an obstructionist policy toward Ottawa, but by a constructive policy of cooperation in everything that is good, and by setting examples to Ottawa in those fields where the Ottawa Government is falling short .

We feel, therefore, that the speech from the Throne offered a basis for a program, a kind of leadership that will be generally progressive and of a reform character. And the readiness of all parties to cooperate strengthens our belief that this House will play an important roll in that direction.

In so far as the points dealt with in the speech from the Throne, one of the important ones, of course, is the post-war planning. I wish to congratulate the Government upon taking that step. The establishing of that new department is an Act that deserves congratulations, and we will not be at all niggardly in giving them. But I think it would be correct to point out that what has already been mentioned, namely that the department, in order to bring its full results, must be under a separate ministry, that he should have an advisory council of a democratic nature, representing industry, labour, farmers, science, the youth, the veterans, and so on, and let the Ontario people feel that they are participating democratically in the formation of our post-war plans, and to encourage the formation of such committees in each locality.

I think it should be emphasized more than it has been in the speech from the Throne and in the legislative proposals that are coming before the House, that slum clearance and house construction must be brought forward to the centre of all discussions. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would be wise in bringing in legislation during this session that would make possible for every municipality to set up housing with authority. There is no such legislation at the

present time. Existing housing boards have only advisory powers. In the past, when the Federal Government made available large sums for slum clearance in the City of Toronto, the housing board had no authority to borrow any money or to engage in slum clearance and house construction; and I wish to urge the Government, as an integral part of its post-war program, to include and bring down legislation which will give legal authority to municipal housing boards to actually clear away the infested, crime breeding, health destroying slums of our municipalities, and build through the funds that undoubtedly will be made available by the Federal and other Governments, modern houses, fit for Canadians to live in, and at a price which the low paid workers can afford.

Failure to give this authority to municipal boards will tie their hands, and there will be no planned slum clearance, although there may be some construction of homes, but it will be a planless and costly effort, leaving the slums where they are and providing homes for only the few.

The second point I want to deal with, in the speech from the Throne, is that dealing with collective bargaining and other labour problems.

The speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker contains a number of indications that desirable measures will be introduced during this session; and that is welcomed by us and welcomed by the whole province. But I feel that it should be brought to the attention of the House and the Government that the program is as yet insufficient. It should be pointed out that labour in our country, in Ontario and elsewhere , is highly efficient, initiative and resourceful and has obtained productivity second to none in the world. In the war it has demonstrated a patriotism that is beyond question. And, what is more, it has sought, it seems to me, to avoid industrial strife. Labour in Canada has exercised tremendous restraint and self discipline in the interests of the war effort. It has resisted provocation of the worst sort. It has swallowed pride and overlooked mistreatment which at normal times it never would have done.

But labour in Canada has not been given the recognition that labour has received in all other democratic countries and in every country of the United Nations.

Let me quote from the brief of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada presented to the Federal Government about a week ago:

> "We would much prefer to aid and assist the Government than to devote time to protesting undue infringements upon our liberties," and so forth.

This is the unquestioned attitude of all Canadian labour. They do not desire to quarrel with Governments or with employers. They are anxious to coperate; but that opportunity has not yet been given Canadian labour.

Our legislation is backward, Federal and Provincial; and the attitude of management and of large big businesses is certainly not inspirit with the declaration on the war and with any principle of democracy.

In our own provincial department of labour, for instance, — and I want to say that I am not criticizing the present labour department alone, it was so before this Government took office, that the Ontario labour department is considered as a minor department and in fact is one that really operates on antiquated, phelgmatic and unimaginative fashion. For instance, the Forestry Department issues literature about conditions of trees, about the treatment of forest products, about planting, and so on. But the labour department never issues anything, in Ontario, about labour and its problems. The Agriculture department quite rightly issues a lot of literature about the care of, the breeding of cattle, marketing conditions, the development of the cheese industry and the conditions of the soil. I have received those publications and I am sure they are appreciated by the farming industry. But the Department of Labour in Ontario did not send out one line about the conditions of housing, or the workers and their health, and so on. And that is true of all former governments. I am not critical of the present Minister of Labour any more than I am of the previous ones.

In fact, I want to say that the Labour Department has no literature at all. All it issues is the one report to this House. For the rest of the time one could conclude that there are no labour problems such as health, child labour, or anything else.

I would point out that in Manitoba, — the members of the Treasury Branch perhaps will appreicate this, — a request was made for a study of the labour law; and that study was made by the former premier of that province, and a lengthy document was prepared. We have not anything like that in Ontario. The Department of Labour here lives from hand to mouth, and the leadership of it is nil.

I might, however, say, in passing, for the information of the Conservative-Progressive Party that the result of that report has produced no legislation in Manitoba until this date.

The few strikes that have taken place in our province under these conditions, I maintain Mr. Speaker, do not constitute any indictment of labour, but rather of the kind of labour legislation which we have, an indictment of the attitude of certain sections of management or employers of labour. That is true of almost every strike that has taken place. That is true of those mentioned by the hon. member for Ontario, and many besides.

Collective Bargaining Act. The present provincial collective bargaining legislation is not satisfactory and Ontario labour wants it changed. I am conscious, Mr. Speaker, that this Government did not introduce this legislation. It has certain favourable features but it has many objectionable features. It operated in a manner that caused labour to be alarmed.

I want to quote from a statement issued by the registrar of the Labour Court, registrar Finkleman, who points out that during 1943 the Labour court of Ontario has certified sixty-four collective bargaining agencies. Of these, thirty-two were for groups that affiliated with trade union bodies, and thirty-two were not so affiliated.

Now, to labour, that means that fifty per cent of the certifications in 1943 went to company unions. Furthermore, labour objects to the whole court structure. The working men of this province want to have

the right to appear before a labour board, if necessary, in their overalls and with their working hands on the table speak to the Board, without lawyers being required to speak for them, particularly in the case of smaller unions that cannot afford, in many instances, to engage counsel to go through the costly procedure provided by the Court.

Now, the question is what shall replace the present Act? There has been considerable exchange of thought on this question in the Legislature. I wish to make the following comment. In the first place, labour desires, if I interpret its desires correctly, national and uniform labour legislation.

In that regard, the policy of the Government, as announced some weeks ago, has the general support of labour. I, for one, agree with the position that they have taken, because the conditions of labour, hours, wages, and production, and so on and the opportunities for trade unions to grow and exercise influence should be national and uniform

That, however,does not mean that in the absence of national legislation this province should sit back and wait for the millenium.

The Federal Government has brought down a code. I understand that the hon.Minister of Labour will speak this afternoon and may have some pronouncement to make, but I think that one element of the new federal code should be emphasized in its constructive value, and that is that, with all its faults, and it has very many faults, it represents a departure of the greatest significance,- under pressure of course - for the first time collective bargaining is recognized in a Government bill, Federally, and they seek to apply it to a considerable section of industry.

The principle, therefore, of national legislation is contained in that Bill. Should that Bill be applied as it is to the Province of Ontario? Definitely not. I agree with the hon. member for Ontario, who quoted a telegram. I wanted to say that I too, received that telegram word for word signed by the same leader of Labour,- a very able leader of labour, in my opinion. It is true

I may not be able to read the telegram with all the necessary emphasizes that the hon. member for Ontario so ably did.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try.

MR. J. B SALSBERG: Oh, I could not try here. But that telegram criticizes the federal bill and shows its deficiences correctly.

I have also another document which I believe the hon. member of Ontario also received from the United Machine workers of Ontario. That too criticizes the Bill in detail, with the sections of the federal Bill, and I think that correctly appreciated the importance of obtaining national labour legislation.

I believe that the Federal Bill, unacceptable as it is, limited as it is, must be improved upon, and that this government and this legislature in this province of Ontario should do everything in their power, while defending the principle of National Labour Legislation, nationally applied, to bring its full weight to bear upon the Ottawa Government so that this Bill can be amended, even if not at the present time.

Having realized that the limit perhaps was reached at a given point, it is, I think, important that this government should adopt that legislation which will be found necessary to fill the gap left by the Federal code. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government call a conference of all the representatives of organized labour in this province, immediately, an emergency conference. Why not take labour into confidence and call the Ontario leaders of labour, of both trades congresses, — do anything to avoid a loss of time, — and point out to them how best to improve the Federal Act, and finally agree upon what legislation should be adopted in Ontario, now.

While maintaining the principle of federal legislation, Ontario should set an example by adopting legislation which will meet all the requirements of labour of the province as a whole.

I want tto emphasize that the requirements of labour can be separated from the requirements throughout Canada as a whole. They are not class or sectarian demands.

I urge upon the Minister of labour to call at once a conference of labour and agree upon the type of legislation before he brings in the legislation which he has in mind.

The government's pledge to bring in legislation for a forty-eight hour week and one week's holiday is a step in the right direction. I think the government should be congratulated upon taking that step, but I think it should be pointed out that the forty-eight hour week cannot be separated from the whole problem of post-war conditions, in the role of labour, namely,

It is said that either we will have a post-war period of scarcity, or we shall have a post-war period of plenty and economic expansion. I disagree with the Minister of Labour's recent statement that women workers should go out of industry; that the struggle will be on for a job.

I think it is unsound that women should be chased out of industry. Furthermore, I think no shortening of hours will solve the problem unless the wage question is settled. And a forty-eight hour week is insufficient. I think the Legislature should call for a report on the reduction of hours immediately after hostilities and there should be no reduction of wages of those working under the forty-eight hour week, or later on under the forty hour week. No legislation will be complete unless it does carry on the working hours and the wages during the forty-hour week.

Then in addition to the markets and experts, our economic future also will be largely determined by the purchasing power in the province and in the country. That is, in addition to the increased export of our products, we must strive for an expanding home market and purchasing power that will make possible an increased consuption of what we produce and the attainment of a fuller life for all. That is, whatever we agree upon, we shall have a wage structure which will enable the worker and his dependents to purchase the necessities of life, and thus encourage production at home, or otherwise we will have a shrinkage of production.

The hon. minister of health in a very able speech some time ago pointed out the effect of low wages upon the health of the people.

I want to point out that merely drawing this to the attention of the public will not solve the difficulty. I want to point out that the condition of wages in this country is so shocking that it hardly could be believed. In Hansard of February 15th, 1944, page 515, the hon. Mr. Ralston is discussing the question of wages and soldiers pay, and went on to say;

> "It was pointed out by the representatives of the Department of Labour that to detail soldiers for duty in eastern Canada on soldiers' pay and allowances would probably cause dissatisfaction among civilian woods workers because the earnings of civilian workers, generally speaking, were, it was said, less than the pay and allowances of a soldier."

That is the situation in connection with the wage rate. And I might quote, Mr. Speaker, from a very conservative economist, none other than Gilbert Jackson, who brings forth a very important fact, namely that the wage rate of Canadian workers to-day is lower, -- the actual wage rate, -- than it was at the beginning of the war and lower than it was at the turn of the century. Now, this may sound astounding, but it is correct. When comparing the wage rates with the wholesale prices he arrives at the figures as follows:

> 1939, the wage rate when compared with wholesale prices was at 103 per cent.
>
> 1940, it dropped to 95.5 per cent.
>
> 1941, it dropped to 95.9 per cent.
>
> 1942, it dropped to 93.8 per cent

In other words the value of the earned dollar of the Canadian worker in relation to the wholesale prices, declined. It was 109 at the turn of the century.

This is a very serious problem, not just from a humaniterian point of view, but from the point of view of the post-war reorganization of our lives. We cannot have post-war security without the adjustment of a proper wage.

I therefore wish to bring to the attention of the Government a proposal

that the whole question of minimum wages be reconsidered. The minimum wage for women is antiquated and completely out of line with wage rates and cost of living. But reconsideration is necessary not merely of the minimum wage for women but a reconsideration is necessary of the minimum wage for males, youths and apprentices.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government commence an inquiry immediately, either through the government committee or through the labour committee which has not met the last year but will meet, I hope, this year, to hold a public inquiry into the whole wage question and bring in proposals for legislation and adopt legislation which will provide a wage policy which will cover all workers in this province for the immediate future.

I want to say that the Workmen's Compensation Act must be amended to provide one hundred per cent payment for injured workmen, victims of industrial accidents. It is a crime to punish the family of an injured workman, injured while at work, by reducing their meagre income by a third. It is not either just or common sense. It must be abolished. I want to propose, further, that the hon. minister of labour give some leadership in the solution of a number of important problems. The hon. the premier, when leader of the opposition in the last House, came forward at one time for the proposal for a conference between labour and industry. I suggest that this be done now, calling a conference of labour and industry and the government to deal with the questions of man-power, layoffs, transfers of labour, industrial conversions, etc. I want to say to the Government through you, Mr. Speaker, that the government should avail itself of the large groups of labour members in the House, as well as supporters of the Government, all who are anxious to cooperate with it in achieving results which will be of lasting benefit to Ontario in solving the problem of industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken a lot of time, but, as I say, I am completing the debate from this part of the House. I think that the part of the speech from the Throne dealing with public welfare and health is the least satisfactory. In so far as public health is concerned, I think there is ground for fear that influences of insurance companies

and other unprogressive forces are being felt within the government, driving towards provincial health measures, rather than struggling for national public health schemes. The present health plan is not a satisfactory one; but here again there is a first step in the direction of national health measures, a very important principle that we must grasp and broaden and improve and apply it everywhere.

My friend, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) says we are all waiting anxiously the pronouncement in regard to the labour court.

There is reason for fear that what the hon. minister of health proposes will weaken the link between labour and the government. I think it would improve it if he announces that he desires national health measures and that the government will do everything in its power to see that national plans are incorporated for Quebec, for Ontario, and for the rest of Canada. The present scheme, of course, has its weaknesses. I do not want to elaborate on that, but it is a Federal scheme, something that has been required for a long time.

Old age pensions. The question of old age pensions has not been dealt with. The Minister is glad to report in the speech from the Throne that many recipients have declined to accept the pension. But if the Minister would tell us also, — which I think is also known, that the old age pensioner is still limited to a total of $365.00 a year, regardless of the increased cost of living, you will realize that some of them will strain every last bit of energy to try to work, rather than to go under the old age pension. We believe that the old age pension should be increased to $40.00 a month as a minimum, increased to $60.00.

Mother allowances. In so far as mother's allowances, I find that there is no immediate intention to increase the allowance. I was shocked to find when in the Toronto City Council, that the allowances given to widows and their families are still below the Bell standard of relief. This province should be ashamed to continue such a system. We propose that a committee of scientists, dietitions, doctors and dentists be appointed by the government, — that has not been suggested

by the government, but it should be accepted by them, until a sound scientific basis is found for these families.

Unemployment relief. This is hardly dealt with but it is still a big item, and we believe ~~and~~ unemployment relief should be taken away from the municipalities, that they should be relieved of the cost of relief. And furthermore that the relief allowances in Ontario be increased to the level of that which Toronto pays upon the report of Dr. Bell, Without the province relieving the city municipality. The city of Toronto is compelled to shoulder the increased food allowances, and the province refuses to share the extra cost.

(Page 430 follows)

It is a grievous problem. There is an indication that the effort will be made to extend the city tax power, but that is only to cover a loss. In reality, the financial situation of the municipalities in Ontario is, to say the least, a tragic one. Their tax powers are limited; the services they are carrying, although the minimum cannot be dodged and the government has left the whole problem of municipal financing in the laps of the city government.

There is no indication in the speech from the throne of any measure. However, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that there may be plans that the government has, but it is not taking this house into its confidence. Last week, at a meeting of the Board of Control of the city of Toronto, his Worship Mayor Conboy made a statement when discussing an additional expenditure, and he said, "I know the plans of the Provincial government, but I am not going to announce them, but I say that this expenditure can be made and it will not call for any increase in taxation".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know there is such intimate relationship between the mayor and the government, but, as members of this house, we should also be informed, and furthermore, there are mayors who are not of the same party, who may not enjoy the confidence that Mayor Conboy enjoys, and they are now struggling with the 1944 tax rate, which they hoped would be reduced by the government assuming the taxation of schools and other subventions, and they are unable to reduce the taxes, the Assessment Act is not reframed, and they are compelled, in many instances, not only to retain the old tax, but to increase their rate. I believe that these words of criticism are intended to elicit from the government some action to help the municipalities in solving a problem which has led to the loss of homes by workers, and so forth, through an unjust tax system that has run over from the horse and buggy days, and now carried over into the era of monopoly, capital and big business. It is high time this be done, and I hope it will be

done.

Now, there is one item in the speech from the throne, that is very important, in my opinion, and I want to congratulate the government on the action they are taking. This has reference to the legislation against racial discrimination, and a Bill has already been introduced.

I am sincerely appreciative of what the government is doing in that regard. Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficiently appreciated in this country that Canada is a land to which has come people from every corner of the globe. Perhaps I am the only new Canadian in this house, and I am naturally appreciative of the opportunities for a new Canadian to reach this chamber. I want to assure you that I am fully impressed with the dignity of this house, and its history, and its past accomplishments. It is good to know that the government is paying attention to this problem, and it has suggested legislation, and it is implementing it. It also mentions it intends to appoint a committee to educate the new Canadians. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of the second suggestion. Namely the appointment of a committee to educate the new Canadians. I have no doubt about the intention of the government but may I, as one of the new Canadians, say it would be considered rather patronizing and condescending and hardly required.

New Canadians, contrary to popular conception, are not an ignorant people. Many of those whom you see and hear speaking broken English, have attained a very high cultural level in their own tongue and amongst their own people. The new Canadians have made a great contribution to this country. They have built railroads; you go through the forests of this country and you find the Finns and the Swedes. As we ride the railroads, we are not always aware that the Ukrainian and the Pole watches those tracks and the road bed to enable us as Kipling said:

"So we can ride in comfort undisturbed during the darkness of the night".

You go to the mining towns and you will find people of every European country producing the gold, and the nickle and the other precious metals that some people perhaps think they are responsible for producing, because they are located in Bay Street, or in King Street, or in St. James Street. But almost everyone in this chamber wears garments and shoes which have been produced by new Canadians who have worked in sweat shops. They have chosen this country, and are devoted to Canada, and their funds are in this war, the same as all others, and new and old Canadians are falling side by side in Italy and elsewhere, and they carry on great cultural activities amongst their own people. The Ukrainian handy man or laborer in your shop may be performing in a dramatic club during the week/end, a drama of high order; the Finnish maid working in your house, finding it difficult to speak English, may be a leader of her cultural group in her spare time.

These people are not ignorant. They are loyal; they love Canada; they are making their contribution; they do not have to be patronized, and I would say to the hon. prime minister, who is also the hon. minister of education that he can greatly help them, not by the appointment of committees, not by bringing down people who do not understand them to pay an odd visit, but by extending the educational facilities, night schools, public, high and even university courses to be made available in the evening for the new Canadians. But, above everything else, to see that in this province and in this country democracy is practiced in daily life in an exemplary fashion, that will unite all people, new and old, who are making this Canada.

Insofar as the legislation is concerned; it goes a long way; it is the first action of the sort, and I know it will be appreciated. I had the privilege, amongst others, of bringing

the matter to the attention of the hon. prime minister in a long letter to him, and I want to say -- and I want to have it on record -- that the hon. prime minister showed immediate concern with it. I am appreciative of this. He replied forthwith and suggested a personal discussion. Such a discussion took place at which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was also present. Thoughts were exchanged, and the hon. prime minister suggested I provide him with a memorandum embodying some of the suggestions I made to him personally in addition to the letter. Such a memorandum was forwarded. I know others have interceded with the government and made presentations, and the result is this Bill which has received first reading.

But, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the government, in full appreciation of what it is doing, knowing it will receive the support not only of this house -- I have no doubt how the opposition will vote on this question; I have no doubt whatever, and I have confidence that the liberal group will also support it, and it will be carried unanimously, but in saying this may I suggest to the hon. premier and, yes, to the hon. the Attorney General, that perhaps another item could be added dealing with what is perhaps the most painful problem in the whole question of discrimination -- discrimination on the job.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, some photostatic copies of only one of many such cases. Here is a Jewish worker sent by Selective Service to work in a war industry. Now, there is a man power shortage in the country; every plant needs workers. This man is sent down by Selective Service, and he is denied the job, although help is required and orders are not filled -- war orders, if you please -- and since Selective Service requires every employer to give a reason for not accepting an employee, the manager of this firm wrote very frankly, "Reason; nationality". It did not matter that this war plant needed help; it did not matter that this man

was quite capable and willing to work. This employer placed his prejudices before the need of the industry and the need of the war effort, and denied a worker the right to work, the right to earn a living, because of his national origin. It is on record. There are hundreds of such cases. That is not only undemocratic; it is criminal. It injures the whole democratic fabric of the country. The democratic fabric of a country is as strong as every thread in it, and this is the Hitlerism in our midst, the poison of Hitler's education to divide the people, to discriminate against the people, and I want to appeal to the government, Mr. Speaker, that they consider the advisability of adding a section, making it unlawful to deny employment to any citizen, regardless of his racial, national or religious origin, and in doing that I believe we will be going a long way towards a solution of a problem that has been crying for a solution.

This is only one of many things necessary tostrengthen national unity, to integrate the people of the province into the efforts the province is making now in the war effort,and it will be laying the basis for the attainment of these goals that the people of Ontario hope to attain after Victory, hopes for economic security, hopes for cooperation of all people, hopes of a Canada in which all -- new and old -- will work and contribute, each to the best of his ability, in making the province and making the country rich, prosperous and free.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Mr. Speaker, there is only one point I want to bring to the attention of the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) who has just spoken, and I do so, not in any way in criticism of the remarks he has made, but simply so there will be no misunderstanding.

He left the impression that some committee would be appointed which would be calling upon the new Canadians in a patronizing way which was suggested in the speech from the throne. To

keep the record clear, it should be quite definitely pointed out that that was not in any way suggested. In order that the records may be correct, here are the exact words:

"The education of new Canadians is of vital concern to all our people. A strong committee will be appointed to advise the government in planning an effective program for those amongst this group of citizens who require special education to gain the full advantage of their Canadian citizenship."

There was no thought of any patronizing visits by any committee, but simply to provide the education where it is actually needed, amongst that group.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that in view of all that the last speaker, the hon. memberfrom St. Andrew, (Mr. Salsberg) has just said, and has touched upon a few subjects I had made no note about, I would probably just briefly touch on them at the first, because there is so much in what he said that I agree with, that there is very little left to argue about.

In regard to the increase in old age pensions and mother's allowances: on the one hand, he intimates that we should give more, and on the other hand that we should tax less. Now, I think that everyone would be glad to be able to give more. It just reminds me at one time there were a couple of little boys playing outside my window, and one of the lads said to the other, "Now, we will dress up for Hallow-e'en; we will get a wig and all the paraphernalia, and we will do this", and the other lad said, "Yes, but where are you going to get the wig,". That is the sum and substance of increasing all these things. How are they going to be brought about? I don't think anybody would object to it, if, in our national economics these things can happen, considering that we are in competition in the first place with other provinces, and to a great extent with other countries.

Now, this is my first opportunity to be able to speak to

this Legislature, and I assure you that I am fully aware of my shortcomings, in view of the fact that I am following a number of very eloquent speakers.

My education was received in a small town, and I believe I made what reputation I had from the delivering of short speeches, but I can see if I am going to survive in this field, I will have to develope a new technique and be able to stretch a little in a long ways.

Now, I am going to say I rather marvelled at the other speakers, in that none of them had taken the opportunity of mentioning their home riding, because it seems to me that a lot of these talk in connection with the speech from the throne is to get a little publicity. It goes back to the local paper, and they say "that is our boy over there", so I will say that I come from St. Catharines, in the heart of that marvellous riding of Lincoln, the heart of the fruit belt. The people over there expressed their confidence in me and sent me to this Legislature, and the hon. prime minister further expressed his confidence and asked me to assume this high post of minister of labor. I appreciate the confidence extended to me particularly from the citizens, because I can say this, that in the month that I have been here there have been no pressure groups, or no people from my riding trying to put any pressure on me to accomplish any favour for that riding, and I think that is outstanding, because it just proves that the people in that district, when they asked me to do something, give me an opportunity to do it before trying to put the pressure on.

I would also like to point out that, as everyone knows, spring is coming and the trees will be in blossom in that area, and it is a picture to behold. I would suggest to those within hearing of my voice, and if it happens to go further afield- that they try to save a few gasoline coupons this spring and take a trip to the Lincoln riding in the Niagara Peninsula and see the wonders of nature there.

Now, you heard the other night the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) in a speech of nearly two hours, while he read a couple of newspapers to us ---

MISS MACPHAIL: (East York) And while he was interrupted so often.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: (Lincoln) The unfortunate part of it is we were working overtime to hear him. We might not have minded so much if it had been in the daytime, but when we had to work nights to hear this sort of thing, where he set himself up as a great leader, and protector of the little people. Well, I am one of those "little people". In my riding, my Liberal opposition was a very wealthy man, the C.C.F. opposition was a labour man, and a fine, outstanding, conscientious fellow, too. I was in the middle. I was one of the "little people", but they chose to send me here.

I would like to tell the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) with regard to the attitude of his address, that in any labour agreement that deals with human endeavour, that is, an agreement between management and labour, there has to be something more than the written word of the Legislature; there must be good-will, and management and labour are realizing more and more the value of it. There must be a two-way road, as the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) said, and so well put it, and I can say now that I am very happy that all the labour men with whom I have had to deal have not adopted the attitude of the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams), but have been reasonable men, as a rule, and desirous of doing their job and doing it well.

Now, the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) even went so far as to insinuate I was lying when I said I had a code prepared for Ontario. I will say again I have a code. I worked many, many days, and a great many nights with the finest advisers that I thought I was able to get, and like he so quaintly put it at the finish of this address, "I would not take this opportunity of calling him a liar," but I will say this, that his attitude does more to blast the hope of securing a reasonable agreement, and the hope of bringing about more friendly relationship between labour and management. I believe in a few years the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) will be remembered only for one thing, that he did more to delay and disrupt labour and management relations than any other man, and that is all he will be remembered for.

Now, as has already been pointed out, the Federal authorities, if they deem it necessary in wartime to make legislation covering labour or any other phase of activities, have the power to do so. As has already been said, Ontario did not agree with the basic principles involved in the proposed Ottawa Code, but recognizing the authority of the Federal Government and being a loyal province with many thousands and thousands of our finest young men and women overseas, we are going to accept it, and we are going to do everything in our power to make it work, and to keep the wheels of industry turning, and get our boys back as soon as we possibly can.

Now, we cannot change the Ottawa code for war industry and the speakers know it. We could set up another code for what is left of industry in this province, but consider the confusion where there are two codes, possibly working in the same factory because many factories today are divided in their activities as to war and peace time. It would be ridiculous. It would be unworkable.

There is some criticism that we have not set up a Committee to investigate this whole proposition. You know we were sworn in on August 17th. The McTague Report was issued on August 17th, and an immediate National Code announcement was made would follow. There was no reason why we should continue with plans to call a Committee to prepare a code that we could not put into effect, but we did, to be safe, build a code that we would have been pleased to present to this Legislature, had Ottawa not taken the steps they had.

I have just returned from a conference with the Minister of Labour at Ottawa. My colleagues and I discussed many objectionables clauses; clauses that we objected to with the hope that they could be adjusted before the code goes into effect. I will say we did not get very much encouragement on some of these things. Ottawa feels that they have discussed that with labour and that this code as is represents pretty much the feeling that it is worth a trial, and in spite of what the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) said that the two presidents of the two great congresses did not discuss this matter with him, they apparently did with the Minister of Labour at Ottawa.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) He did not say that.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: (Lincoln) And have more or less agreed on the basic principles.

The results were, from my conference in Ottawa, that this Act will be proclaimed in the very near future. A National Board will be set up within a period of not more than ten days. Consideration of our suggestions would be taken into

consideration and certainly if in practice as the Act is found weak, that it will be amended. We did a very important thing, I think, so that the present certifications and agreements are to be preserved and also certifications that have taken place under the present Labour Court, where no agreements have been reached to date - of which there are a few - will also be preserved. So that it will not be necessary for the unions or whoever is implicated in this, to go through the whole process again and the time they have already put in will not have been wasted.

The Ontario Board will be set up under the joint authority of the provincial and federal authorities because, as you know, to include all of industry brings us definitely into the picture. So I presume we will pass enabling legislation protecting our interests and do our best to make it work, and I think that this Act , with its faults, which I will admit, will probably be no better, no worse than the administration and if we are able to select a good Board of men representing labour and management there is possibility that some of the grievances that we have against the code, as it appears on the surface, might disappear. I hope that we will be able to give it a chance. I presume that there will be ample opportunity to discuss this code when the enabling legislation is brought in.

I want to do what I should have done, Mr. Speaker, in the first place, and just briefly say that I concur in regard to your appointment with all the former speakers. I would imagine by now it has become just a little embarrassing but I do concur in what has been said.

I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I think it is a great tribute to our party that two men from the rank and file can be just selected to give the constructive talks they did and the ability to express them as they have, and I am very happy to be associated with these men.

I listened for a considerable length of time to the leader of the opposition. I would say to him I was a little disappointed. I have heard him speak on several occasions and he is young, he is without a doubt clever, and I really expected to hear something really worth while, but I found his address was mostly one of condemnation of former governments, and this government, and all things even that might happen. I was really sorry that he was so gullible as to accept this Griffith case. That was one of the first things that came to my attention when I came to Toronto and I went very carefully into that with the Minister of Hydro and investigated the whole circumstances, and I passed it up because I could not see where any injustice had been done. In fact, just the opposite could be said but I suppose the leader of the opposition thought that here was a chance where he might discredit both the old party, the new party and the Hydro all in one swoop. But it would seem to me that the trend seemed to be, not only in this case, but others that I had to do with, that digruntled people seem to have a tendency now to hold the threat of the C.C.F. over the heads of the Government. In other words, the C.C.F. will get you if you don't watch out. They forget that since that Winch was thrown into the machinery.

AN.HON. MEMBER: Those are the little people you are talking about.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: (Lincoln) There is one question, though, that I do not want an answer now to, but I would like the hon. the leader of the opposition - because this is a letter I received this morning and it says:

"I belong to International ...."

I won't mention which one.

"Until July 15, 1943, I paid 45 cents per week union dues, after that date they were raised to 50 cents per week, 5 cents per week to go to C.C.F.

Why should I be asked to support C.C.F., an organization which in my opinion ...."

I mean the writer.

"..... is no good".

I would like at some later date to get the answer as to the

veracity of that statement if it is contingent upon a person receiving employment in a union shop that they must contribute five cents per week to a political party.

Now, the sum and substance of the leader of the opposition's remarks, as far as I was concerned, that he criticized and he felt that possibly the sense of justice and the brains of the people were centred in the C.C.F. group, but I cannot agree with him. It is quite true that our party has yet to prove itself to a considerable extent - certainly I have - but to me it is quite evident that under our form of government, whether it be Liberal or Conservative, great progress has been made, a high standard of living has been built up and we are gradually attaining a type of life closer to the ideal. That, of course,--

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS: (Ontario) You are an optomist.

HON.CHARLES DALEY: (Lincoln) I was impressed also with the solid, common-sense attitude as expressed in the speech by the two members of the Liberal party - the leader of the party and the member from South Grey. Two masters, I would say. Their party suffered grievously, but they are still big enough to want to - in fact, say: give good legislation and we will be behind it, and I think that is the attitude that should be taken here and lack of antagonism - which they maybe had some reason to feel - to express that spirit of cooperation. I think they will do it even if the member from South Grey (Mr. Oliver) does not get the Minister of Highways to shovel all that snow that he wants shovelled or if he does not get the Minister of Agriculture to supply those pink pills for those black legged cattle. I was impressed with the solidness of their remarks.

Then, youknow, I was looking over the list of farmers in the house; that is, excluding the farmers boys over here, and the thought struck me, if farming produces such men as the members for Brant, South Grey, Kent East, Peel and Oxford, this occupation cannot be quite as black as it is pictured. But it will be thought that the well-to-do farmer pleads for the poor farmer, and the men who seldom work plead for the worker,

and the batchelor lady tells the mother of children how they should raise their families. Well, that is democracy at work, I believe.

I listened also with some surprise to the very able speech of the member for Bellwoods (Alexander A. MacLeod). You know it was whispered to me that I had the worst job in the Cabinet. They would tear me limb to limb, and I should watch this fellow, and so I was agreeably surprised because I certainly thought he would be an explosive sort of character, and he would make very radical statements.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Should have seen him three years ago.

HON. CHARLES DALEY: (Lincoln) I found that he delivered one of the soundest, most constructive and thought-provoking speeches yet delivered in this legislature, and I compliment him on the wisdom of his address, and his ability in delivering it.

Labour and management is a common expression of today, but working together, if a spirit of harmony can be produced, I think a great deal can be accomplished, because everything you know we have in this world was created and fashioned by labour. The word labour automatically registers in one's mind as the man who maybe works with pick and shovel, or the man who runs the machine. That is not so. All people are labourers. The man who designs or creates or produces anything that adds to the material value of the things of this earth is a labourer, whether it is a cottage, a skyscraper, or a beautiful park he creates, each according to the ability that he has, and according to the extent that he cultivates his ability. It is certain that men are not all alike. Some have abilities, others lack. Even go into the forest. God in creating the forest did not make every tree alike. There are straight trees and bent trees, strong trees and weak trees, all standing in the same sun, all weathering the same storms, and all standing in the same rain, and yet they are all different, and I presume that the Creator of things meant that should apply also to men, and

therefore we have great men, we have big men, little men, we have men that are painters, and sculptors and some have power to influence others, some become great leaders, others have the gift of finance and organization and become great industrialists.

I propose bringing into this house legislation to make mandatory holidays with pay. I was thinking of a young lad I used to chum around with, and he came to me and he said: "I have got a week's holidays," and I said, "With pay?" and he said, "No." I said, "You have not got holidays, more than you are laid off." That is what I think a man is who gets no pay for his holiday after doing a good, conscientious year's work, and I think there should be holidays with pay. There may be argument on possibility that if we set 48 hours somebody may say it should be 40. There may be a difference of opinion. The hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) stated we should make it 40 hours, and I am not prepared to say that he is wrong, but I do think it is a step in the right direction. To me it seems that the length of time we have to work in order to make a living depends upon how much we expect out of life. If we wanted to go back to the way people lived even when I was a boy, when the Sunday school entertainment and the picnic in the summer was the principal high-light of entertainment for the year and when a patch on your pants was no disgrace, and you had very little of the comforts - if we wanted to go back to that, I suppose, with the development of modern machinery, improvement in making things, why we would have to work very little, probably a couple of hours a day would provide it for us, but we want more than this today. We want modern homes with all conveniences, and at least a car, maybe two, in the garage, and I would say to the Attorney General we want more than 26 ounces or 24 pints. We want our children well clothed and no patches, and lots of vitamins. We want these things. We are entitled to them and we can have them. A great majority of the people can have them, and with all

our modern methods of machinery for industry and farming we will still, in order to have them, have to work a little longer to get them. We want more people to enjoy them. That is our job. to plan that everybody can enjoy the fruits of his labour. I have no sympathy for the man who won't work, but I have a good deal of deep sympathy for the man, especially the man with a family, who wants to work and cannot get it, and we should never allow that to happen again. I think our country with its great resources, its industrial capacity, - and it has been increased tremendously in war time - the initiative of the people and, I say the most important, the resolve that we will do it and we can.

Now, the premier in his remarks previous to the election outlined what is now famous as the 22 points. I think these points will bring us closer to the kind of life - life of greater equality, elimination of social injustices, a greater measure of social security, if we the Government are permitted to enact these by legislation than we ever have been before. So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would say the concern of this Government is for all the people, and not only for the - as the Ontario member said - "little people", but our concern is that the little people will be given an opportunity so that tomorrow they are the big people, and that we by our cooperative efforts can bring to the people of this province a better condition so that all men will be able to say - life is good.

MR. ANGUS DIXON: (Perth)

(Page 445 follows.)

MR. W. A. DICKSON (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I want first of all to congratulate you on being chosen as Speaker of this House. You came to your exalted position with valuable experience as a Presiding Officer. You did a wonderfully good job in municipal life and I believe you have a sense of fairness so that you will fill your office in this House in a manner that will be acceptable to all the Members and that will reflect credit on yourself, as well as give satisfaction to the entire province and to your own constituency. At any rate, I wish you well.

We Liberals find ourselves in a much different position in the House than the one we occupied for nine years, but I assure you it is not all disadvantage and I hope we will give a good account of ourselves. It is not our place in the present Legislature to carry the responsibilities of Government and I believe we can sit where we are now and make constructive suggestions that will be helpful in furthering the interests of the province. We have a duty to perform to the people who elected us; a duty to see that the Government carries out the promises it made before August 4th last, and a duty to see that it meets the challenge of new questions in a way that will be of advantage to the people of Ontario as a whole and not just for the benefit of any one party. I am not sure that we should oppose any of the legislation that the Government proposes to submit to the House as a result of the people having passed on their programme. Nor do I think we should oppose any legislation that we consider in the interests of the people of this province just because we are on the opposite side of the House. I think it is our duty as Opposition Members to state our views regarding any new proposals and it is up to the Government to adopt our suggestions or discard them as they see fit. Their action then becomes their responsibility. We Liberals are not in any way downcast at the turn of events. We were entrusted with the affairs of the province from 1934 until August, 1943, and we left office with a record that any Government might well be proud of. I want to say to the Prime Minister and his Government through you, Mr. Speaker.

that they have stepped into office under vastly different conditions than that which fell to our lot when we took charge in 1934. The record of the Liberal Government in handling the finances of the province has been unique. The Liberal Government made a real contribution towards putting Ontario into a sound financial position and I hope that the present Government will do its best to maintain our high record. We fully expect that, in the natural course of things, the Liberal Party will be asked to take charge of the affairs of the province again after the next election and I just want to throw out the suggestion now that we would rather not have the responsibility of straightening out the financial affairs of the province once more. The present Government did not have to tackle the big job of untangling our financial affairs and so they looked around and said, "What can we do that will make an impression on the people and give them the idea that we can do things?" They decided that the best thing they could do was to move around the furniture in this chamber and, although it is a more or less harmless undertaking, I would just like to say that I am inclined to think they did not make an improvement.

We know that, when a new lady comes into a home, she always wants to change things around considerably at putting this piece of furniture in one corner and that piece of furniture in another corner, so as to make things look different. Evidently that trait of character is not confined to the ladies for here we have grown men who have changed around the furniture of this chamber just to suit a whim of their own and not because there is any real improvement.

It is a tragedy of every election that there are some very valuable men lost to the service of the province through defeat, and the election of August 4th last was no exception to the rule. We have lost men who are very valuable and whose contribution to the well being of the province will not soon be forgotten. I believe, however, there have been many new Members elected to this House who will be a valuable asset to it. I am probably the

only Member who tasted both victory and defeat at the last election. I was in a three-cornered fight and had a comparatively small margin over my nearest opponent. On election night it was announced that I was at the top of the polls. The next morning the Conservative candidate appeared to be in the lead and that went on from day to day until the following Saturday when it became apparent that I definitely had a seat. A recount followed and that increased my majority slightly. It was a rather thrilling experience and I thought it just worth mentioning on this occasion.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches made in the House in this debate and I am impressed with the fact that they have all been on a high level. I am sorry that I was unable to be present when the Mover and Seconder gave their contributions in reply to the speech from the Throne but, from the reports I have heard and read, I understand they did exceptionally well. Other speakers who have followed them made good contributions, particularly in regard to co-operation with the Government. It perhaps is not a bad thing for the province that the Government of the day finds itself in the position it occupies in relation to the rest of the House. It is just possible that Democracy will be at its best in a House where the Government is really in a minority and has to walk warily. I would suggest to the PrimeMinister that he will make a much greater reputation for himself and his Government if he listens very attentively to suggestions made by Members of other parties and enacts into legislation the best ideas that come forward, no matter from whom the suggestions come. He may not be able to go through with his own ideas quite as successfully as if he had what is called a "Working Majority" but, on the other hand, the net result to the country as whole may be a lot better and that is what we should all be working for.

During the nine years I sat in this Legislature, I was greatly impressed with the possibilities of Committee Work, and

I would like to ask the Government to give close attention to the possibilities of having committees of the House undertake substantial responsibilities. I do not think we make enough use of the different Committees. One of the best examples of the usefulness of a Committee was the work of the Game and Fisheries Committee under the Liberal Government. I was fortunate to be a member of that Committee and I enjoyed its work and the spirit in which its work was done. At each Session there were two or three days devoted to sessions of that Committee. The preservation of game and fisheries in Ontario is a most important responsibility of this Legislature because Ontario is, and should be, a paradise for sportsmen and tourists. We have possibilities along that line much greater than anything that has been achieved in the past, although we have benefited substantially. I think, therefore, that the game and fisheries of the province should be preserved. Now, at each meeting of the Game and Fisheries Committee, we always meet with representatives of different associations who send their delegates down here to present their briefs and to exchange views. I always thought that the results were very satisfactory, many fine ideas represented and harmony has prevailed.

Then again, at the last Session of the Legislature, a Labour Committee was appointed to discuss a Collective Bargaining Bill and a very valuable amount of information was secured by that Committee. The results were shown in the Collective Bargaining Bill, which I think was a big step forward, even if we may make some changes and go farther forward during the life of the present Government. I think, if the Labour Committee followed a plan similar to that of the Game and Fisheries Committee in inviting the different unions to come in and talk over their different problems, there would be a different feeling existing among the members of the Committee and among the House as a whole.

I wish also to make a suggestion that the Agricultural

Committee could be made of greater assistance in furthering the interests of the province. Rightly or wrongly, I have formed the impression that the present Prime Minister believes more in commissions of outsiders than appointing committees of this House to work out problems. I think the Committee System is the more Democratic and also the most effective, and costs less. I attended a sitting of the Agricultural Enquiry Committee at Clinton, Ontario, a short time ago and, while there was a good attendance, the hall full of people, and a good discussion, I don't believe there was anything advanced for the interests of Agriculture that could not have been handled better by the Agricultural Committee of this Legislature and at much less cost. At the Clinton meeting, there were farmers present from four different counties and they presented their briefs in a praiseworthy manner, but we are living under a Democratic system and why not place the responsibility for working out new plans for Agriculture where it rightly belongs, and that is with the Members of this House. I feel that the Agricultural Committee could do a much better job than any commission if they were given the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of feeling that I approach this question of the Agricultural Industry and its requirements. I am a son of the soil. My forefathers were pioneers in the County of Perth and were among its earliest farmers, and I am proud myself to have spent my life as a farmer in my native county. I am intensely interested in improving conditions in the Agricultural Industry, but I suggest that we face realities and not conjure difficulties that do not exist. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Honorable Member from East York. I know her intense interest in Agriculture but, it seems to me, she painted the picture of the farmers' condition a little blacker than it really is. It is quite a different thing to talk of the income of a farmer and the income of a worker in a town or city. For instance, the farmer gets his

living off the farm. He has his own meat, poultry, eggs, vegetables and many other things that the town or city worker has to buy. The farmer is not paying high rent for a house to live in, and these things make a big dent in the worker's pay envelope.

I realize that there have been many farmers who went broke and lost their farms and it is possible there will always be farmers getting into financial difficulties. I think this is due, to a large extent, to the fact that many of such people have been unfit for the farm and that they should never have been farmers. There was a time when the original settlers in this country looked over their families and picked out the bright boys and said, "This one or that one, because he seems to be a little brighter than the others should be given an extra education and made a lawyer, or a doctor, or a clergyman". "If there was a dull chap in the family, well, he was good enough to be a farmer".

The fact of the matter is the farming industry cannot be carried on as it should be by people who are just "beasts of burden". It is not all hard work and no management. The farmer who is going to make a success must be fit for the job and must have capacity, and I wish that if a boy is not suited for a farm, he be made a doctor, or a lawyer, or a clergyman, and keep the bright fellows for the farm because their brains are needed. You cannot make the Agricultural Industry a success by making conditions on the farm suit people unfit for farm work. I am anxious to see conditions made such that young men who like farming and who would make a success on the farm, have an opportunity to do so. There is a real difficulty before the boys and young men of the farming community today in that it is easier for them to become independent in a town or city job than by beginning on the soil.

I am somewhat alarmed at the fact that there are not as many young men on our farms as there ought to be. I do not know what the average age of farmers is all over the province, but I am afraid it is pretty high, and who is going to come after them?

In my own county, a canvass was made a couple of years ago among the farmers and important questions were asked, including the age of each farmer. The average at that time was just below fifty years and these farmers have not got any younger since, which means that many of them are up to seventy years and over. Our rural school attendance is dropping at an alarming rate. I think you will all admit that is something we don't want to see, for it is an unhealthy condition if the province of Ontario is not going to have a body of young people well educated, well trained and capable of taking hold of the farms and encouraged to do so.

Ontario is a natural Agricultural province. A great deal of interest was taken by the Liberal Government in improving conditions on the farm and I am glad to see that the present Government propose to move farther with the same objective. I am pleased that the Prime Minister has been lucky in securing the services of the present Minister of Agriculture whose heart, I am sure, is with the Agricultural Industry, and I would direct the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture to the necessity of studying who is going to run the farms of Ontario after the present generation of farmers have passed away.

Ontario and Canada are what they are largely because of the contribution made by boys from the farm going into the professions and the business world and that is a healthy condition that should always prevail in this province, but it won't prevail unless we take steps to correct it. A great American Daniel Webster, said:

> "When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers are, therefore, the founders of human civilization."

That principle is applicable to this province, Mr. Speaker. Many centuries ago an eminent citizen of ancient Rome, the great Cato, said:

> "The Agricultural population produces the bravest men, the most valiant soldiers and a class of citizens the least given to evil designs."

That statement is as applicable to the province of Ontario as it was to ancient Rome. So, where are we going to be fifty years from now if there is a decline in the type of farmers on the farms of this province?

The Honorable Member for Bellwoods said there was a tendency developing for Landlord and Tenancy farming and I believe he is right and I think we should try to overcome that if possible. It would be unthinkable to have Ontario farms run by no one but tenants because they would soon decay and farming would not be the same industry it has been and we would not be able to maintain the fine population that we are capable of maintaining either on the farms or in the towns and cities. Take it from me, Mr. Speaker, if the farming industry declines, manufacturing and all other industries will suffer.

The young men of today are not going on the farms. One of the principle reasons is that they cannot secure capital to start farming. A young man is naturally ambitious to marry and have a home of his own. If he has no capital to start farming, his tendency is to go to the city and get wages and have a home of his own. It is an entirely different proposition to start farming today than it was in the early days of the country. The land itself is not particularly high priced, but you have got to have an entirely different set of equipment to make a farm successful. The machinery and livestock necessary to run a successful farm runs into thousands of dollars and where are our young men going to get this capital? Their fathers have not been able to make sufficient money on the farm to be able to establish their sons and the money must come from somewhere if we are to have high-class and enlightened people to carry on the Agricultural

Industry.

A number of years ago, we had what is known as the Agricultural Development Board, whose duties were to loan money to farmers, but it was far from being the success I would like to see, and I believe the time has come when we will have to develop a different system. I am going to be bold enough to suggest a plan which I hope the Government will consider and perhaps develop into something that will be of use to the country as a whole. I think our banking system could do a very useful work in establishing young men on the farms. I know the banking system would have to be changed somewhat and, if it is not considered advisable that the present chartered banks do this work, perhaps it could be done by an enlargement of the scope of operations of the proposed Industrial Bank now being discussed at Ottawa to help small industries after the war. My plan is that, through some banking institution, loans be made to young men who can qualify as farmers so that they can buy and equip a farm and pay a much lower rate of interest than the usual farm mortgage demands. The Government should stand behind each loan, but no young man should be given a deed to his farm until he makes good. He might be given a bill-of-sale or given possession when he has proven himself capable of running the farm successfully. I am far from suggesting that anyone applying for a loan be given it. These advantages should be confined to qualified people or else it would ruin the farming industry. I think this is one of the places for the Agricultural Committee to be set up in each county to decide on which persons should get loans. But I would not just leave it at that. I would have one or two farmers in each county, who have made successful farmers, visit these young farmers and give them friendly advice and supervision, and I am sure, if a constructive plan is followed, we could make such arrangements that the Agricultural Industry of Ontario will flourish.

One of the reasons farmers have failed in this province

is that, when they did not have enough money to buy and equip a good farm, they bought a run-down farm and were licked before they started. Under my plans, they would have good farms and have much better opportunities to make a success of them. If a scheme of this kind were handled properly, I don't think it would cost the Government a great deal of money through loans but, even if it does cost a large sum of money, the province of Ontario needs a plan of this kind and boys who elect to spend their lives in the Agricultural Industry have as much right to a chance as have the boys who go to college and into professions. Many of the brightest young men from the farms are now offering their lives for their country. They are not all coming back, but let us play fair with those who do come back, and do not ask them to go out on to poor farms. Let us give them a chance to establish themselves where they have some chance of making a success and making a contribution to the health and well-being of this province. Let me conclude by quoting the well-known lines of Goldsmith which are very appropriate to the situation in which we find ourselves:

> "ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
> A breath can make them as a breath has made;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

While I have quoted the words of Goldsmith in which he refers to the country people, or farmers, of his native Ireland as "peasants", I do not, of course, concede that Canadian farmers are peasants. In Europe a small landed proprietor or leaseholder who tills the soil was considered a peasant. In other European countries there have been large numbers of them. Any petty farmer or farm laborer or any uncultured countryman is regarded as a peasant. The farmers of Canada are a much better informed class of people than European peasants and it should be our constant aim to raise their standard both by a better general education and by seeing that the men of the soil are

given sufficient opportunity to make a contribution to the country that a real high-class population of farmers ought to do.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York North). Mr Speaker. I move the adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr Mitchell moves the adjournment of the Debate. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move, Mr. Speaker, that the house do now adjourn.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Can the hon. Prime Minister tell us anything about tomorrow's business?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Yes. We will proceed tomorrow with the second reading of a number of Bills, and the continue with the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and continue on tomorrow night as well, so that we can get ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the house do now adjourn. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at three o'clock.

The House rose at 5:55 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - - - -

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ont. Tuesday, March 7, 1944.

- - - - -

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions?

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions?

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The following petitions have been received:

"Of the Corporation of the city of London, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the city to include one mill in the annual tax rate for public park purposes instead of one-half mill as theretofore.

"Of the Corporation of the city of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass to validate tax sales, to authorize the Corporation to provide for the payment of contributions to any superannuation or pension fund for employees on Active Service, and for other purposes.

"Of the Corporation of the township of Monaghan, praying that an Act may pass validating an order of the Ontario Municipal Board annexing a portion of the said township to the city of Peterborough."

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting the report by committee.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, that leave be given to introduce an Act

respecting the Ontario Research Foundation, and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moved, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, that leave be given to introduce an Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Ontario Research Foundation"; first reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act", and that the same be now read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed go.

MR. WILLIAMS (Ontario): May we have a word of explanation from the hon. minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: After the Bill has been read the first time, you may ask for that information, sir. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAMS: Will the hon. minister explain?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the explanation of the Bill is this: it is formal in its nature. The Department of National Defence has requested that all officers in the Services be able to take affidavits concerned with soldiers' declarations, and so on, rather than it being restricted to the ranks of Major

and up.

MR. HOWARD W. BROWN (Welland): I move, seconded by Mr. Casselman, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Municipal Act", and that same be now read the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Brown moves, seconded by Mr. Casselman, that leave be given to in roduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Municipal Act", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion be carried?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Municipal Act"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): May we have an explanation, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BROWN: The purpose of this Bill is to enable employees of School Boards and Boards of Education to qualify for and sit as members on Municipal Councils.

MR. A. H. ACRES (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Murphy, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Public School Board", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Acres moves, seconded by Mr. Murphy, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto Public School Board", and that same be read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Ottawa Public School Board"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. ROBERT LAURIER (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Belanger, that leave be given to present an Act respecting "L'Union St. Joseph du Canada", and that the same be

now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Laurier moves, seconded by Mr. Belanger, that leave be given to introduce an Act respecting L'Union St. Joseph du Canada", and the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting L'Union St. Joseph du Canada"; the first reading of the Bill.

MR. MITCHELL (York, North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Docker, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of North York", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Mitchell moves, seconded by Mr. Docker, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of North York", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of North York"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. CHARLES A. STRANGE (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Williams, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Brantford", and that same be now read the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Strange moves, seconded by Mr. Williams, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Brantford", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Brantford"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. HAROLD R. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Stewart (Kingston), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Township of Anson, Hindon and Minden", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Scott moves, seconded by Mr. Stewart (Kingston) that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled, "An Act Respecting the Township of Anson, Hindon and Minden", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of Anson, Hindon and Minden"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. THOMAS A. MURPHY (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Acres, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of Scarborough", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Murphy moves, seconded by Mr. Acres, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of Scarborough", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of Scarborough"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. THOMAS A. MURPHY: (Beaches) Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Acres, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Town of Leaside", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Murphy moves, seconded by Mr. Acres, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Town of Leaside", and that same be now read the first

time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Town of Leaside"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex, South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Scott, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the County of Essex", and that same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Murdoch moves, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled an Act respecting the County of Essex", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the County of Essex"; first reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Dr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales", and the same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunbar moves, seconded by Mr. Vivian, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales "; first reading of the Bill.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Fort William", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Anderson moves, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act

Respecting the City of Fort William", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Fort William"; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day; I know that I am speaking on this matter not only on behalf of the members on this side of the Legislature, but of all the members, when I say that we are very pleased to welcome back to this Legislature the member from Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. A. W. Downer). It is only two weeks ago to-day that I mentioned the fact that he was on Active Service, and he has only recently left the battlefront in Italy, and it does give us a direct contact with the men at the front and what they are experiencing at the moment, to have back with us now, as a member of this Legislature, a member of the Active Forces, who, so short a time ago, was on the actual fighting front.

I know that those of us who know him well, and those who are meeting him for the first time, will all join in expressing our pleasure that he is here with us, well — extremely well, I would say by his appearance, — and we are extremely pleased to know that he will have the privilege of being with us, on leave from Active Service, during the course of this Legislature.

I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this Legislature would be grateful if you were to give the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. Downer) the opportunity to speak to us on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had the honour, before the opening of this

House this afternoon, to receive a visit from the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. Downer), and he told me he would like to rise before the Orders of the Day to greet his colleagues, and I am very happy, at this time, to call upon him.

REV. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker; first, I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister for the warmth of his welcome, and to thank you, too, — and everyone here — for the expressions of welcome extended to me.

I have just come back from Italy, as you know, and I have with me not only verbal greetings, but I have carried with me literally hundreds of greetings for citizens of the province of Ontario, greetings from their boys, boys who are doing an excellent job, boys who are proud that back here in Canada you are doing your share, and the people are doing their share, to furnish the tools that will help them finish the job.

They are interested in what is taking place back in Canada, far more interested than you can possibly imagine, although the information they receive is meagre, indeed. Most of the papers we receive in Italy have been written or printed at least three months before they reach us, so you can have some sort of an idea of how far we are behind the times.

But the boys are interested, and they are not only interested in what is taking place now, but they are interested in the land that will be. They want to know what plans are being made for after the War. I am interested in that, too, just as much as every man over there.

Ontario has sent almost, if not beyond, one third of the men who are in the Army and the Air Force — has sent more than one third into those Forces,—easily two hundred and fifty thousand men and women have gone from this province. These men are

interested in rehabilitation, are interested in what is being planned for the future, and I say to you — and I say it with all the emphasis at my command -- that you and I, every single one here in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker,-every single one - should be interested in making this land, this province of ours, a province fit for heroes to dwell in. For the boys who are fighting on the fighting lines are heroes.

I should like to tell you something about the conditions that exist there, because, as I go about, the people are asking questions, "Why are we making such slow progress in Italy? Why are we not getting ahead with the job?" Well, that is easy to answer. We are fighting an enemy who asks no quarter, and gives none. Our men are a match for them; they ask no quarter, and give none, either. But when we think of the other side, we are fighting in a mountainous country, and the weather conditions have been so terrible during the past few months that progress is almost impossible. Our men were fighting in mud to their knees, sometimes to their hips. Knowing the condition of things, perhaps our people will understand why we are not making greater progress.

And yet their spirits are high; they are ready and waiting for the day when weather conditions will improve, and then I am sure we will hear good things from Italy.

They are happy, in spite of the mud and the fleas; they are happy, happy because they know the cause for which they fight is just: they are happy because they know the Empire, and the particular part of the Empire from which they come, is behind them; they are happy, too, because the food is good, and that is a very important thing, because an army fights on its stomachs and marches on its stomachs, and I can assure you that the food given to the boys in Italy is even better than the food we got in England, and the food in England was very good, indeed.

The main job — or my main job — in the Army was not only to contribute to the spiritual peace of the men, but also to help raise the morale of the ordinary mah on the ground. It is no mean job to keep a man up and satisfied and happy. The only good soldier is the satisfied soldier. A man who is dissatisfied cannot be a good soldier. Now, you can have a part in raising the morale of the men in the lines. Nothing raises the morale of the men more than a letter from home, for instance, and I would like to pass out to the people of this province the suggestion that they write more often than they ever have written before. It takes mail a long time to go to Italy, and it is looked forward to with the greatest of interest. They love to get parcels. I remember just after Christmas that we had not received mail for a considerable time, and the first mail that came in was parcels — parcels — seventy bags of them. Almost every man got a parcel, and yet, as they came up for their parcels, you could hear them saying, "Well, it is nice to get a parcel, but I would rather have a letter." As I say, they are interested in things at home, and so, if there is one thing I would like to emphasize more than anything else, it is for you to write, and ask your friends and neighbours to write, write, write and write again, to the boys in uniform.

I understand there is a campaign, too, on at the moment in Canada to raise funds for the Canadian Red Cross Society. I know somewhat about the work the Red Cross is doing in Italy, because it was my privilege to visit the hospitals constantly, and I can say to you, with all sincerity, that the Red Cross is doing a magnificent job in Italy. Not only is it doing a magnificent job, but there is not a man forgotten — not one.

A great number of people back in Ontario, whom you may used to know,/send parcels, parcels they said were to be given to those who were sick in hospitals. There have been times when I have

gone to the hospitals, taking those parcels, and I have had to take them back to the lines again, or back to the rear again, to the men in my own outfit, because the men in the hospitals had everything they could desire, provided by the Red Cross.

And so I would like to say that I hope this appeal will go over in a big way, and that it will be oversubscribed doubly.

Then, I should like to say a word about England. I wonder if you realize the part that England has played in this conflict. We think that Russia has pulled the big end of the load now, and she is pulling it. But I wonder if you remember, now in 1944, that in 1940 Britain stood alone, and that if she had not stood -- Well, what the world would be to-day is your guess, which is as good as mine.

During the first four years of the War Britain lost almost thirty per cent. of her pre-war naval strength; she lost thirty-eight thousand three hundred pilots and crew men. Her Army, back in the early days of the War, was just like a police force, but since then it has fought in every quarter of the globe. She bears in her land the scars of War, and bears them for you and bears them for me, and will show them proudly. They paid the price. One would have thought that the bombings and raids and casualties would have affected the morale of the people. Well, the spirit of the English people and the Scotch people and the Welsh people is as high as ever; they are determined to finish the job, and make the world safe for democracy.

As I looked about, I used to be amazed at the children. They are healthy lads and lassies. I have never seen more healthy children than the English children and the Scotch children. True, they have had to do without many of the things which you and I and our children have in this country, but

they are healthy and strong, and I think we need not fear for the future of the Old Land, and if we can entice those people to come over here after the War - and we can do it - then by all means let us do it, for we need the men and women such as they have in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland.

I would like to pay tribute to an organization which has done a great deal for this province; it has done a great deal to advertise this province. This city of Toronto, and this province of Ontario, are known throughout the length and breadth of the Motherland, known because of the excellent work performed by the"Evening Telegram" of this city. Everywhere you go they tell you about the British War Victims' Fund. I say that honestly. I heard it in London, and in Coventry; yes, and in countless other hamlets and towns,I heard them paying tribute to the generosity of the people of the province of Ontario, and I heard them paying tribute to the great evening paper in this city of Toronto.

I do not want to keep you too long this afternoon, but I would like to say this, that if you think the War is over, you are mistaken. If you think the War is going to end in a couple of months, you are just doing a lot of wishful thinking, because that is all it is. The enemy is still strong, still determined. Hitler and his cohorts are in full control. They may crack; they may fold up quite suddenly. We hope they do, but it does not look that way, and, to me, coming from a theatre of war, I can say to you, "Prepare for greater sacrifices and tougher going."

The War has not been won yet, but the horizon is much clearer; the sun is beginning to shine. It is not shining in its fullness, and I say to every one of us, every man, woman and child in this dominion of Canada, that you need to keep his or

her shoulder to the wheel, because the battle will be long and furious.

In Italy we were close to a regiment from India; Mohammedans they were, brave men, the finest soldiers I have ever seen and ever met. Not far away there was a regiment of men from New Zealand -- good soldiers, too. And I thought, as I met these men from time to time, especially as I met the Indians from far-off India, "If this is what England does for people, then God bless India."

I could go on, but I do not want to take up any more time this afternoon, except to say this, that men in the lines, the men in the Canadian Army everywhere, are looking to you back home, looking especially, Mr. Speaker, to those who sit in places of authority, looking to them for leadership. Let us not disappoint them.

We can give them leadership in this Legislature. Let us open up new horizons for them, so that when they come back they may be able to say, "We are proud we came from Ontario, proud that Ontario has recognized the part we played." We can do that. The hon. Prime Minister, I am sure, will give us leadership, and I believe that every member of this House is just as interested in this great and burning question as I am. Let us not put if off; let us give them something to fight for, yes, even to die for, but especially to live for, and let us start out this Session.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity of saying a word, and thank you, again, Mr. Prime Minister, for the warmth of your welcome.

(Page No. 469 follows.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say for the whole House that we are very glad to have you back again and to be able to listen to your address.

Is the House ready to refer back to the reports of committees?

Motion agreed to.

MR. H. A STEWART (Kingston): I beg to report the first report of the committee on Standing Orders and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Stewart for the committee on Standing Orders begs leave to present the following report:

"The Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Standing Orders begs leave to present the following as their First Report:-

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:-

Of the Corporation of the Town of Leaside, praying that an Act may pass prohibiting the annexation of any part of that municipality for a period of five years.

Of the Corporation of the City of Brantford, praying that an Act may pass to provide for the election of members of the Brantford Public Utilities Commission annually, one from each of the five wards in the municipality and the Mayor, ex officio.

Of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass empowering the said Corporation to lease, option, sell or exchange lands acquired at tax sales for other lands and providing for the election of members of the Board of Parks Management.

Of L'Union St. Joseph du Canada, praying that an Act may pass bringing the petitioner under the terms of the Ontario Insurance Act as it affects fraternal societies.

Of the Townships of Anson, Hindon and Minden, praying

that an Act may pass authorizing the amalgamation of the said Townships into one Township.

Of the Corporation of the County of Essex, praying that an Act may pass to validate by law No. 924 of the said corporation, fixing the equalization of assessment in the said county.

Of the Corporation of the Township of North York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to alter the boundaries of school areas, to establish a transportation area and for other purposes.

Of the City of Ottawa Public School Board, praying that an Act may pass to provide for the election of the members of the said board, every two years at the same time and places as the election of members of the Ottawa City Council.

Of the Board of Regents of Victoria University, praying that an Act May pass to redefine the rights and powers of the various governing bodies of the University.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Scarborough, praying that an Act may pass prohibiting the annexation of any part of the Township to any other municipality for a term of five years.

Of the Corporation of the Township of York, praying that an Act may pass to provide for the erection of the Township into a City and to prohibit the annexation of any part of the Township to any other municipality for a period of five years."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House that the motion carry?

Motion Agreed to.

HON. W. C THOMPSON: (Kent East) Second Order.

HON. C. A. CHALLIES (Grenville-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a report by the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario relating to differences in cost of power for municipalities in Ontario, as ordered by this House on April 13th, 1943.

HON. W. C. THOMPSON: The second Order.

HON. C. A. CHALLIES (Grenville-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, in moving

the second reading of the Bill to amend "The Rural Power District Service Charge Act", I may say that the Act in itself is a rather simple one. The first clause provides for the reduction or the total removal of the service charge which was previously fixed under sub-section number 1.

The second section provides that where reduction or removal of the service charge has been effected any deficit shall be chargeable to the Consolidated Revenue of the province.

I may say that does not need, in itself, any further explanation; but, Mr. Speaker, it might be wise or prudent at this time to go into the matter that led up to the present amalgamation of our rural rates. In so doing, perhaps I had better point this out to the House, that this matter comes separately in itself, and not as an amendment to the Hydro Electric Power Commission Act, but rather as a special Act, to amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act, the reason for that being that the Government down from the past have played an important part in the promotion of the use of electrical energy in our rural areas; so that the Government itself is keenly interested, for one reason, that they have already invested over twenty million dollars in capital cost for the promotion of rural hydro. Also that the governments in the past have promoted the use and been responsible for the financing, so far as deficits are concerned, in the use of electricity under this Rural Power District Service Charge Act.

Again, the main reason for this Government assuming responsibility for the Act is the fact that in the new set-up it is estimated that there will be a reduction in revenue, and that reduction or loss in the rural parts shall be directly chargeable to the consolidated revenue of the province.

Now, I am sure Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to stress in this House the importance and the immense value of hydro on the farms. No one realizes this more than the farmers themselves. This demand for service under the new-set, is sufficient to prove in itself the universal acceptance of the new rural rate set-up. The new rural rates and the amalgamation of the district have been recommended by

the Hydro Commission and approved by the Government. This has not been a simple problem. In fact, the previous government for a considerable time was studying the question of bringing up to date the Rural Rates, and when this Government came into power we simply carried this study on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be wise, as there are a number of new members in the House, to just hurriedly touchupon some of the high spots in the history of both urban and rural electrification.

In 1912, when the Hydro pioneered in this province, the rate structure was arranged for the urban districts. That promotional rate structure included not only the charge plus a service charge in three brackets. The word "service charge" does not really cover the explanation of the charge. It really should have been a capital charge, because a service charge was set aside to take care of the capital costs of the line or the lines that took the service to the farms. Then the three brackets for the consummation charge, the first was called the energy charge, and the second bracket was slightly lower and then there were the follow-up rates.

May I just digress here long enough to say that the three cents per kilowat followed up the rate in rural districts with a rate that was not enjoyed by more than half a dozen municipalities in Ontario. That is the lowest rate enjoyed by any municipality. Very few enjoy that low rate, except about half a dozen.

Now, this rate structure in the early days served its purpose well. It was scientific and was extensively copied not only in other provinces but in the states to the south of us. To-day, however, the service charge in the urban districts have differed, for reasons which are quite obvious. In the change of demand for the removal of the service charge, that first came xhxm in our urban areas. But in our urban districts it differed from the rural areas in that each change of service charge made, there was a corresponding up-take in the rates on an extension of the block, so that the extension did not go out of range. So that our rural electrification has lagged a little behind. In our rural sections is a problem of scattered population and

small loads, where the unit cost was relatively high.

I do not know of any better way to illustrate that than to repeat the statement made by the member for East York in the House the other day in referring to power and machinery on the farm. The statement was made that the power equipment could not be economically used on the farm where it was used less than a thousand hours. Now, that is a very good illustration of what might be said about taking energy to the rural areas. And might I emphasize it that as an over-all situation electrification cannot be taken to the rural areas with a kilowat consumption or use of much less than fifty-five milowat hours. The principle is much the same.

The rural areas were organized in 1920 and started to grow. In 1921 the Government of the day realized that assistance had to be given in the rural areas, and provided for fifty per cent of the cost of the primary lines.

That of itself was not enough to encourage farmers, where there was a demand for small amounts of energy. In 1924, however, the Government in order to give an added boost, paid fifty per cent of the cost of primary and secondary lines. That practically meant that the capital cost of taking the hydro energy to the farmers' gate was paid and subsidized by the Government. And ~~for~~ FROM 1924 rural electrification has grown quite steadily. This grant or this bonus allowed the Commission, which was administering the whole matter, to lower the rates, as far as paying interest and sinking fund were concerned. And, because the whole picture must be reviewed as a matter of record, before the second bonus was given the annual service charge, or capital was $5.20 per month, that is on a standard class three one hundred acre farm.

After the granting of the second bonus, this service charge was reduced to $4.10 per month. Now, you can see, in the light of present conditions what strides the rural areas have made with regard to the cost of power to them.

In 1930 the rural service charge was cut to $2.50 per month; and in 1935 to $2.00 per month; while in 1936 it was reduced to $1.00 per month.

During this evolution, I want to point out to the House another and important factor that was never taken into consideration, so far as revenue was concerned, and it is this, that the original rule or regulation demanded that there must be three class three "A" farms to a mile before the extension or grant could be given. That was reduced to two, and it is quite apparent to everyone in the House that that just cut the revenue in rural districts by one third, by giving two customers a mile instead of three. No provision was made to replace that change in the set-up; and, on top of that, no change has been made practically in the rural charge for energy from this reduction from $4.10 to $1.00. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to all the members that when you reduce a monthly charge of $4.10 down to $1.00 a month, the people who are on a two and a half cents or a three cents rate are getting a greater advantage than those who are on the upper brackets.

No consideration was given to the balancing up or adjusting of these rates. So that we find, when getting into this problem of removing this service charge, that that was the only condition that had to be met; and in this evolution of things small [illegible] groups grew up over the province, and these small groups increased until we had one hundred and twenty rural power districts in the power of Ontario, and in that, within the province, we had thirteen different rate structures with eleven different rate classifications.

I am sure that we should consider this sympathetically, because it all has to do with rural areas' prosperity. You are lopping off the service charge and cutting off the revenue and you are leaving the energy charge the same. I should have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that in the adjusting in the rural areas, as they removed the service charge, [illegible] the first block of energy was extended, and that is common practice in all public utilities where there has been a balancing up of rates.

Now, in the whole matter of the amalgamation of the districts

we had to arrange this because of the increase in the rates, because of the unbalance of the charges, not only in the districts but as between districts, and because of the elimination of service charges in towns having proven successful it was decided to pool the whole one hundred and twenty rural power districts along one uniform rate, so that the amalgamation will bring operational benefits and improve eventually rates and costs.

Amalgamation alone would not have brought these benefits, because you could not amalgamate the districts without having a uniform rate. Here is a district, which, because of its geographic or arbitrary boundaries, a farmer enjoying a service may have been within half a mile of a transmission line, but he was in the other district, but he might be paying much higher charges than his neighbour across the road. Without amalgamation you could not wipe out that inequality; also you could not have had that joining up, because here was a district with probably a six cent rate while the other one had perhaps a two and a half cent rate.

The House will see that in order to start forward with an amalgamation we had to have some logical set-up as to the amalgamation of rates.

Kindly bear in mind that the primary object in the financing of rural power was to take power to the primary producer in the province, whether that primary producer was on one acre of land as a producer, or was a bee keeper, or was on a hundred acre farm.

When this government said, We will remove the service charges off the areas, it was to the primary producer; and we went further and reduced the service charges by fifty per cent.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I have been too hurried in my description of what has happened, but this was a difficult job. A courageous government tackled it in a courageous way. As far as the finances are concerned, I will point out to the House that the estimated reduction of the cost in this uniform rate is $527,500.00. That is the estimated annual reduction in revenue. When one couples with that the fact that the total revenue in the rural hydro at the end of 1942 was only five million, four hundred and eighty-four dollars thousand dollars,

one can see how little cushion one has to play with. So that the estimated reduction in revenue is practically ten per cent.

Now, perhaps something should be said about old and new rates. It is very difficult for a layman to compare rates. It is highly technical, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in rate structures, so far as hydro is concerned they are all very difficult and most technical and complicated, so that we must keep in mind that the old rates of service charge are scientifically devised to give service at cost, and to give a promotional rate for energy use. In this, as I have already intimated, as we got away from that and reduced the service charge over half, we had an unbalanced follow-up or consumption rate. Areas of low cost were getting power at less than cost, while others were paying more; and you could not expect to have areas move forward where the energy charge was as high as six cents. Relief is given where rates are in that scale. Where the rates are low, naturally they will get the least benefit. I point this out to the House, that ninety-seven per cent of all the customers on rural hydro lines will have a varying benefit, while three per cent of those will have in varying increase. That is three per cent, to be quite frank with the House, is estimated at less than four thousand. That four thousand is estimated to have an increase of $20,000.00 a year, or five dollars a year on the average of an increase.

You may ask me why we do not reduce the rates to pick up this. The answer is simply this, the first rate that was struck, the uniform rate was four and three quarters, and we found that was not enough to pick up the lower rates. Everytime you reduce a mill you reduce a thousand customers and you lose a thousand customers, in order to reduce two, three or four. That is the position that the amalgamation arrangement gives us.

I have said before, and I repeat, ninety-seven per cent of the rural customers in the province of Ontario will enjoy a reduction in the revenue of $527,500.00.

In the high six cents brackets, some of the class three

farms will have a reduction of a dollar and a half a month. That may seem large, but again that is only an indication that you are giving relief where relief is needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that the evidence of an increased bill is not evidence of increased rates. Let me repeat that: the evidence of an increased bill is not evidence of the increase of the rate.

Twenty per cent of all rural consumers in the last year have had an increase over the year before. That is explained by our experience. All in the House know the difficulty that farmers have been having to get labour. Farmers have been buying pumps and milking machines in order to help out. That has increased the consumption of electricity on the farm; and the only logical way to figure out a Bill is to take a stated number of kilowat hours, and what will that Bill be on the old rate, and what will that Bill be on the new rate. That is the only fair and logical way in which a comparison can be made.

I would like to emphasize again the difficult position the Commission found itself in these new rates. Can you conceive the City of Toronto, for instance, with more customers than we have on all our rural districts, having one hundred and twenty districts within it, and having thirteen different rates with eleven different classifications? On one street will be one rate, and across the street will be another rate.

That was the problem, and that problem has been solved. In summing up, may I say that this government is conscious of the fact, as mentioned by the young man from Simcoe, our young men and women, when they come back to Ontario want to have some of the advantages of living conditions that they used in the town or the city; and I submit to the members of the House that the easiest way, and our responsibility is to see that electricity is given to every home in the rural areas, so that they may have the advantages to be found in the cities and towns. Hydro confers those advantages.

I might in passing say that the Commission for months has been

busy with an interdepartmental committee finding ways and means by which they can help the farmer in solving some of his plans. It is proposed that as soon as the war is over mechanized units shall visit all parts of Ontario demonstrating electrical equipment for the farm. I go further, this includes not only farm equipment but also machinery for the house. I can see nothing better which Parliament can do, where the farmer can have water in the homes and refrigeration.

On all sides people are becoming conscious of what refrigeration means to the people in the home. The hydro commission in its laboratory has been experimenting for a considerable number of months in order to get a quick freezing unit that we can sell, — the government or the commission is not selling anything, we are not merchandising, but some industry will be producing a quick freezing unit that they will be able to sell to the farmer at a very low cubic foot cost. When I tell you that it is possible, and it is in vogue now, a quick freezing unit on which one Ontario industry has been conducting experiments for the past several months, one man told me that he has had a unit in his cellar in his house with six dozen ears of corn, six crates of fowl and meat, — this is quick frozen. Anyone can visualize what that means to the farm when they can keep the surplus meat and poultry, or whatever it is, in the cellar, in the winter time until he wants to use it. If he has fresh strawberries, raspberries or cabbage, he can go down and get it. This is a realty. All we are doing is to give leadership to the industry, and to see that whatever they sell to the farm will meet the requirements of the farm and at a price that the farmer can afford to pay for it.

Over and above that, we have a rather selfish interest. There is only one way by which the commission or the government can pick up this half a million dollars, and that is by getting the farmer to use more energy. We are taking this equipment to the farm so that ix he may increase his kilowat hours.

Members of the House, take this seriously. This could not have happened under the old set-up. This unified rate in one district

I do not see very well how it can be argued against; and we are in this fortunate position that as we have increased the consuiption of the farms, on that line we increase our revenues, and as we increase our revenues we can reduce the rate. As your reduce the rate to the consumer the revenue increases; so that at the last you are about where you were before.

We have enough faith in the people of this province to give them this scheme. While we are obliged to pay out of the Consolidated Revenue of this province any deficit, we realize that it will be only a few years before that deficit will be all wiped out and we will be able to reduce the costs of power to the farms.

Mr. Speaker, I have purposely kept away from any thought of trying to justify or explain, or anything else. Every increase can be explained and can be justified.

I leave the whole picture with you. I ask you to share with the Government in what, to me, is one of the greatest moves, a courageous move by a courageous government in order to help the rural section of Ontario.

I have great pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Bill number 38, An Act to amend The Rural power District Service Charge Act. Shall the motion carry?

Motion carried.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I desired to say something upon that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. L. E WISMER (Riverdale): Thank you. We are very much in favour of the proposal on this side of the House, but we are very much surprised that the rate structure should be discussed under the heading of A Service Charge Act. Later we are going to hear about a Power Commission rate, under which the rate structure will be considered.

HON. C. H. CHALLIES: Is that a question?

MR. L. E. WISMER: I am leading up to a question. I would like to ask Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister would further enlighten

us as to how much of that charge for service charge and the rates are going to be charged against the Consolidated Revenue Fund and how much is going to be absorved by the Hydro? It has all been mixed up here.

If the service charge is now being removed and the rates have been up in some cases, why we have to be bothered in this Legislature with the Service Charge Act and why it cannot all be charged to Hydro.

Could we also have information, if he has the figures, as to just how much money is involved in this in the current year? For instance, in 1943 we might learn how much deficit there was in rural areas, and how much surplus in other rural areas under the Service Act. Also we might be informed when we may expect the Report of the Hydro.

HON. G.H. CHALLIES: The annual report is not ready, but as soon as it is ready it will be brought down.

Now, you asked me what part is the Hydro going to absorb. What do you mean by the Hydro? The Commission has not any money. The commission is only a custodian for the municipalities, and the commission itself is absorbing nothing. The whole rural service stands on its own feet. And that probably answers your next question as to what will come out of the consolidated revenue. Whatever is the loss will be taken out of the consolidated Revenue, because the Hydro has no money. This is only held for the municipalities.

MR. WISMER: In Section 78 of the Power Commission Act, - I have it here if I may read it:

> "The rates to be charged to customers receiving electrical power or energy from the Commission in a rural power district shall be fixed by the Commission, and shall be sufficient ro provide the sum necessary to pay all the charges to be borne by the Corporation under Section

I may be wrong Mr. Speaker, but I thought these rates were being changed and the power given under Section 78 of the Hydro Commission Act.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: No. The rural Power District Service Act says that the government may order a reduction in the power service charge. And if a reduction is made, certain things happen. This amendment simply provides, as a first clause in the Act:

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in any statute or municipal bylaw of contract, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario may from time to time make regulations fixing a maximum service charge for any class of service rendered by the commission in a rural power district and also fixing the minimum number of consumers of different classes per mile of transmission line required for construction of works by the Commission in a rural power district or part thereof and may from time to time reduce or wholly remove any service charge previously fixed."

So that we have provision both for removal and also for reduction. Under the old Act that was not provided for.

MR. LE. R. WISMER: I understood that the minister said before that the service charge was only a capital charge.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: I said originally what is called a service charge was the cost of capital. The average cost of the rural transmission was about two thousand dollars a mile, of which the government pays a thousand dollars. That means that the capital cost has to be borne on a thousand dollars. The average cost runs about ten per cent. A service charge has to provide for that service.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I said, Is the motion carried? and I paused. I am very happy to accommodate the member for Riverdale. The motion carried but the motion is in your hands.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: I am satisfied, if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other questions?

MR H. E. BROWN (Welland): Yes, I have a question. The Minister said that every cost can be explained and justified. I have here a couple of clippings from the Kitchener Era where Mr. Webster, reeve of the Township up there, held a meeting and protested the rates which were increased from twelve to thirty-seven dollars, on February 14th. Then, on February 27th, I have another report in which Mr. Webster states that the reclassification recently given to the township, and which was responsible in rates, has been cancelled, and the consumers are now back on the old rate classification. I would like to ask the minister how they have the power to raise these up, and he explained to us very clearly how these rates had to be pushed down in order to make it equal to everybody throughout the province.

Now, I would like him to explain how this one group, which are holding protest meetings were able to get the rate back to where it was before.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: You did not read the whole of the article. If you go on and read the whole of the article you will find what was said.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that we are not following the procedure of the House on a second reading.

I remember that even the minister is not allowed to speak more than once, unless in reply. Members are not allowed to ask questions back and forth as we are doing. If this is to go on the system will be shattered. I think it is now time to stop it. People who want to speak on a Bill on second reading should prepare themselves and prepare their argument. They have a perfect right on the second reading to speak in favour of a Bill or against it. But they should prepare their arguments.

The procedure of the British Parliament, including this one, has been evolved through the centuries, through experience; and it would be very unwise indeed, if at this present time, we were to permit any

encroachment on this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the motion was carried, but I sensed the feeling of the House as having regard for our new members here; as the days go by they will come into line.

I think this has gone on far enough.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (York South): We all appreciate your courtesy, Mr. Speaker, in allowing the hon. member from Riverdale the floor. I suggest, however, that he had risen before the motion was put, but quite inadvertently he was not noticed. I am sure the hon. member from Riverdale and the hon. member from Welland made statements in the form of questions.

While I agree entirely with the hon. member from Prescott in regard to the procedure on second readings, I submit that the two hon. members who asked questions were perfectly entitled to do so and to make speeches in the form of questions. The minister was entitled to reply on second reading. No one objected, because he made the reply in the way he did. It was convenient for the minister to speak in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate your remarks. I might say to the House that the mover of a Bill has not a chance to reply to any remarks made on the motion.

I do not want to be forced to give rulings and say that any member of the House is out of order. I have extended the fullest courtesy. I will ask the member for Riverdale if he will complete his questions and have them answered.

MR. L. E. WISMER: (Riverdale): The question was, Mr. Speaker, How do we justify the lowering of these rates after a protest meeting has been held, after what the minister has said telling how necessary it was to have rates that were set.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: From the Telegram I make this quotation:

> "I am informed that the local rural hydro office has received instructions to revert to the old classification and to issue a credit for the overcharge."

Does that answer your question?

MR L. E. WISMER: (Riverdale): Not very clearly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: May I make it clear?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Out of order.

MR. G. H. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow the practice, at the outset of extending to you my compliments upon your election to the high office you hold. I am well satisfied that you will fill that office with honour and dignity.

I have another matter to bring before the House which has escaped notice up until now.

Quite a lot of talk has been made about the number of groups in this House. One gentleman said, Mr. Speaker, that his group, composed of himself and another hon. member were at least pleased to know that there was another group in the House with a smaller membership.

(Page 484 follows)

I am going, now, to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I think there are either eleven or twelve Georges in this House. I happen to be one of them. I am not going to say that the Georges will consistently agree with each other, but when I remember the opinions of the people to show that inclination to "Let George do it", as they have in the past -- If we have the full cooperation of the other members of the House, the Georges will endeavour to see that the right kind of Legislation is drawn up.

Speaking of that, and particularly now that we are fortunate enough to have the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. A. W. Downer) with us this afternoon, I would like to say that I am very pleased, for several reasons, to see him here. One of the reasons is that he is going to be in the happy position of hearing the remarks of a man who was a "buck private" in the last war, and hearing his views as to what happened after the war, with regard to the way our men who served were treated, and the manner in which we hope they will be treated after this war.

Now, I notice, also, Mr. Speaker, that up to the present no reference has been made to the points raised by the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) -- up to the present. I presume that will be taken care of in due course. That is, that with the exception of the remarks made with regard to the now celebrated Griffith Farm. I have been giving very serious thought to this farm situation, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. Prime Minister did suggest, when speaking, that this farm was going to be converted, and used for purposes of amusement. I think it was something of that nature. I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that rather than convert it into a museum they should still retain this house in its character as a farm house, and that it should be put into something like fit and proper

order for residential purposes, and possibly, say, in one hundred years from now it might be pointed out as "that historic farm-house, where the hon. Mr. Bracken rested his head as he was travelling from coast to coast, asking the residents of this fair country to support the Government at Ottawa during this war period".

Now, with regard to the educational grant, whichwas one of the twenty-two points dealt with during the election campaign: I might say, with regard to that, that as the hon. Prime Minister has so well stated, he will deal with it "at a fit and proper time". I think the hon. Prime Minister has also stated that he is prepared to keep his election promises, so that I have no hesitation in saying, gentlemen, — I want to re-assure you — I have no hesitation in saying that since the hon. Prime Minister says "at a fit and proper time he will tell you he is going to keep the promises with regard to the educational grant".

However, in the dual role of a member of this House and the Reeve of a municipal township, I may say I am very anxious to hear that expression made, because we are anxious to strike our mill rate. We may be delayed, to some extent, unless the hon. Prime Minister sees fit to make that observation in the reasonably near future.

Now, all the hon. members, I think, Mr. Speaker, have agreed that the farming industry, in order to survive, must have more adequate prices, and that some Governmental guidance will be necessary in the post-war years, particularly in regard to foreign trade, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there should also be a lower rate of interest on farm loans.

I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, there should be further restrictive legislation with regard to mortgage foreclosure proceddings, both with regard to the farms and homes in rural

and urban districts, and I feel that people, in recent years, have suffered much injustice through confiscation, after creating a sizable equity in the property.

I am also pleased that members of this House are prepared to support better health and educational facilities, and that is definitely a move in the right direction.

I am sorry that at this moment the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is absent from his seat. I would like to make this observation: Up to yesterday afternoon, I must confess to having been greatly impressed by the high level and tone of the utterances of members of this honourable body. I do feel, however, with regard to the utterances of the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) yesterday afternoon, that he fell far below the level — very far below it — and most of his time was taken up in decrying others, something I do not want to do, except in constructive criticism, and, in the final analysis, I think I must confess that after summing up the hon. minister's remarks, I can only classify them as being a cross between "Grimm's Fairy Tales" and "Songs My Mother Taught Me".

Now, with regard to social services, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I find the policy adopted by previous provincial governments as totally unsatisfactory. The allowances granted in most cases were barely sufficient to keep body and soul together, particularly in the case of relief recipients, this being given as the main reason why so many of our young men were rejected when volunteering for service in our Armed Forces, and I urge the Government to take immediate steps to rectify this situation. I may also say that there has been too much rigidity — and I bow to the hon. member from Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) in the use of that sixty-four-dollar word — I say that there has been too much rigidity shown, and trust that in borderline cases the applicant will be given the benefit of the doubt.

I note that some steps are to be taken with regard to

hospital space, and much suffering has been caused through failure to provide an adequate number of beds. I think this province is still fifty years behind the times in this regard.

The impression I have at the moment is that if the hon. minister of Health (Mr. Vivian) is endeavouring to do something about it, I am only too pleased to assure him that he will have my hearty support.

Now, I want to deal, for a moment, with the question of "special privileges". There is quite a bit of it, I find, Mr. Speaker. In the time of our forefathers there was great concern over the privileged classes. There was then a section of society which, by custom, or prerogative, or by Royal grant, enjoyed special immunities and concessions not available to the common folk. By reason of continual effort, these privileges have been largely abolished, and, with the poet Burns, we can say, with some truth:

> "That man to man the world o'er, shall brothers be, for a' and that."

But recently there has grown up a privileged class of another sort, the privileged corporation. So often now one meets with the assertion by some company, or society, of some right not usually enjoyed by such a body, and, on making enquiry, the Secretary or Honourary Treasurer confides in you, "We have a special Act". And then you learn that some corporations are created under the Companies' Act of either the province or the dominion, but others of the privileged group acquire their powers under a special, private Act. Some of these are quite old, as institutions go in Canada, and I presume that some of the special powers and immunities granted were quite proper at the time, and for the purposes then in the minds of the legislators.

When John Jones gets some special concession, it usually

lasts only during his lifetime. In Canada, I know of no prerogatives that one may pass to his heirs, save in the case of a very few grants of titles. But the corporations may live forever. We do review our financial institutions, that is true. The Bank Act is revised every few years. Our life insurance companies are subject to periodic inspection. But these favoured corporations escaped attention until the exercise of some of these special prerogatives became notorious. My attention has been drawn to the situation by two incidents in my own riding, in the Township of North York.

Recently the township of North York passed a by-law limiting certain land to residential purposes. Before passing this, the owners ih the area were notified. One of these wrote the township clerk, claiming that, under its special Act, it was not bound, nor were its lands bound, by municipal by-law. This owner, the Toronto Burying Grounds, urged this same privilege before the municipal board.

The lands in question are not used for cemetery purposes, but are being farmed.

Upper Canada College purchased another farm in North York several years ago, doubtless contemplating moving this school, or part of it, to the new location. This has never been done. The lands are being farmed. They, however, are free from tax, and immune from expropriation. In Toronto, alone, there are a number of bodies incorporated by private Act. In other cities, there would be others, making a large number for the province, and involving, perhaps, many varieties of special corporate privileges.

It is my feeling that the time has arrived when the powers and privileges of such corporations should be reviewed and revised in the interests of the common good, and in most cases abolished.

Toronto corporations in this category are, in part, as follows: The Consumers' Gas Company, Massey Hall, The National Club, The Royal Canadian Yacht Club, and the Toronto General Burying Grounds, and Upper Canada College.

Now, as a parallel case to what I have just been speaking about, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to a report of a recent by-election held in West Derbyshire, England, the county wherein I was born. You may have noticed there, Mr. Speaker, that the Duke of Devonshire had held approximately thirty-two thousand acres of land, and that most of the voters in that riding were tenants; in other words, it goes almost back to the old feudal days.

But, Mr. Speaker, you may remember that the man who was elected was, I think, the son of a shoemaker, but that only in two cases in two centuries had the Duke of Devonshire, or a member of the family, been defeated, and it was all due to the fact, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the main, that they were under the domination of the Duke of Devonshire, or his family, and were in such an embarrassing position that they were not free to exercise their franchise in a fit and proper manner. This was almost directly a survival of the feudal days.

Another matter that has concerned me for some years, and of which I have spoken before other bodies, is that of tag days. These tag days have seemed to develop to a greater extent during the war, but it has always been a source of worry and concern, and certainly dissatisfaction, to me, that insofar as the care of our blinded, our consumptives, our orphans, and a number of other similar cases of this kind, it should be necessary to have public, periodic tag days, days when people have to stand on street corners, and solicit alms for our unfortunate citizens. I think the time has definitely arrived, Mr. Speaker, when legislation should be brought down, either separately or jointly with the Federal Government, wherein these respective

Governments will assume full responsibility for the care, treatment and attention of these unfortunate people, rather than letting this peculiar system survive any longer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words regarding the re-establishment of members of our Armed Forces. This service was bungled badly after the last war; in fact, thousands of ex-servicemen never were re-established. They, unfortunately, turned out to be the "unwanted men". This cannot, and must not, happen again. I have noted that some pronouncement with regard to vocational training has been made by one of the ministers of this Government to the effect that the province will assist in this vocational training.

I am very much concerned about this matter, as I do not want to see a divided authority. In view of the administrative experience I had in this work after the last war, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that only a small percentage of those receiving training carried on along the line of training. It was, in fact, impossible to place them, and for this reason that kind of training should never have been given. If the Federal Government is compelled to carry these persons on pay and allowances until properly re-established, it will be more careful in the policy laid down. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the Government of Canada failed to keep the pledges given to the men who fought, and many of whom died, in the last war, and we must see to it that the pledge of full employment and better living conditions given to the members of our Armed Forces in this war, will be kept. We dare not fail them.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex, South): Mr. Speaker, rather than go into the Griffith case, as many other speakers have done during this debate, I would prefer to follow the lead given by our hon. minister of labor, Mr. Daley. When he spoke about his native St. Catharines, it gave me a desire to place before the members of this Legislature a brief bird's eye picture of the district which I am very happy to represent in this Legislature. I understand that my predecessor in this chamber did not speak very often, so I may have to make up for him a little, too.

The riding of South Essex is that part of Essex County which lies along the north shore of Lake Erie, and is bounded on the north by the portion of Essex County which includes that vitally important and highly aggressive city of Windsor.

When the honourable member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) was speaking about extending industrial hydro into rural areas, I noticed that he drew loud applause from the members of the opposition, and I would like to state that I will co-operate in every way possible with the hon. members for the Windsor Ridings (Messrs. Bennett and Riggs) in decentralizing the huge Windsor plants -- and putting some of them into the south riding.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH: Although always considered as a strictly rural district, the towns of Amherstburg, Harrow, Kingsville, Essex and Leamington are fast developing into very worthy communities, communities which will be certain to benefit from any future plan of industrial decentralization.

As this district is the most southerly portion of the Dominion of Canada, it is naturally a high class production area of early fruits and vegetables, and it is to this area that the large city of Toronto looks for its first potatoes, melons, tomatoes and various fruits each and every year.

No matter how far I may be from home, even across the sea, I can nearly always reach out on any dining room table and consume the farm produce of South Essex, in the form of tomato and other products prepared by the Clark plant at Harrow, the Van

Camp Plant, and the Heinz Plant at Leamington.

And furthermore, when you shoot a goose or a duck -- and I hope it will be in the hunting season -- it might be banned by that well known naturalist of South Essex, Jack Miner.

And when you fill your pipe or light your cigarette you can remember that South Essex was the one district in Canada where the production of tobacco was first introduced and where tobacco was first successfully grown.

I do not propose to go into any further details of what we call the "banana belt of Canada", except to say that less than one hundred years ago this riding was a thickly wooded area and the price or value of the land at that time was almost negligible. But the pioneers had faith, and with their bare hands and an axe and a spade they wrested a living from that land, displaying courage and vision of a type which in some places we seem to lack to-day.

Those pioneers sailed in wooden ships, they rode in covered wagons, they met and overcame many great dangers. Since that time with microscope and telescope we have increased our power of vision.

With the telephone and radio we are enabled to hear from great distances. With trains and cars we have developed a swift method of locomotion. We can fly in the air much faster than birds, and with bomb and shell we have surpassed the might of the fist. We have developed our physical being to a degree undreamed of even in my younger days.

But what about that undeveloped power within every one of us, that power to make ourselves and others loving, contented and happy.

But with all these great developments in the past we have among us to-day many who tell us we are all wrong. Mr. Speaker, the world is not lop-sided, but we are.

Less than a year ago many of us who are in this chamber did not even dream that we would be sitting here as members of the 21st Legislature in the Province of Ontario. I know that I speak for my fellow members on this side of the House when I say

that we are here for a definite purpose. We are not thinking about the next election but the next generation.

In my twenty-five years as a full time working man, I have experienced the problems and difficulties of the worker, the farmer, and strange as it may seem, the business man and I have learned -- I have come to understand how the economic problems of different classes and groups interlock.

To-day it seems that every different group, and perhaps we are all guilty, is trying to obtain for itself a bigger slice of the melon but very few of us seem to figure out that by working together in this Dominion we can get a bigger melon to slice.

(Page 494 follows)

I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. F. R. Oliver) for the compliment he paid to the new members on both sides of the house, and I really like the term he gives us, "The Ginger Group".

We may not be as witty; we may not be the same heavy political timber, but I would speak too for my colleagues when I say that after eighteen years of service to this Legislature, if we still have as much to grumble about as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. F. R. Oliver) we will gracefully leave the future of farming to some new Ginger Group. However, I am sure after his worthy effort the different Ministers will provide the health insurance for the sick cows, and I am sure that the Minister of Highways will get that 75% for the roads in his riding instead of 50% from this Province, because we are here to do a good job.

And with all the weight which the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. F. R. Oliver) possesses, it would have been quite permissible for him in the past to go right through the stock yard door and through three or four more doors that he mentioned; but seeing that he took no such positive action at that time, I would suggest that his next best step would be to assist us opening one door at a time.

I was very much interested the other day in hearing for the first time our lady member from York East (Miss Agnes Macphail). Although I am surprised that in spite of the fact that we have eleven farmers on this side of the house and in spite of the fact that two of our members are still bachelors, she seems to be attracted and inspired more by her mutual friend the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Kennedy).

The hon. lady member from York East (Miss Macphail) mentioned that she had been working for the farmer for the past twenty or twenty-five years and she also mentioned that the income of the farmer during that time has dropped during that period from one-third of the national income to one-sixth.

and now standing at one-tenth. So I would like to assure her that with the help of the other farmer members on this side of the house we will do everything in our power during this Session to raise the income of the farmer back to where it was before she started. I can fully sympathize with the lady member in all she said because I have produced and sold eggs myself for six cents a dozen. On my farm there is a small plum orchard, and the previous owner of this farm picked and shipped to Toronto some 80 baskets of plums. But besides picking the plums, and supplying the baskets, the broker in Toronto, after selling the plums, advised him that the proceeds of the sale would not cover the shipping expenses, and would he kindly remit to cover same.

The hon. lady member for York East (Miss Macphail) mentioned that it would be her intention to socialize farm machinery and I agree this would be a sound practice as a war measure when machinery is so scarce, and hard to get. I believe socialized farm machinery would be alright provided it is the farmers' ideas and not some armchair expert, because the Canadian farmer is the greatest individualist in the world - and I know whereof I speak - and he zealously guards his rights and priviliges, which he has all through the past strived so hard to gain.

He wants to farm his land in the way he thinks best, and even if the hon. lady member for York East (Miss Macphail) and the armchair experts have it all figured out that it would be more economically sound to have his land farmed on a co-operative plan, with cooperative machinery, the farmer still wants his own machinery. You ask him some time.

And I am convinced that the farmer is entitled to prices for his products which will enable him to buy his own machinery. It may be perfectly alright for the armchair farmers to suggest cooperative farms and farm machinery; and then the experts are going to give the farmer a price for his products which will guarantee him the cost of production.

If this system goes into effect - the experts will run the farm - the farmer will do the work and he will still be broke. Meanwhile the factories will close down. I may be stretching it a little bit here but, after all, who does not stretch it a little bit these days. The opposition members entirely agree. Thank you. Now, meanwhile the factories will close down, and the trade unionist will be out of work, because the farmer will not need to buy farm machinery. All those engaged in the manufacture of farm machinery will lose their purchasing power, making the demand for farm products still less. The demand for farm products being less, farm production will go down, because you won't need as much, and with the production down the price of what he does grow will be higher. This is just a new theory, folks. Now, the trade unionists who are still working will not be able to buy so much farm produce because the price is higher and the cycle starts all over again. Oh! Boy, what a plan!

I was very much interested in the very eloquent address delivered by the hon.member from Toronto Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and his colleague from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and I know that he will support any sound progressive measure introduced into this house, especially if it concerns labour. The member pointed out that he is looking forward to the time when a working week of 40 hours will be generally accepted and considered the standard for labour. Now, the thing is to be a labour man out of the desire that you be a good labour man, and in this respect I would like to point out that at a meeting of the Railway Transportation Brotherhoods in Ottawa, November 24th of last year, they made, among many other, the following proposition:

> "All labour employed on Government supported projects should be paid in accordance with fair wage schedules and collective agreements. A six-hour day and a five-day work week should be established as a post-war measure."

Or 30 hours a week instead of 40 hours a week.

AN. HON. MEMBER: A good proposal.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH: I would not like to see our hon.labour members and the trade unionist members on the opposite side of the house taking a back seat as it were from anyone with regard to labour, but I would ask that when labour is going on a certain size work week with no reduction in pay that the farmer be put on exactly the same plan and we will all be very happy.

The hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) went quite fully into world conditions, and the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail), along with others, mentioned different points in agriculture which they would like to have put into effect, but I would like to express the sentiment that in this country, and in every country, our problems in the final analysis are the problems of the individual, and in order to develop this province we must supply our people with a full abundance which we are able to produce, we must first of all develop the individual.

We have heard a great deal about the development of our natural resources, and I would like to present my five dimensionalviewpoint dealing with the development of the most important natural resources of this province, the development of the individual.

I am very happy to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the proceedings in this Chamber are commenced each day in prayer. It must make each and every one of us realize that into the individual, instead of dissatisfaction, adversity and chaos, we must implant a sincere and active faith. Faith will overcome all adversity. Faith gives us something to look to, something to live for. Faith banishes fear of the future and we must go back to that old belief that we are punished for wrong-doing and rewarded for virtue.

If we can start by developing faith in the individual, perhaps we can give to him a new conception of his vocation or occupation. Perhaps we can help him to realize that the greatest happiness in life comes to a man through pride in his

vocation and the satisfaction of doing any job well and being of service to the public.

We often hear the old truth that man must work. Man in his make-up is essentially an expressive and creative creature. Some work with the hands, some with the voice and some with the brain. Of course, I do not believe it is necessary for a man to work,really, but he must express himself and the hours of labour may be reduced to a very short working day, but even in that extra leisure time a man must still express himself, and the expression of the man and creation of a man during that leisure time can be used as a power for good or a power for evil. Now, can we be honest with ourselves and say that we use that leisure time to more advantage today than we did one hundred years ago?

When we ask for and are granted certain rights and privileges we automatically assume corresponding duties and obligations, and the perfect expression in this respect is produced when a man has a job and he likes his work. This is an attitude of mind. We can see many humble workers giving good service with enthusiasm; putting their whole hearts into the job.

I have always liked the little story of the men who were building a cathedral and a visitor walked up to one man and asked, "What are you doing, my good man?" and he replied, "Earning my bread and butter" and a second man was asked the same question and the reply was, "Laying stone." And the visitor asked the same question of a third man, "What are you doing, my good man?" and this man replied, "Helping to build this beautiful cathedral."

Employees need more than a raise in wages to keep them happy and contented. Many employers do not realize that a pat on the back and recognition for work well done, is often a bigger boost to an employee than a raise in wages which does not come from the heart.

In the first instance the extra time which we are going to gain through shorter hours could be spent in the home. We

are always introducing legislation and will be introducing and discussing very important legislation during this Session to encourage and foster the type of homes we would like to have our people live in. We are going to build thousands of new homes, equip them with all possible labour-saving devices. We are going to provide free medical services to establish better health in the family. But we can accomplish nothing unless the individuals in the homes realize their own responsibilities. You will not buy good health for $24.00 a year or $50.00 a year unless each and every individual realizes the fundamental and very simple laws of good health. We all realize the home is the foundation of the nation, but would you say that life in the home has kept pace with the progress and development outside of the home during the past hundred years? Are men any more considerate of their wives, giving them their presence, their every help in caring for the family? Do wives realize any more in a brand new home than in an old one that they can do a great deal for their husbands?

She can nag him and drive him to distraction or she can encourage him by her admiration and belief in him, so that he can accomplish the impossible.

Today we hear a great deal about juvenile delinquency - a very serious problem - and it makes us realize, as Chief Constable Draper of Toronto, remarked: "A nation can rise no higher than its homes". The Chief Constable goes on to say: "The home was a place where the family actually lived together, was trained, disciplined, grew up and worked - a place where love and respect held sway. Today this cannot be said of many homes. There are too many homes now, where members of the family meet only occasionally, perhaps once a day, perhaps not so often. Indeed, in some instances, it has been a place where they go when there is no other place to go. Home today, in a great many places, is simply a place to eat and sleep."

We have been told that, "It profiteth a man nothing, if he should gain the world and lose his soul." But we do not have to go that far because we must realize in our striving for physical possessions that we can accomplish nothing unless

we develop and encourage love and character in the home.

After leaving the subject of home, we find there is another natural instinct in man which needs developing - that is the instinct which urges man to help his fellow men. This is the true basis of all our social legislation - old age pensions, anything at all - is the urge to do something for other people and to satisfy this natural impulse we have men taking an active interest in municipal affairs, in politics - preferably Progressive-Conservative politics - churches, lodges, social clubs, agricultural societies, and even labour unions.

Hitler developed this theory in the German people. He had a deep interest in the people, but instead of developing this instinct for their own good he used this power to further his own selfish aims and ambitions and in doing so destroyed his people.

I am convinced the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) has a sincere desire to help his fellow men, but he must use caution, lest his enthusiasm for the cause which he represents leads him away from promoting the development of his fellow men. The hon. member referred to his love for little people. It is a great pity, in my opinion, that so many people are referred to as little people, ordinary people, because there is no such thing as an ordinary person; but we do see thousands of people about us who have never had an opportunity, either through their own neglect, or through the neglect of the state, to develop themselves.

The hon. lady member for York East (Miss Macphail) mentioned the immediate necessity for an improvement in the educational facilities in rural areas. And I fully agree, but education is not a matter of going to school, and we do not stop learning when we leave school.

We must develop the so-called "little people", and give them a new zest for life, but let us not keep telling these people the world is all wrong, and always has been. Instead of telling them only that they should have a better

labour code and more bargaining power, let us wake up in every one that latent, sleeping, undeveloped power which I know has been given to every creature of God's creation.

4 I know of a man in Toronto who has great skill, great power, and a very large following. Although not acquainted with him personally, I am a friend of his evidently because I am on his mailing list, and many people of this city patronize the propaganda he propounds in Massey Hall. If I had the power to do likewise I would endeavour to inspire the people to nobler thoughts and actions, giving them something to lift them up, giving them hope instead of putting a chip on their shoulder. Because no person can think his best or do his best with a chip on his shoulder. Along with the privilege of education there is a corresponding obligation to express the result of that education in a worthy manner.

Along with the gift of great ability there is given the responsibility of using that gift to make people contented, hopeful and happy.

In my humble, uneducated opinion, anyone who uses his God given talents, stirring up stress and strife - to put a chip on someone's shoulder, to make people afraid of the future, filling them with fear and despair - anyone doing these things is abusing and not using the privilege of education.

George Matthew Adams speaking on the educated person has said: "Vast learning or a great accumulation of knowledge does not mark that one is educated. He who has learned the importance of self-control, and has applied himself to the improvement of his mind, so as to give to others as well as to himself the widest possible opportunity for service, certainly may be termed an educated man".

The great secret of life and the basis of all our legislation that is passed in this Legislature is that we must learn - and it is very simple - we must learn to live together, and the more education we receive the more we are indebted to the state and society as a whole not to further our own selfish ambitions by that education, but pass on those benefits in helping to develop our neighbours.

In this respect the labour member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) mentioned yesterday that we should recognize more fully the position of the new Canadian. The new Canadians came to this country because they saw the possibilities and sought to live in accordance with British tradition, otherwise they would not have come.

Now, there is one thing about members from Toronto, and that is - they do not get out of Toronto enough and they become too much --- The hon. fellow member on my right (Mr. Roberts) says when I say that you should get out more from Toronto, he says they cannot get out because they have not any gas. Then they should read a little more and try to remember there is a little more to the province than the city of Toronto.

Now, new Canadians are not persecuted in my part of the country. In fact, they are doing real well. At the present time they are buying 90% of all farms which are changing hands and they are paying $5,000, $10,000, $15,000 and as high as $20,000 for them, and paying cash. They are buying 90% of the farms, many homes and many hotels, and I give them every credit in the world for doing this because instead of grumbling these men took off their coats and went to work. I have never seen it fail. If you make an effort in this country and take your coat off and go to work you will get along. I know many new Canadians - I see many smiles from members of the opposition - I know of many new Canadians who did not have a cent in 1933 and who today are worth anywhere from $10,000 to $20,000. I could take you to them in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER: They must have had hotels.

MR. MURDOCH: In answer to the question by the member, I could tell you of one man who worked in 1933 for a dollar a day. Now, he was working for farmers. I knew farmers who needed men and they could only pay a dollar a day, which was all they could afford. Nobody would work for a dollar a day

but this man did and he put his heart into the job and did a good job. I have always noticed a man who puts his heart into anything always gets encouragement, and next year he was offered the opportunity to work that farm on a share basis, which he did, and which he repeated and today that man has his own farm - well stocked, equipped with the latest machinery, and, really speaking, he has not a worry in the world, and during that time he has brought his family out from Central Europe.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a dollar a day?

MR. MURDOCH: He did not do this, Mr. Speaker, on a dollar a day, but he did this because he took his coat off and went to work.

And even from that great and terrible depression, when the proper people failed to make the necessary effort, we have produced the finest generation of young men and women of any age, in any place.

It is for their future that we are planning today and the only importance of this Legislature is that between the historic past and the glorious future we are the connecting link.

You know, there was a man and he was going to be hung, and when the noose was being put around his neck, somebody asked him, "Have you not something to say before you go?" and he replied, "Well, this is going to be a lesson to me."

This country was not built in a day, and we must be very careful that in cutting away the fabric, we do not cut into the whole cloth. We must not be hasty, lest when the noose is about our neck it will be too late, "This is going to be a lesson to me." We must first build on a solid foundation. We must direct our legislation to the one and only final objective, the development of the individual and the full development of the individual.

The hon. member from Temiskaming (Mr. C.H. Taylor) mentioned a road that was built in his riding not being built on a solid foundation but on muskeg, and we must profit from

our experiences of the past and build first a firm and solid foundation - the character of the people - and on this foundation we can, through cooperation and assisting legislation, we can build a super structure worthy of the builder.

Now, I will just reiterate the points. We have got to have faith. We must have an interest in what we do in our occupations, jobs, professional calling. We must always keep sight of the importance of the home and we must take an interest in our fellow man.

My fifth and final point is, that we must as individuals and as a nation have a definite goal - something at which to aim. I sincerely believe from the speeches given already in this house that every member of this Chamber in most respects is striving towards that same goal. The only difference is that we seem to be travelling by different roads. One group is travelling the road to the left, another group the road to the right, and we have two hon. members who are travelling along together on a road by themselves, each giving the other mutual comfort and support, perhaps even holding hands.

And we have a lone traveller present with us today who, for the time being, is blazing a new path all by himself, but it is the same goal - the full development of our natural and human resources.

Those on one road are planning for an abundance of material things, but in obtaining these necessities we must not fail to plan for an abundance of life itself.

We should not look forward in despair to insecurity and want. My experience, which is admittedly short, leads me to believe that we can accomplish everything, even that which is supposed to be quite impossible, if everyone concerned will try to achieve it. If everyone is determined to bring about a certain result, anything can be done.

So that we can march forward together not divided but united, not destroying but utilizing all our talents, agriculture, labour, executive ability, the professions - I will even throw

in the banks and insurance companies - marching forward together as one body into a new era of progress for the nation and development for the individual.

So that in this 21st Session of the Legislature in the province of Ontario we can repeat the words of the Englishman when he said, "This is the finest hour."

- Page 506 follows -

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott) Mr. Speaker, looking at the clock, of course there is lots of time to make a speech but my feeling in the House is that when it comes near to six o'clock and a man has a lot of remarks which he proposes to make, he has to break it up. I would not like to do that.

Now, if there is no objection on the part of the leader of the House I would like to adjourn. If it would cause any inconvenience, I would be willing to go on.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: All right, adjourn.

MR. A. BELANGER (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member moves to adjourn the debate. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, do I understand it is the case, that the House is not sitting to-night?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the House do now adjourn.

The House is now adjourned until three o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario, Wednesday, March 8, 1944.

- - - - - -

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the committee on colonization, and move its adoption.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the report be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Kennedy, that the name of Mr. Downer be added to the committees on education, private Bills, agriculture and colonization, and labour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the name of Mr. Downer be added to the committees on education, private Bills, agriculture and colonization, and labour. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Township of York", and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Jolliffe moves, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Township of York", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Township of York"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Transportation of Fowl Act", and that the same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Goodfellow moves, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Transportation of Fowl Act", and that the same be now read for the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Transportation of Fowl Act"; first reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I request your indulgence to have the privilege of bringing before the House a matter of interest to it.

The matter to which I refer is dealt with in an editorial appearing in the Toronto Daily Star of Tuesday, March 7th. It was also dealt with by a letter appearing in "The Globe and Mail" this morning, March 8th.

The object of the editorial, and the object of the letter, is to make critical reference to a notice that the Liquor Control Board of the province of Ontario has caused to be posted in the liquor stores, in the beer stores, in the

wine stores, and in every beverage room in the province of Ontario. I have brought into the House one of these notices. It reads as follows:

"The quantity of alcoholic beverages saleable at this sales' outlet is restricted by reason of Order-in-Council P.C.11374, passed by the Dominion Government of Canada on December sixteenth, nineteen hundred and forty-two."

I would emphasize to the House the language used in this notice. The words are : "restricted by reason of". The editorial appearing in the "Toronto Daily Star", to which I have referred, and the letter appearing in this morning's "Globe and Mail", suggest -- I will read the language of the "Star" editorial. The editorial pointed out that the restriction came into effect November first, nineteen forty-two, relating to the volume of beer sold in the province for the year ended October first, nineteen forty-two, and it points out that the effect of the restrictive order was to reduce the quantity by ten per cent. I might add there that is not the whole story.

The effect of the Order was retroactive, and the result was that, commencing the year beginning the first of November, nineteen forty-two, the Liquor Control Board proceeded on the old basis, and it oversold its quota substantially for that year before the Government Order came into effect. The result was that for the remaining part of last year there was considerably less than ninety per cent. of the basic-period beer available in the province. I just wanted to clear up that little situation.

Now, what the editorial and the letter suggest, in effect, is this, that the Federal Government had nothing to do with the reduction of the amount of beer in beverage rooms from

ninety per cent. down to seventy-five per cent. I want to point out that what actually happened was this, that by reason of the Federal Order's reducing the quantity to ninety per cent., and for the balance of last year somewhat less than ninety per cent., there was created that inadequacy of supply that created the necessity for rationing. It was that Order that created the run on both beverage rooms and on stores that always follows when somebody is told they can have thus-and-so of something, and no more.

That order, in itself, greatly increased and expanded the demand in the province of Ontario. As the result of that, and as there was an inadequate supply, the Liquor Control Board of the province of Ontario, and the Government of the province of Ontario, were faced with a responsibility and a duty. That responsibility and that duty is one that is always inherent under a condition of rationing. It is a responsibility to see that the available supplies are distributed in the most equitable manner possible among all those persons desiring to purchase in the province.

An examination of the situation made by the officials of the Liquor Control Board, and presented to the Government of the province, indicated that since the commencement of the War there had already taken place a substantial shift in the tastes of those who purchased, from the beverage room to the store. The Government was faced with the problem of line-ups at the stores, in the winter months of the year, and following its duty — whether it was right, or whether it was wrong, precisely, in what it did — it faced the problem honestly and with courage, and it shifted from five million gallons of beer from on-premises consumption to home-premises consumption on this simple theory that it made available to every one in this province, insofar as it was possible, to all holders of

permit books the right to first acquire twenty-four pints of beer before other citizens started to drink up second and third rations. That was the obligation to all the people of the province.

Now, for the "Star" to suggest, or for the writer of the letter in question to suggest that the Government of Canada had nothing to do with that decision, is preposterous. That decision was a decision made as a result of the obligations of this Government, by reason of circumstances set in force by the Government of Canada, over which this Government had no control, and, therefore, with respect to this notice, Mr. Speaker, I say that the reduction from ninety per cent. to seventy-five per cent., which took place in the stores, was, as this notice truly states, "by reason of Order-in-Council P.C.11374, passed by the Dominion Government of Canada", by which the governing restrictions forcing that action on our part were brought into being.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I am tabling answer to Question No. 12.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole, to consider Order No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that I do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole, to consider Order No. 4. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House resolves itself into a committee of the whole.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the Rural Power District

Service Charge Act", Mr. Challies.

THE CHAIRMAN: "An Act to Amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act"; shall Section One form part of the Bill?

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Challies), in connection with Section One, if it is his intention, or if the Hydro in the province are prepared to make any research into going a little further in this Section, in reducing rates, by cutting the expenses of meters, for instance, and rural transformers, as has been done in the U. S. A. under Federal Government supervision.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: I do not quite gather the purport of the question. The question, as I understand it, is, "Is the Commission prepared to" -- What? To do what with the meters and transformers? What do you wish us to do with them?

MR. DENNISON: At the present time the farmers in rural districts find one of their great expenditures is in connection with meters, and so on. I was wondering if, as in the U. S. A., in instances where the Federal Government has helped rural districts extend lines, they have found it very helpful, in extending the lines, to go to certain manufacturers and say, "We will give you an order for so many of these, if you give us a price", and in many instances they have secured a price just about half of that previously charged. I believe there the prices for meters have dropped from around thirty-six dollars down to somewhere about eighteen dollars.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: May I say to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) that meters and transformers are not a charge on the customer, except as it is included in capital cost, of which the province pays half. Ever since the Hydro started, the meters and transformers have been bought on a competitive basis, and I do not think the information is quite

correct, that in the United States they are buying meters at half the cost, buying them in this way. We buy all our equipment on purely competitive bases, by tender.

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON (Simcoe, Centre): Mr. Chairman, with reference to this first Section, there, concerning the removal of any service from time to time - removal of any service charge previously fixed, I think we are entirely in agreement that that service charge be moved, but we are dubious of the idea of the way it was done, by increasing the rates to the power users in the rural sections. I do not know whether that figure of three per cent., which the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) gave yesterday, -- whether it is a fair figure, or not, because there have been many complaints from rural areas that their bills have been increased. We have received these complaints, and I am simply bringing them to the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Challies).

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: In the first place, Mr. Chairman, may I say -- You say the power users have felt the increase?

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON: The consumers.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: We may grant that, for the simple reason that in the set-up of the rural Hydro system in the province the primary object was to serve the primary producers of the province by means of a fifty per cent. grant of their costs, as I explained yesterday.

In this growth, or evolution, as long as the service charge was there, the commercial users, who are making money out of the system, were paying a share toward the carrying-on of the system. As the service charge was eliminated, leaving nothing but the meters, or a consumer charge, the commercial users were getting "under the wire" by taking advantage of that grant given to the farmers, and intended, primarily and

solely, for the farmers.

Now, in this adjustment — and it has been proven in the past — there are types of commercial users of rural lines who are paying much less than the same business, probably, across the street, or beyond the boundary of a township or village, because they were getting the advantage of the fifty-per-cent grant made by the Government.

This is just bringing up to a proportion of that level where they are paying of the cost of the service they are receiving. That percentage is very, very small, and I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Johnston) — and this is all done by means of curves and mathematical calculations -- that if he will go over the bills already sent out, he will find that three per cent., or a little less, have received increases in their bills.

But it may be interesting to the House for me to just give you a few examples, not all, but a few, and the first one which comes to my attention, which we have investigated, is that we are hearing very much about those who had their bills increased. Unfortunately, we do not hear much about those who did not have them increased. However, that is apparently a trait of human nature.

Let me give you just one , as an instance. One of the hon. members of the House gave a Press interview about this raise in rates, and in reply to that, without mentioning any names, we find in the "Letter to the Editor" the following:

> "I note in yesterday's paper the statement, by Mr. So-and-so, that some of his rural constituents were complaining that their Hydro bills were higher under the new rate."

I can explain the reason why they were higher, but here is the milk in the coconut:

> "By taking an equal number of kilowatt hours under

the old rate, I have a saving of one dollar and fifteen cents, and my neighbour, on the same basis, is saving two dollars and forty cents. Of course, these are small sums, but, by the same token, the amount of electricity used was small. I am wondering, if a proper comparison were made between Mr. So-and-so's and his friend's, what would be the result."

That is one instance. I also have the instance of a lady complaining, just outside the city of Toronto, that her bills were raised. Upon investigation we found that this bill was raised eleven cents for three months -- eleven cents in three months. That was the amount of the raise of the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are typical of, I would say, seventy-five per cent. of the bills that are drawn to our attention, and as indicative of the difficulties of extending the service, including the reading of the meters and the arranging of the bills. This was handed to me by the hon. minister for Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) for explanation, and it is typical of seventy-five per cent. of the complaints we have.

This was an October, nineteen forty-three bill — October thirty-first, nineteen forty-three — one hundred kilowatt hours. The bill was six dollars and sixteen cents. The next three months, in the peak months of the year, when the consumption is the highest, the bill was eight dollars and forty-two cents, an increase of two dollars and twenty-six cents, but the consumption was two hundred and seventy kilowatt hours. The first bill was for one hundred kilowatt hours, and amounted to six dollars and sixteen cents. That works out at a unit price of 6.1 cents per kilowatt hour. The other bill of two hundred and seventy kilowatt hours works out to a unit price of 3.15 cents per kilowatt hour, just one half, because of the fact that in the first bill there were three dollars and thirty-three cents of a service charge, and in the second bill there was no service charge, at all.

Does that clear up that part of it?

What I emphasized yesterday was that when you compare bills, compare them with an equal amount of kilowatt hours on the two different rates.

Now, I could give more examples, Mr. Chairman, and I might just give you another class, upon which I touched yesterday, following up a statement made by the member for East York (Miss Macphail), that mechanized equipment on the farm cannot be economically used for less than one thousand kilowatt hours. I said then you cannot economically serve rural customers with less than approximately fifty-five kilowatts under the present rate, and that is a net of two dollars per month.

Now, a lot of our customers have installed electricity, and they have watched the meter, because six cents means something to them, and a large number of them are using twenty kilowatt hours a month, or thirty kilowatt hours a month; in other words, twenty kilowatt hours per month at four cents is about eighty cents for consumption, and one dollar and ten cents for their service charge — I am speaking now of the hamlet rate — which makes it about one dollar and ninety cents; ten per cent off brings it down to a little over one dollar and sixty cents. They can now get, for forty cents more, instead of kilowatt hours, fifty-five kilowatt hours.

Now, it is all a matter of utilizing the energy, and fifty-five kilowatt hours is very little energy. It can easily be divided into watts. A seventy-five-watt lamp used for two or three hours runs up to about one third of a kilowatt per day. So, kilowatt consumption is economical for us to serve, as all you have to do is to use fifty-five kilowatt hours, rather than twenty, and you get it at just about one half the former rate.

Does that answer my hon. friend from Simcoe Centre (Mr.

Johnston)?

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York, East): Mr. Chairman, I just want to give the member of the Ministry, who is dealing with this, Mr. Challies, the benefit of some thinking done on the part of the farmers of Grey County, and the results sent in by the Grey County Federation of Agriculture, and dealing with some matters referred to by the hon. member behind me (Mr. Johnston) about the equipment and the installations.

There are several "whereas'es", and then this resolution:

"Resolved that the Grey County Federation of Agriculture" -- and this is a County Federation, including town Federation and commodity groups -- "in meeting assembled do hereby request that the Hydro Electric Power Commission of the province of Ontario first supply all wires, transformers, insulators, switches, and other material incidental to the installation of Hydro in the farm buildings at cost.

"2: That a consulting engineer be appointed, whose duty shall be to assist, direct and give advice on the proper installation and supervision of all wiring in rural buildings.

"3: That farmers be permitted to make such Hydro installations on the advice, and under the supervision of said consulting engineer, and,

"4: A copy of this resolution be submitted to the Commission of Government and to the Hon. Thomas L. Kennedy, and to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario."

I would be very glad, indeed, to send the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) the "whereas-es".

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: I already have them.

(Page No. 518 follows.)

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Grenville-Dundas): In reply, may I say this, that our reply to the representations of the federation of agriculture and their communication to us is absolute proof of what I have pointed out in this House, that is so acceptable to the people that we are just swamped with applications. I think there are one hundred and fifty applications attached from one hydro area, and why would not there be. A six per cent kilowat hour rate, when they can get it for four cents? That is the way the province of Ontario is accepting this.

The answer to the other question is this: yesterday we had all the district superintendents in, lining up what is suggested in this memorandum. I would point out that the district superintendents are splendid chaps. Ninety per cent of the men are boys who were born on the farm and have the farm approach to this problem, and we are asking them, in this period of difficult restrictions, to be sympathetic to those who come in and make applications for services. I am not saying that they are not sympathetic; but their offices are available to any rural consumer who wants advice or assistance, and we welcome them into the office to sit down with the superintendent, who will help them in any way, shape or form, which will be of assistance on the farm. We want the superintendents to be in the same position exactly as the district representatives is in agriculture.

I think I have referred to the point of a superintending engineer and assistent.

Second, that the hydro should furnish wire at cost. It may be worthy of consideration, and we will consider it; but in the past we have found very little satisfaction in having the hydro do merchandising. That is interferring with the natural channel of business; and, after all, as far as the wire is concerned and the switches, and that sort of thing, that is a very small part. But we shall very sympathetically consider that.

There was one little bit of information I forgot, in my hurry to give the House last night. That is that since we have had slight

modification of the restrictions put upon us by the metals controller in Ottawa, we have accepted four thousand farm contracts, and two thousand urban contracts, the largest number in the history of the province for a like period.

Our problem is a problem of labour and material, and I might as well explain that now to the House. As you are all aware, aluminum is the metal used mostly in high powered transmission, and copper is next. Aluminum and copper are used extensively in all war industries. There is a silicate metal also used in transformers, and that is also used in war material. For that reason, quite wisely, the Dominion metals controller, working in cooperation with the United States authorities have placed restrictions on these essential things that are required to carry power in our rural areas.

As we move forward, and these restrictions are relieved and we are relieved, we shall be prepared to go ahead with this program.

We have asked the authorities to allow us this year to construct three hundred miles of rural lines. Last year they allowed us to construct four hundred miles. They have received our application very favourably. We are not told what we can do this summer. As long as we have warning enough to do our rural power extensions, -- that is largely a matter of labour. Our labouring men are largely a matter of skeleton crews. I think there are about a thousand, five hundred of such men who have enlisted. We must keep places for these men after the war is over. We will do this work as soon as the labour and materials are available.

We are not unmindful of all our responsibilities, and will do this work as fast as the labour and material are available.

I know that you people who represent the constituencies are pressed, but I ask that you tell them that our difficulty is because of the lack of material and labour, and that we will do the work as soon as the materials are supplied.

MR. G. H. MITCHELL (York North): May I ask the minister to enlarge upon the matter, in a lot of the north district they have not got hydro

yet, and there will be a demand for hydro, how will it be divided as to the three hundred mile program?

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: It will be divided over the province. Naturally, where the demand is greatest, that shall be the area; but we are not limiting it to any part of the province of Ontario.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): The minister told us the loss would be somewhere about half a million dollars. How much money is involved in the abolition of the service charge itself.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: I can give it to you in this way: The money involved in the abolition of the service charge would be a dollar a month, or twelve dollars a year on practically sixty-three thousand rural farm areas. There will be about sixty thousand where the reddtction will be half of that, or six dollars a year, because the reduction to urban consumers is only fifty per cent of the other reduction.

What we will lose or what the deficit will be is pretty much a matter of faith. We have already accepted six thousand applications, and, as soon as they can be put on, -- these are on, practically all, existing lines, so you can see the tremendous boost that will give us.

There are so many factors that enter the question, it would be foolish for me to say anything more than I have said yesterday, that the anticipated reduction in revenue is around a half a million of dollars.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): May I add a word there, because as a layman, the member who has just spoken and I are in the same boat, because we get confused in technical details.

Upon the basis of an accurate computation of the readjustment of rates, as at the date when the charge was made, with that same number of consumers, there would be an annual loss of five hundred and twenty-seven thousand, five hundred dollars. But we are proceeding on the assumption, which has always been true in the past, that with lower rates you always get increased consumption, and that increased consumption would immediately begin to counteract the lower revenue.

As has been pointed out by the commissioner, there are already six thousand applications. As soon as those are put in that will decrease any further loss.

The possible reduction in revenue, taking the exact number of consumers as at that time, and the exact prices as readjusted, without any regard to the existing new consumers and of these consumers among the six thousand applications, we are proceeding upon the legitimate business assumption that when you reduce the cost you increase the revenue at the same time.

MR. R. PATTERSON (Grey North): The Minister yesterday said that on the reduction the consumers would be getting the current at less than cost. As I remember the report last year, there was about one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars of surplus, and there has been an accumulated surplus from rural of about one million, eight hundred thousand dollars. What becomes of that money? Should that not be used in this adjustment? Are those figures substantially right?

HON. G. W. CHALMES (Grenville-Dundas): I do not know about the totals of the surplus, as you call it. You are right on the amount of revenue over expenditures last year, or one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars. And that just shows what I am trying to point out to the House. That one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars you might say was a profit on operating last year, and that makes that dollar all the cushion you had to go by, one dollar per year per customer.,

Naturally, in throwing all this into one system the reserves of short surpluses will be thrown into one pot.

Bear in mind that in the grant of fifty per cent of the primary lines, to the extent of twenty million dollars, you can easily see where any control is when the government is responsible for the deficit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 of the Bill carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 of the Bill carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 of the Bill carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I now move that the committee now rise and report a certain Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Drew moves that the committee now rise and report a certain Bill. Shall the motion pass?

Motion agreed to.

The committee rose, and the House resumed. Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. W. B REYNOLDS (Chairman of the Committee of the whole): Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole house reports a certain Bill without amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The chairman of the committee of the whole House reports a certain Bill without amendment? Shall the report carry?

Report agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the House wish to pass the first reading of this Bill?

HON. C. H. CHALLIES (Grenville-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary to say anything about the first part of this Bill, establishing a hydro electric advisory council.

May I say that the government and the Commission have felt that there is an insufficient tie-up as between the different types of customers and the Commission. In this, I wish to say that the Commission has always worked very closely with the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association, the association representing the hydro municipalities. But, outside of that organization, it has been thought that there should be some tie-up with the representatives of the electric consumers.

This Bill as introduced follows very closely upon the Bill which worked so successfully in great Britain, under what they call the grid system of the distribution and generation of electrical energy.

It is proposed that the major part of this committee shall consist of representatives of the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association; then there may be other groups. I might suggest that they might be farmers, representatives of farmers' organizations, of industry and labour as labour organizations.

Any problems, as they might arise, upon which the Commission might want any suggestion or counsel, might be referred to this committee. Or it would work the other way, any representation made by any group could be studied in connection with the technical staff of the commission. I do not mean by that that the technical staff of the Commission would not be available to assist or counsel, -- that has already been provided for in one of the sections, -- but from the view of counsel, to study any problem which might come up. I do not think there can be any better example than the agitation for the so-called flat rate. Not that the matter has not been dealt with between the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association and the Commission; but this would be a committee that would be sitting and studying the various aspects of rural power distribution and what goes with it, and that sort of thing.

Provision is made for the number of the Council, the number of meetings, the matter of technical advice which would be furnished to them on any precedent that they wanted on. And their conclusions and advice would be passed on to the Commission.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the substance and the purpose of the Act.

There may be some of it that may be for discussion. For instance, you will notice that no senator or member of the House of Commons of the Parliament of Canada, and no member of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, shall be eligible to be a member of the advisory council.

That is taken out of the British Act in order to divorce politics, as far as possible, from the operation of the Commission, or from the body advising it.

Now, the second part of the amendment is simply a matter of

clarification.

We have property or own physical assets or personal property, and in order to clarify and make the Act clear, this provides a clause in the Act so that there will be no misunderstanding that transformers or other property placed on a person's property shall still be the property of the Commission.

The other clause refers to the placing of posts, and so on, on a pole and makes it an offence to drive nails or tacks for posters on a pole.

That is quite obvious to all, I think, that the men climbing the poles may get their clothes or hands torn by tacks used in the poles.

The final section of the Bill is an odd amendment to ask the House to approve of, because it has been on the statute book for a long time; but the Act as it is now allows the hydro electric power commission to disperse any surplus in any municipality, but in the right of any council.

That never was the purpose of the Act at all, and we have inserted in the clause, in order to define the rights of the commission, these words, "derived from the production, development or distribution of electrical power or energy or from dealing in electrical fittings, fixtures, appliances, machines or equipment," .....

In other words, the surpluses which we can allow in a local commission to disperse are surpluses which are allowed for these purposes.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the substance of the Bill.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. F. W. WARREN (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether it is the purpose of the government to accept the recommendation of the O.M.E.A. as to the personnel of the committee with the commission?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I might answer that, that the recommendations will be considered, but as to whether the whole four

will be appointed upon the recommendation of the O.M.E.A. is a matter for the government, and we have undertaken to cover the broad fields of labour members and others.

The Ontario Municipal Electrical Association represents not only municipalities but also represents labour and the industries in those communities.

MR F. W. WARREN: I do not mean the recommendation as to the whole four, but will you accept the recommendation as to one or more.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): The practice, which is called a good one, existing in Great Britain, where they have a similar provision as to officials, they have a panel, and the choice is made from that panel, and that will be the practice followed.

MR. G. H. MITCHELL (York North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister of hydro whether he is able to tell us now as to whether the hydro is going to make a decision on the application for a reduction in rates where large surpluses have been built up, in particular in my own municipality, Mr. Speaker, an application was made last October, which is still awaiting a decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a little wide of the point but I will allow the answer.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: The time for adjusting of rates to the municipalities is always at the end of the year, when all municipalities have made their returns. This year it is a little late because of the fact that the commission is recommending to the municipalities an amalgamation of the three southern systems, and as soon as that is decided it will have a bearing upon what shall be the rates to the municipalities.

MR. L. E WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I think a principle is involved there. I would like to speak to the House regarding the advisory council which we are definitely welcoming. We, on this side of the House, think it is a very good thing.

Unfortunately, I do not think the Bill goes far enough, in that it does not make enough of the advisory council. It says they shall make a report, but it does not indicate to whom the report should

go. Presumably it should go to the Commission; but if the Commission did not wish to make the report public, some contention again might come up which would never get a proper airing. That, I think should be cleared up while we are considering this amendment, in order that this advisory council may form a useful part in connection with hydro electric services to the province.

To go no further, rather than pay the council just a per diem allowance, in the shape of giving a blank cheque, I think the principle laid down in the power commission Act of saving an amount of money which would be paid to the hydro power commission members, it would be well to lay down the same thing as to this advisory council and let it not be a matter of how many days the council would sit, and the minister said it likely would be constantly sitting. Why should it not be said that they would be paid a definite fee for their services?

There is no doubt, as was mentioned in the speech from the Throne, that the five groups that were to be represented, the hydro electric municipalities, industry, mining, agriculture and labour.

(Page 527 follows)

I think that is a very very wise choice, that they should be represented by these people here as truly representing the interests of these people in so great an enterprise as hydro, but it seems to me that they would have to sit constantly, and, therefore, should be paid a reasonable fee for their services.

Unfortunately, I think in the Bill there is one thing which we should seriously consider in committee, and that is the recital in sub-section 6 of section 2, where it says:

"The commission may provide the advisory council with such professionaly, technical and secretarial or other assistance as the commission may see fit".

Now, to my mind, "as the commission may see fit" suggests that this advisory council might someday find itself without any assistants, and be required out of its own pocket to supply themselves with a stenographer, and a place for her to sit. That is not a good idea. I think if we are going to have this advisory council to do this great job, -- and everybody in this house admits it is a great job -- they should be able to do their work and not require the government or a department to supply them with necessary assistance. I think, Mr. Chairman, we should seriously consider this when we are discussing this question of appointing an advisory council, so as not to find outselves in the position of simply appointing five vice-admirals to look after the hydro.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I think I should make some observations on this. This is an introduction of a new departure, and no one can yet tell exactly the amount of work or the amount of time that will be involved, and, frankly, I am under the impression that Opposition usually takes the very opposite course to what it is suggesting here; they are usually rather cautious of fixed amounts regardless of the amount of work that is going to be done.

We had thought of doing it in this way, it could be dealt with on the basis of service actually rendered, and then at another time, and under whoever is responsible at that time for it, the facts will be there, and if it is deemed advisable

to fix the rates, upon the experience which has been obtained, that could very well be done.

I know that I personally am inclined to think that it is very much better that we should proceed and pay on a per diem basis, so that with the experience of one year's operations, we would then be able to determine whether that should be continued, or whether some fixed amount should be set instead, having regard to the experience of that year.

Now, as to the fact that these are simply people being appointed to polish up the handles of the old front door and not do anything more; on the contrary, these people are people chosen from those who are conversant with Hydro-Electric affairs. They are not limited in the extent to which they can go, and they can meet and discuss and make recommendations whenever they see fit. They can meet at the call of the person chosen from amongst the group, and one reason for placing some limitation on the staff made available by the commission, is that after all there should be some reasonable safeguard as to the extent to which the operating commission might be expected to provide from its own staff the available staff for this organization. I do not think it presents any difficulties at all. I think it will be found, having regard to the experiences of the past, those who represent the Hydro-Electric Municipalities Associations, agriculture, labor and commerce, and the consummers, and so on, will be people who have had experience in their own municipalities at one time or another, in some way, in connection with this, and would be fully conscious of all the difficulties, and should they at any time find themselves restricted they have the very proper means of presenting their recommendations to the government direct, if for any reason -- which I would not anticipate -- they are find/not getting the full cooperation of the commission. I think that would be most unlikely. And perhaps on this I should emphasize that to maintain the very type of contact that will broaden the basis of the commission itself, and will bring to the commission a continuing contact outside of the ordinary executive staff of the commission, but will bring the outside viewpoint to the commission

itself by people who, not being actually within the Electric Hydro Power Commission, are approaching it really from the point of view of the public in the various aspects of their activities.

Mr. Speaker, I just do want to say this, that one of the things which has prompted us to introduce this very measure is that of all of the organizations in Britain which have retained complete public confidence through the testing years of the war, none has done so more than the Central Electric Board, and upon enquiry as to the reason that they were able to retain that public confidence those with whom I discussed it, impressed me with the fact that through these additional appointees, who were really in constant contact with the public, the Central Electricity Board was dealing not only with the problem from the point of view of the technical expert, but also from the public with whom they were dealing, and I think it may be a matter of interest that this board which has succeeded in keeping the flow of electric power to the industry of Britain, in spite of bombings which have severed their main connections time and time again, has been greatly helped by this addition of five representatives of the public, and it is our hope that by doing the same thing here, we will achieve the same satisfactory results.

And may I suggest that approaching these points of view, we are introducing a new measure, and there is no reason to anticipate barriers between them, and upon the basis of the experience of the first year, it will be very easy then to sit down with that experience behind us, and upon the basis of recommendations of this council, make such adjustments as are deemed advisable in the interests of the public, and the consumers throughout the province.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I think the proposal as contained in the Bill is to be commended. I certainly want to congratulate the government and the ministry for putting this Bill forward. But I think there is one defect here we should consider before we go into committee of the house on the Bill itself.

I think the idea of an Advisory Council is splendid, and

it is evidently intended, by the very wording of the Bill, to assert its independence, and keep it out of politics. But I would like the hon. minister to turn to section 8 of section 2 where it says:

"The Lieutenant Governor-in-council may terminate the appointment of any member who in his opinion has become unfit to continue in office, or is incapable of performing his duties".

In order to carry out the evident intention of the Bill, and have an independent group advising the commission of public interest and of interest particularly to the consumers, this public utility, I think that it might be strengthening the Bill to carry out its intention, if we should strike out the words, "in his opinion has become unfit to continue in office", and it would then read:

"The Lieutenant Governor-in-council may terminate the appointment of any member who, in his opinion, has become incapable of performing his duties".

Then it would be simply a matter of inability to perform the duties.

The matter is, to some extent, taken care of because there is the safeguard concerning the reappointment after two years, and if there is somebody who is not carrying on in the proper manner, the matter can be attended to at the end of his term of office.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I assure you we will take that into consideration. The only purpose of this sub-section was to provide for a change which unfortunately may occur within a period of two years, when one of the members of the council might not be able to act, for various reasons, and that was in contemplation. However, I may say to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) that we will take your proposal into consideration before the Bill comes into committee.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York, North): I rise on a question of information, Mr. Speaker, I tabled some questions on February 28th with reference to hydro matters, and have not yet received a reply. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) can tell when I may expect an answer to those questions.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: I will give the answers today, if you dispose of this Bill. We would probably have time then to deal with the other.

MR. MITCHELL: Alright, thanks.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): May I say that I am heartily in favour of the Bill. But there is one thing I would like to be assured of, and that is on the question of the representations on the council from labour and from agriculture. Some reference has been made as to the way it works in England, and I would like to enquire just how these representatives are appointed in England.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the hon. prime minister answer the question?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): As I have indicated before, our purpose would be to consult with the proper authorities, and with public bodies to obtain recommendations concerning those who have knowledge of electrical affairs in these various fields. It is desired that within the group I mentioned that those chosen have had experience, and we would seek information on that, and then, of necessity, this or any other government must make its decision and we hope to do that by full consultation so that those chosen shall be satisfactory to the various groups concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Challies moves the second reading of Bill No. 2, "an Act to amend the Hydro-Power Commission Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Seventh Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 47, "an Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation", Mr. Drew.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I do not know that I need amplify very much what I have already said, because in my remarks in the debate of the speech from the throne, I

have already discussed this question of research, and the reason for introducing a Bill to set up the Ontario Research Foundation, upon a new basis.

Briefly, I might simply say that this Bill is for the purpose of creating a board of governors, and placing the control of the Research Foundation in the board of governors, so that it will have powers and a continuing responsibility commensurate with the scope of its work and its importance.

As it stands at the present time, the Ontario Research Foundation has really fallen under the direction of a chairman with power to delegate certain of his authority to a vice-chairman.

It was felt that considering the tremendous importance of this work, it should be placed under a board similar to the board of governors directing the affairs of the University which partially itself is, in one aspect, a research organization, such a board as directs the affairs of the Toronto General Hospital, and so on, and that this board, while having the powers that will make it possible to expand the responsibilities and activities of these functions in the future.

Now, this is really only bringing up to date the Legislation which created this very important organization in the first place.

As you know, it was started with funds contributed by the provincial government and by private subscription. It is now maintained largely on the basis of funds received from various industries where research is carried out.

I do not think it was ever so important that we strengthen our research organizations in every way possible. I have said that before, and I shall not elaborate on it now, but I want to emphasize my own conviction in this respect, that we are sometimes inclined to listen to argument that this is no longer a country of great wide open spaces, that these spaces the have been filled. I do not agree with that for a moment. It may be that people have spread out into most of the areas, but in any of those areas where population is not yet really developed, science and research will be the answer in a great

cases, and even though our geographical areas are filled -- which they are not -- we still would have before us the wide opportunities which have been opened up by science and research, and in the days that lie ahead perhaps our greatest opportunities for expanded employment and for increasing prosperity in a province which has unparallelled resources in relation to its population, that expansion and prosperity and security will depend very largely upon our research organization which find new ways of putting to work the products of the soil, of the forest, of the mines, and of the streams.

And this is, too, simply to place under a sound, continuing organization, a board of governors, as described before, the Research Foundation which should contribute greatly to this expanding world that is to come and will come I believe, contribute enormously to the expanded opportunities of this province.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): I would like to ask the hon. prime minister (Mr. Drew) if section 3 of this Act will give this Foundation as wide a scope in the provincial field as is now enjoyed by the National Research Council of the Dominion? That is one point.

The other was, on what basis will the fees be levied, upon the individual? I presume a municipal body, or a public body would have the right to present before this Foundation any problem, provided it is a problem which is in the interest of the public, but would a private body, or a manufacturing establishment be able to do that without a fee, or what would the basis of the fee be?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): The answer to that is to be found in section 12;

"The Foundation may carry on research, investigations, studies and operations upon such terms and conditions as the executive committee may determine, subject to the direction of the board."

Your answer to that may be "Well, that is very wide". It is. Actually the practice has been to carry on research,

so far as individual experiments are concerned, at actual cost, and subject to agreement as to the way they will be repaid, and in each case a simple agreement is made between the individual, industry or the manufacturer or anybody, and the Foundation -- it may be a hospital or it might be any other organization which goes to them, and they make an individual agreement. I know of cases where they have conducted experiments and charged nothing. Actually it is deemed desirable that there be great latitude on the part of the board in making decisions, because what they seek to do is, while it is a profit-making organization, with the opportunities of making a profit already there, they naturally deal with it on a different basis than when they are dealing with something that is purely speculative. Supposing a concern operating now, and is able to carry its own weight; they naturally would deal very differently with that than they would with a case where the subject is still not even in existence, but merely exploring the possibilities of some development. In many cases where somebody makes a suggestion, which may appear worth while, they conduct the whole thing as a public service. That is being done today.

But, to go back to the earlier question of whether this would give too wide a scope to the Ontario Research Foundation than our geographical sphere warrants, or is giving the same scope as is possessed by the National Research Council at Ottawa at the present time; and in that respect, both the National Research Council and the Ontario Research Foundation have, wherever a proposal was made, that gave reasonable prospects of being in the public interest, for war or other public purposes, they have actually gone ahead and conducted experiments at their own expense. And while I recognize that this is a case of wide-open latitude, I think it is the only practical way in which this can be done, and if it were found that the board did not act reasonably on any occasion, then, after all, it being a body answerable to this Parliament, this would be the place to bring the complaint, and the proper adjustment could be made.

I know of no other practical way it may be done.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I have one observation to make about the principle of this Bill. There cannot be any objection to extending and perhaps enlarging the scope of the work being done by the Foundation, but I am certain there is an important place for such a foundation in the province, but, at the same time, we do know that some of those directly concerned with research and with the sciences are a little fearful that there may develop a certain amount of competition or perhaps overlapping with the National Council. They are a little fearful that the province may undertake -- or the Provincial Foundation may undertake -- investigations which could perhaps be better done by the other council.

My suggestion, therefore, simply is that if it is not precluded by the wording of this Bill, it is important to bear in mind that there should be complete co-operation between the two councils, as there has been in the past, and we should avoid anything in the nature of unnecessary overlapping or competition.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I may say, Mr. Speaker, that there already has been a most whole-hearted -- and I think I may properly use the term "remarkable" -- cooperation between the National Research Council and the Ontario Research Foundation, throughout the war. I cannot speak too highly of the accomplishments of the chairman of the Ontario Foundation, Mr. Speakman. He has done a magnificent job, and is in constant touch with the National Research Council, and our desire is to co-operate in every way, and may I say also, that we want to be sure things can be done and, as I have already expressed my own belief that while centralization of policy in certain things may be desirable, that decentralizing the practical application is equally desirable, and in my own opinion we cannot rely upon a completely centralized research foundation in Ottawa, but there will be co-operation, I am sure, as there has been in the past, and certainly so far as this government is concerned, insofar as any board that is set up is concerned, it will continue the

traditional co-operation which has existed since its beginning, and I would again like to emphasize the fact that already the existance of this foundation has made possible achievements in research which would never have taken place at all if we had relied upon one central research council.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Speaker, there is one item I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. prime minister, and I am sure he will agree it is a fair question, in view of his own remarks the other day with regard to the co-ordination in the planning and development Bill which is now before the house. I would like to know what co-ordination there is going to be between this Planning and Developing Department of Government and the Research Foundation under this board of governors, because naturally they will be working largely for this Planning and Developing Department of Government, and yet I see no provision in the Bill for a close tie-in or co-ordination of these departments, now being established by the Bills before the house.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I might say there actually is no need for a statutory tie-up, because it is the duty, as I outlined in the case of the Department of Planning and Development, to make it available for all organizations within the province which can contribute to planning and development for the future and the Research Foundation would be available at all times. I might say that it is certainly on the same terms as anybody else.

As you know, they have already stepped up the Research Department in the University of Toronto, Western University, and Queens.

I will tell you, without being more specific at the moment, that we have plans which we hope to be able to announce reasonably soon, with regard to a considerably extended research, which is now under consideration, but which cannot be announced until certain discussions are completed. But all these will be effectively co-ordinated by the department whose duty it is to deal with every organization in the province, which can con-

tribute to planning and development, and for that reason it was not felt there was any occasion to actually create a statutory section in order to have the Research Foundation co-operate in every way with the Department of Planning and Development.

I move the second reading of the Bill

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the second reading of Bill 47, "An Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

(Page 538 follows)

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill. Third order - resuming the Adjourned Debate on the motion for the consideration of the Speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. AURELIAN BELANGER: (Prescott) Mr. Speaker, congratulations for your elevation to the post of first commoner of this province. You will not resent the statement - not due to you. They are due to the prime minister of this province and the Government and this house for the choice that they have made of a man who is eminently qualified to hold this dignity by his vast experience in this Legislative Assembly and in other deliberative assemblies since for a long number of years, you have graced the Chair of the First Magistrate of this great city of Toronto. What is due to you, though, is a great deal of sympathy for the sacrifices - real sacrifices - that you are making in order to properly fulfil the duties of your office. You have continually to forego in this house your participation. You have always been the loyal and unwavering supporter of a party, and you must now use a lot of self-restraint and willpower, as you have done since the beginning of this session, in order to forget that you belong to the Government side of this house. A greater sacrifice you have to make - the greatest of all - you have to forego that right which is the dearest to any Britisher and Canadian, the right of free speech because notwithstanding an historical tradition entitles you to the name of Speaker, still in this house you are the least speaking of all the members. Of course, in olden times the presiding officer of the Government was the mouth-piece between the Legislature and the King or the other house of the Government, but this practice has now fallen into disuse, and the Speaker is not supposed to speak.

Our choice is the more to be eulogized since one honours one whom the King has honoured, and in 1939, on the

first of January, his Majesty was pleased to call you to one of the great Orders of the British Empire, and this occasion, I think, is a proper one to congratulate you on that distinction bestowed upon you by the King.

Wishes would be futile because the knowledge is there that you will fulfil your duties with honour and credit and that you will occupy a place in that long magnificent pageant of speechless Speakers in British legislatures.

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, is le lieu ou l'on parle; therefore it is a place where we speak and since there may be a danger in that because it has been said some hundred and fifty years ago that a very great part of the mischief that affects the world arises from words. And even a much older saying than that, going to 2500, which states that words never built a wall.

However, we are here, therefore, to speak to the Debate, and discuss and this was open to us by the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne which is supposed to be the only one read in this house - I said advisedly, supposed to be; theoretically the Speech from the Throne is the only one to be read in this house.

May I take this opportunity to ask the prime minister (Hon. George A. Drew) whether it would not be good and fair to require from the official stenographers and typewriters to typewrite an extra copy of the addresses delivered in this house, so as to have one available for those members who are too busy or too lazy to write their speech beforehand and who are speaking only from notes. It would be indeed helpful because since it has been said I was going to address this house, I have been asked by every single member of the Press Gallery to furnish them with an advance copy of what I was going to say, and to my confusion I had to say I was very sorry I had no text, but I was not repentant at all.

The Speech from the Throne throughout the years has suffered quite an evolution. At first it was a message

from the King and at that time, as it would ask funds for wars, for the civil list, for the commissioners sometimes of his Majesty, the commoners would find that the Speech from the Throne contained a great deal too much.

Nowadays, every year I have sat in this house, and I am sure since the Speeches from the Throne have become the message of the Government instead of the message of the King, the opposition has always found that there was too little, and this year was no exception. Reproach has been addressed to the Government that the Speech from the Throne did not go far enough. One member - if my memory serves me right, I think it was the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) - would have liked to see the Bills fully set out in the Speech from the Throne. It would be a lot of labour. But I think the tendency goes on and the day may come within this generation when the Speech from the Throne will be abolished. In Ottawa they are revising the rules of the house and it suggested that the Debate on the Speech from the Throne be done away with. That is a step, of course, towards abolishing the Speech itself. But the Speech has opened the phase of addresses during the session. These addresses have been of a very high quality from the mover and the seconder of the address up to today.

Some thoughts have been thrown out by those speeches which it may be well, perhaps, to review. I have alluded to the address of the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams). There are great qualities there, remarkable features in that address. One of them is its universality, both in time and space. That address could have been delivered as well in 1900, the year of our Lord 1900, as in this fifth year of the war with very little to be changed, and universality and space that same address could be delivered - and I dare say has been delivered anywhere in the nine provinces of the Dominion. Could have been delivered in any one of the United States of America - in any legislature throughout America - in England,

and I guess in any labour congress of Wales. Really, it is worth while to be able to bring out an address which has such a generality, such a universality that it can be delivered at any time and anywhere.

Another good feature of it is that it can be easily summarized. Reading it over I find, really, that all the main thoughts, the main facts, can be condensed within a quarter of an hour and perhaps less and it has, therefore, this good feature of it to commend it, that it can be so easily remembered. It amounts to this - if I was asked to give the main gist of it - is that nothing good can come out of the old parties or ever has come out of the old parties, and nothing can come out, no matter what their promises may be, from the old parties.

MR. DENNISON: (St. David) Without pressure.

MR. BELANGER: Let us say that, and as the pressure, according to the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) as the pressure has not been strong enough in the past, then the old parties have not done anything commendable in this province of Ontario. It is true that there is announced some progressive labour legislation, but I have no faith in this, because, you see, it comes from the other side. Of course, we know what we want and we would be able to give exactly what we want - and I say the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) ~~that~~ thinks that way.

This Dominion of Canada within the last hundred years and less, they have progressed in a wonderful way. Railways, trans-continentals that are the wonder of the world, ~~may~~ have been built. Provinces may have been developed out of deserts, yet those parties - those two old parties - had nothing to do with it. They did nothing. Canada had such a wonderful development that people across the Atlantic felt that they should come to this country in order to seek a prosperity and a happiness which evidently they could not get in their native lands. Yet these two parties who have

had the development in this country, have done nothing.

This is about the gist of the speech of the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams). It is a wonderful speech and analyzing it, I was wondering whether we could not get the recipe. It is worth while. Well, if I was asked a recipe for a similar address, of course, I would give it only to the members of this side of the house. I would say, first, put a strong base - and I am analyzing simply the speech from the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams) - put at the bottom a very strong base of class prejudice. If you could sprinkle it with a little class hatred it might make it a little stronger. Put a lot of diffidence in other peoples' efforts. No good. Don't believe in promises. Don't believe in them! Don't dare put the future of this province in their hands! Add a great many drops of denial of any good faith in the old parties. Add a few drops more of any desire at all on their part to improve the labouring man's conditions in this province. You may stir up and then add some exaggeration at will, some misrepresentations at will, some misrepresentations on past incidents - Galt, Stratford, Kirkland Lake - misrepresentation of those facts. Be sure you just colour them so that they just fit your case and, of course, I would then, to top it all off, I would not mince it with invectives. I would go so far as to use what has become a first invective - hatred expressing invective.--- Hitlerism! Hitlerism, I would be sure to have some of that in, and of course, then, I would not give it - it might not take long enough so I would give it diluted. I know the principle of the pharmacist is that the amount of water you put in a glass won't affect the effect of the drug at all - so just dilute it at will.

Another address which was rather restful which we heard in this house - it was from a member so very extremist that the members of the Government in this house would not grant him admission to their party, and that is from the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and yet I have

never heard in this house a more statesman-like acceptable address as was delivered in this house by the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and what was the chief tone of his address? It was wonderful. Exactly what we want. Not one-sided, but cooperation.

MISS MACPHAIL: (York East) That is a new party line.

MR. BELANGER: Would you kindly rise, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would be much obliged if you would not interrupt.

MISS MACPHAIL: (York East) Well, what I said, that is the new party line.

MR. BELANGER: I am sorry I made you rise. The feature of that address of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was cooperation. Cooperation as between the employer, the worker and the community. There you have a formula that cannot be gainsaid. There you have a formula to which everyone can subscribe. There you have a formula to which, if we are faithful, then wonders can be accomplished by the members in this house, even at this very session.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was kind enoughto refer to the few French speaking members in this house and to make an appeal to national unity. I was moved by his words. If there was an effort to be made by people of the various shades of opinion, of various races, languages and creeds in this province, a real effort to abate prejudice - national and religious prejudice - if a real effort was made under the leadership of every one of us as representatives of the people of the whole province of Ontario, to work for unity, to say no words, and to put forth no acts that might be detrimental to that unity. Then when our boys come from the front, where they have fought for our freedom, they would find this province a good country united in one common love of the country, common patriotism, in one common desire to make out of Canada one of the first countries of the world.

I am not sure while I am on that subject of national unity, I am not sure that the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. A.K. Roberts) was definite. He made the statement that between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario and when he says the province of Quebec, I understand he means the French-speaking part of Quebec, and which includes the French-speaking part of Ontario - that there was a difference of national out-look - I am quoting - there was a difference in the Birth rates, I agree. There was a diference in social requirements, a difference in the outlook on education, and especially to show the diference in the national out-look he made a comparison. He showed us what he called the muddy Saskatchewan flowing into Clear River and for hundreds and hundreds of miles forming a stream which can easily be distinguished, and it is only when they are coming to the sea that the two really amalgamate and are indistinguishable. He need not have gone so far. You have exactly the same thing right here where the Ottawa River flows into the St. Lawrence, and you can follow the Ottawa River water of a different density flowing in the midst of the waters of the St. Lawrence, quite unmingled with the others. I was wondering how he would work out his parallel - which of the two streams is the Clear river when it applies to Canada's population and which of the two streams is the muddy Saskatchewan. Of course, it is the Saskatchewan that flows into Clear River. Well then, we must take it, that parallel with the Saskatchewan in his mind symbolizes those who have fled into Canada, those who have come later into Canada, the migrants into Canada, and I was sorry to see the epithet "muddy" applied to that. I differ entirely from it. The clear Canadian river, the first stock of Canada, is the French-Canadian stock, unmixed by any immigration, coming from 65,000 Frenchmen who stayed in 1763 after the Treaty of Paris, after the ceding of Canada to England, those 65,000 remained here, having enough confidence in Great Britain - in the conquerors, if you want to call them-

having enough faith in them to rest their destiny in their hands and from those 65,000 natives of Canada there has come through natural acretion a population of over 3,500,000 in less than two hundred years. And what is national outlook? What about the national outlook of the French Canadian? I would like to define it. Without violating the quasi confidence of the Parliamentary Conference held last June at Ottawa I would quote from the speech of Mr. Brook Claxton, K.C., M.P. of Ottawa, who said:

> "By way of generalization it is often said that that there are three groups in Canada."

I do not know whether you will agree with him. I do in every way from observation. I think it is taken from life.

> "One is more British than the English. This group puts Britain first and thinks of Canada second. The group is powerful but I think small and becoming smaller.
>
> "At the other extreme is a group which wishes to put Britain nowhere at all and wants to see Canada separated from the....."

and, remember, that is true, and it is not confined to the French Canadians of Quebec either. I can only allude to certain pronouncement that was made by the late Speaker of this house.

> "At the other extreme is a group which wishes to put Britain nowhere at all and wants to see Canada separated from the British Commonwealth. That group is small but it is loudly vocal in some quarters. We cannot say that it is dying."

Why? Because there is not enough carefulness in either quarters of Canada to stop from - oh, the French word is coming to me - to stop from invective baiting.

They said we had in this province, as I generalize it, as being the voice of the whole of Quebec, when it is but the voice of a small portion.

A third group, I think, comprises a great concentration of Canadian people of all regions who regard Canada as their native land and regard the bond with the British Commonwealth to be worth keeping. How much of it is based upon emotion and how much upon interest varies with each of us.

What is our national outlook, as mentioned by the hon. member from St. Patrick? What is our national outlook? The third group, he says, are people who consider Canada as their native land. Well, my ancestors and the ancestors of many french canadians in this country came to Canada in one of Champlain's ships. One of them was married to my ancestor in 1637 in the only church that there was in Canada at that time; and the family, from generation to generation, has lived, suffered, toiled in Canada. They have buried here their dead. Their dead are scattered all over the country.

They have accompanied the great French discoverers to the Rocky Mountains.

Right here in Toronto, a Frenchman was the first man here to speak a civilized language publicly.

They went with the great explorers down the Mississippi, on Lake Michigan, down the Ohio and right through to the Gulf of Mexico.

Do you think they do not consider this their native land?

What I have said about our ancestors and our suffering, and our dead, and their burying places is not that a very definition of what we in French call la Patrie, which is more expressive than your translation of "the fatherland". But LaPatrie for us, -- there is nothing else, there is nothing else but Canada, therefore, we feel this definition as nobody else in Canada can feel it. Canada is our native land. We love it better than anybody else can love it. We are attached to it by every fibre of our being. Our mode of thinking, coming as it does from our ancestors, from their habits and their toils,

our mode of thinking has grown up right here in this country of ours.

Now the second definition of that group concerns what we think of the Commonwealth. What the french canadian thinks of the Commonwealth of nations is that they want this Canada to continue living as an integral part of that Commonwealth. And what I am giving you is not only words; it is not only a lip protestation, but it is more than that. We have proven it by deeds so often that you could read in the history of Canada, where the french canadians have kept this country to the British allegiance.

Did you ever stop to think of that? At the time of the American revolution, just a few years after these french inhabitants of Canada had lost to the English what they considered their country, just a few years after that when they were being solicited from those from across the line who wanted to gain by revolution their wish to revenge themselves, what did they do? When some of the British traitors and merchants from the other side, who had come like birds of prey to this land, were quite ready to turn over to the United States, the french Canadians, with their priests and their bishops defied them and refused point blank to have anything to do with the Americans.

Later, in 1812, Canada, -- but, perhaps, I do not know whether your knowledge of Canadian history goes to those details, -- but in 1812, Canada had its Thermopolae, and Canada had its had it Leomdas who saved Canada for the British. They were the french Canadian voyageurs at Chateauquay where about three hundred of them turned away Atkin's army of eight thousand on Lake Champlain, where, if they had passed at that time, Canada was doomed as being an independent part of the British Empire.

And, Mr. Speaker, these facts, I believe ought to show clearly what our attitude is. That we have not the same feelings towards England as those who, just within this generation, or perhaps two generations, have come from the land across the seas, and who, even at the present time, have family ties binding them to the old land. We understand that

it is a different emotion. But, Mr. Speaker, we are attached to the British institutions. We are attached to, I will not use the word "empire", I do not use it anymore, it does not smell good to my nostrils, -- the British Commonwealth of nations, because we feel a pride in belonging to that group of nations.

We would not want, as perhaps some right here in Toronto do want, that the western sun could set when it reaches Athabasca, instead of making the rounds of the world. But we also are attached to the Commonwealth and to British institutions, because we have found that they are a haven of justice.

We have had more justice from the Englishman, from the British Englishman, let me tell you that, than from the Canadian Englishman, at certain times of our history.

Towards the Commonwealth, as I say, we like to repeat and repeat to our people that we are not subservient to Great Britain, but that we are equal partners with Great Britian and the other nations of the Commonwealth.

We like to recite and point out to that Balfour resolution at the conference of 1926, when he laid down what was afterwards embodied in 1931, in the statute of Westminster, when he laid down this definition, on just a half sheet of paper, but which contains everything, the very marrow of what should be the relations of Canada to the other parts of the Commonwealth and what should be the mission of every Canadian to see that it is being lived up to.

Balfour stated, and then "It is composed of communist communities within the British Empire of equal status," -- of equal status, not subordinate to one another in any way in any phase or any aspect, I think he states, all domestic or external affairs, "although united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated" -- no more "colony" -- "freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth." Not a word too many; not a word like it. It took a genius like Balfour to be able to express in so few words but with so much truth what henceforth under the Statute of Westminster, shall be the relation

of Canada to Great Britain, to Australia, to South Africa, to New Zealand, to every part of the British Commonwealth; not one being above the other; not Great Britain towering and dominating over what they called "the dominions across the seas", but an equal partnership, an autonomy, in which each one of them is a unit, because they have a common King; so that now His Majesty, their Majesties are no more the King and Queen of Canada because they are the King and Queen of the British Empire, but they are the King and Queen so far as we are concerned of Canada forming a whole with Canada as much as they do with Great Britain itself.

There is, in the addresses which were delivered, if you will allow me, a common feature which struck me, with very few exceptions. The only note that was sounded was an economic note, an economic feature, the material prosperity of this country and of every class in this country. The spiritual features, as you might call them, that our high factors of national life were very little mentioned.

The hon. member for Essex South (Mr. W. Murdoch) deserves commendation for having struck a higher note when he spoke of the prayer in this House, when he spoke of faith, when he hinted that there may be religious questions that will have benefit on the future of this province.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if this province keeps on its present way, it may not be long before another satirist Juvenal, another satirist would apply to us the words that the roman satirist applied to the roman empire when it was at the apex of its glory, but for an observer showed the signs of deterioration:

"Duas tantum res anxius optat

Panem et cirsences."

There are only two things that the people anxiously want, bread and games, material life and pleasure.

And when we hear and see the great part given in our newspapers to the economic aspect only of the public problems, when se see page after page of our great dailies every day filled with the reports of

sports and games, and so little space being given to art, to the higher things of life to the supreme aspect of life, one is apt to think that perhaps we are on the way to that state of the Roman mind at the time of Juvenal, and that our people are only thinking of panem et cirsences.

I do not want to follow along those lines because I would just keep repeating, if I were to speak just from the economic point of view, what has been said already. And my colleagues in the House since 1923 will agree that I have always refrained from taking the time of the House by the repetition of things that have already been said in a better and more elegant way by other members of the House.

(Page 551 follows)

One thing we should, it seems to me, center our thoughts, rivet our attention, and study upon, is what I do not hesitate to stamp as the "disintegration of the family". If there is one evil of our society, not only in Canada, not only in Ontario, but if there is one thing that should make the public thinkers and the public legislatures and the Government stop and think, it is the gradual increasing disintegration of the family. And the family is the soul of society. Let the family be disintegrated, and society will fall in short order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be exhaustive, but may I be allowed to point out for your consideration and meditation a few of the factors that work against the consolidation of the family tie. It is one that I see all around me, and which was recalled to me by some remarks of the hon. Prime Minister, and that is that amongst our young people there is a fear of marriage. Our young men, if they have the fear of want, if there is a fear of lack of wages, we should free them at this time, when it is proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter that we must free the countries, and free humanity, from fear. Well, there is one fear which works havoc in the family, and that is the fear of marriage. The hon. Prime Minister spoke about our young men on the other side marrying British brides, and we read in the papers that these British brides are coming to this province, and bringing with them their children, and to me that is a cause for rejoicing, and it is one of those things where we can say, "Out of evil some good may come".

Now, Mr. Speaker, many, if not most, of these young men who are marrying on the other side -- if they had not had the occasion to go across the ocean, caused by the war, might not have married. What is the reason? I leave the solution to our young ladies of Ontario. Of course -- I had occasion, when I spoke on that question in the House years and years ago, when

the matter was taken up by the newspapers from one end of the country to the other, I was asked to speak on that same question in one of the Service Clubs here in Toronto, and the answer was given to me as the reason for a young man not wishing to marry, or for a young married couple not wishing to have children, that it was an economic one, fear, fear, fear, fear of life and its problems.

And that is why I have been speaking in favour of family allowances, for that is the reason, and the main reason, and so let the Government see to it that that reason is wiped out. Let there be encouragement to marry, let there be encouragement to have children.

New Zealand has set us a fine example. Over in New Zealand the State pays all the maternity services, and the State pays six shillings a week for every child up to the age of eighteen. So that takes away from the young couples this argument which, in fact, in many cases, unfortunately is not a reason, but a pretext for not having children.

Another cause of the disruption of the family is women working, young, unmarried women working -- so many of them. In Government offices, outside in industry -- why, she will not marry a young man who earns less than she earns herself. They will not try to live as two, when they have a big salary just for the one. Again, fear of consequences.

But what about what is taking place at the present time? Unfortunately, the work, the labour of married women, the labour of mothers, mothers of young children, mothers of young girls, mothers of young boys, who leave their homes to go and earn large salaries, such as are being paid in industry. And the family is broken up, and the children are not taken care of. Oh, the babies are taken care of by institutions, and nurseries -- strange hands. Let that go on, and the baby, at five years of age, will not know his mother -- I mean, he will not know what a mother is.

I am sure that if we had had that experience before there would not have been a Government in this country, in view of what is taking place at the present time, and in view of the awful result which is being achieved against a family -- there would not be a single Government that would permit, and not only would not permit, but would prohibit the hiring in industry of mothers with children under the ages of fourteen or fifteen years.

And what is the result? What is the result? Read anywhere in the newspapers, and you will find there examples of juvenile delinquency, which has reached such a stage that it should give our hon. Attorney General a "big headache".

Now, the question is, Shall we debate it in this House? Is that important enough? Is the family important enough, and the preservation of the family important enough, to arrest the attention and the consideration and the discussion of the members of the Legislative Assembly?

I say that this is of prime importance. Let this province be the poorer in money and in resources, if only it will be richer in human capital, and in decent families.

The duty of the Government in this matter -- Perhaps lies less on the Government than on the community -- but it is the duty of every community to organize itself, to organize committees, to deal with juvenile delinquency, and it is the duty of the Government to encourage that, and I would say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Drew) that there should be an estimate in his budget to give grants to every community to help set up community centres. They should organize to attract the young men and the young girls after school, take them off the streets, and occupy them in an interesting way. This is a very, very important problem, I think, and communities should be helped to deal with the problem.

But, regarding the disintegration of the family, I feign

would not touch on worse causes of it. However, I do want to allude to that horrible octopus, which is spreading its tentacles, and has been doing that for quite a number of years past throughout the families of this province, and which is smothering our young lives, smothering our families, and I am speaking now of birth control, that murderous birth control. And I know whereof I speak.

We had, in my own little community of Eastview, in Ottawa, a visit for some months of the notorious Miss Palmer, who went around from house to house -- of course, she chose the place that was the poorest, with the poor working people, people with large families -- and she went from house to house, preaching the gospel of birth control, the smothering of lives, God-given lives, even in the very womb where they were conceived.

There we had that unmarried lady going to young women, and teaching them, with appliances right there, that she had with her,--teaching them how to prevent the families, and even when conception had taken place, how to do away with -- to fight, I might say, God's will regarding the human race.

True, we brought her to court, and we had the spectacle of people, doctors and other noteworthies, coming before the Magistrate and stating that there was no harm in it, that it was even a good thing. The result was that she was allowed to go free, but since that time she has not shown herself within the territory of that municipality, and I would say to her, if she has occasion to hear what I am saying in this house, she had better not, for/the Law, as it exists on the Statute Books, the Criminal Code, is not interpreted textually, but is interpreted so as to favour these anti-conceptional practices, those who come into Eastview will not stay long, I can guarantee you that, Mr. Speaker.

I was very much pleased to see, in the speech from the Throne, eight paragraphs dealing with education, and the fact that the hon. Prime Minister himself has taken over that portfolio shows the importance which is being attached by the present Government to education.

I am sorry that time does not permit me to complete all that I had to say, and I shall pass as much of my address as I possibly can, but there is one thing I would like to say, and that is that one thing has been touched upon in this province on education which has never yet been mentioned, I believe, in a speech from the Throne, but in about a line and a half we see a reference to religious education, religion in the schools, and it has been commented upon in the newspapers. Religion in the schools as a basis of morality, and religion in the schools as an effort to develop the spiritual nature of men; religion in the schools as a rounding-out of a man's personality.

Oh, I know there is an idea amongst certain people that religion should take a few hours of the day, or a few hours of a week, and then forget all about it. Many of us, as we enter a house, or pass through a door, leave our religion outside. With that I thoroughly disagree. I believe that religion should be an integral part of our personality. It is blended in all our life -- or it should be. It accompanies man in his actions and his thoughts. Therefore, why should it not be the care of the school to develop that side of man's personality! It is considered a very big problem.

But you will ask, "How are we going to do that with all these different denominations -- the problem of the public school?" Well, Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the problem is being discussed, I think is a commendation for the separate school system. We have solved the problem in our separate schools.

But, may I suggest to the public school supporters, without any pretense of encroaching upon that domain, a solution?

When you hear or read or talk about religion in the schools, I know that what comes to the mind is a set of religious dogmas of religious principles. That is not necessary, at all, if you want to have religion in the schools. I have been a school teacher for a large number of years, and when you have, in your schools, imbued the young men with the idea of what is around him as coming from a Supreme Being or Creator -- when you imbue him with the idea of a Providence that continually and incessantly has to do with the affairs of men, then your religious teaching will be a success. But if, for instance, when you teach physical geography, things around the child, we, as teachers, are apt to forget, and just be questioning and questioning we try to get them to the cause of things. We explain to them why a river is as it is. First it is a rivulet, then a stream, which comes from the mountains, and we teach them that water comes from the mountains, from the clouds in rain, and from snow, and goes into the rivulets, and then the rivulets and the stream unite to form a river, and the river brings the water to the ocean, and back it goes up to the clouds. And there we stop -- there we stop.

But the teacher who sees things, who looks upon his pupils as spiritual beings as well as physical and material beings, will go further, and will show the pupils the omnipotent cause that created all causes, and will explain the evaporation from the river into the clouds, which causes the rain to fall, and will explain the phenomenon of gravity, so the streams will not go up the mountains, but will come down. Oh, it is so easy to open up those young minds to these higher reasons, and you will be teaching religion, and it does not matter whether your pupil is a Jew or a Gentile, whether he is a Presbyterian, a Methodist or a Catholic, if you give him the idea of the Creator, and an all-pervading Providence,--you will be teaching religion, real religion, in your schools.

And then, too, if, when you are teaching history, you teach him what is really the case. Some of you may laugh at me, but you will be teaching him the fact that God is the over-lording cause of what happens to men, and so very few of the teachers of history go that far.

As I say, some of you may be laughing at me. Well, you are not laughing when there is a war. We forget Providence. We forget Providence when we have peace and prosperity, but when we have children on the other side, then Their Majesties and our Governor and our Lieutenant-Governor call the people to prayer, because they have a firm belief, and the people have a firm belief, that there is up there a Power that can put a stop to this terrible strife, to whom humanity has to pray.

Oh, yes, we throw ourselves upon our knees when these dire calamities strike us. And it is but a mere reflection when we say, "I never thought I believed so much in Providence". If you do believe, let your belief be woven into the personality of your children, and in teaching history, contemporaneous history, the history that now surrounds the life of the child, let us point out the part which Providence plays in it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not doing to delay any longer. Speaking of education, I believe, with the hon. the gracious and learned member for York East (Miss Macphail), that there is not enough difference between our rural and urban schools. We try to teach the rural boys from the same pattern as we use in connection with the urban boys. My idea of giving the child a desire to stay on the land, to create in him a love for the land, is not so much to teach him the technique of agriculture, but it is to create in him a real love of the land.

I would like to see a form of educaticnal programme in our rural schools, so that the children can come to school, and, looking to their right or to their left, they will be interested in taking, for instance, the sprouting blade of grass

this spring, and study it, and will learn to love it.

teaching they receive in the school, and by being guided along these lines will come to learn what a wonderful thing nature is, the renewal of growth every year, in the spring, and how from the little seeds these flowers bloom forth into all their beauty as plants. That is what I would like to see.

But, in order to do that, you must have readers of a different type than you have at the present time in the rural schools. We should have readers that extol rural life; we should have poetry chosen chiefly for these rural schools, which sings of the glories of the farm and the glories of the country. That is my idea of a rural school.

And, likewise, what I was saying with regard to the families -- Do you know what I would do? If I was a Minister of Education, I would call upon the Literateuers, the men of letters in this province, and outside, and I would commission them to find me everything nice that was said about babies, to find me everything nice that was said about maternity and parenthood; I would compile that into reports, and I would tell the artists to draw, or choose from the magazines from all over, the wonderful pictures we see now, so as to instil in our boys and in our girls the love of babies, and I think this would go a long way to stop that feeling to which I alluded a while ago.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a few words about education in the province of Ontario; I was going to speak on the teaching of the French language, not in our French schools, but in our public and high schools. To think that most of you have gone through four years of high school, have been studying French, and then you come out of school unable to understand a Frenchman who talks in the ordinary rythym, and unable to express your thoughts in French. Four years of money spent to try and inculcate French, and that is the result! Why is that? Well, the method, of course — the method. You are teaching French as a dead language. You are not teaching it even as a live foreign language, and not teaching it as a language which is one of the

official languages of this country. What is wrong with the methods? You have French teachers, and you could have the very best. You could have the pick of all the French teachers, and bring them into your schools, not the so-called "specialists in French", because most of them have learned French as a dead language, just in books and by reading. They cannot speak it; therefore, they cannot teach it. Why do you not get Frenchmen and French women in your high schools to teach the French language, and then you would get somewhere for the money you are spending for that particular instruction.

You say, "Oh, it is not necessary for us to know French". Gentlemen, we are not speaking of the necessity when we are speaking of culture. Let me give you a couple of examples. I am thinking of the hon. Mr. Graham, who used to be a Minister of Railways in the Federal Government, and later became Senator Graham. He represented Canada at Geneva, at the League of Nations. When he came back, upon his first speech in Parliament, giving his report, he said, "I was never more ashamed than I was at Geneva. There we found Americans, Englishmen, Chinese, Germans, Czechoslovakians, Italians, Australians, Japanese, all speaking French, and understanding the discussions in French", and he said, "I, who came from a bi-lingual country, where I am surrounded by bi-lingual institutions, where I had the opportunity, the best opportunity in the world to learn French, - I was about the only one who could not speak French." He said, "I will see to it that my children will not be ashamed at any time in their lives, and they will learn French."

Another incident, Mr. Speaker: some years ago, - it was in 1934, I believe, - there was a celebration on the promontory at Gaspe, the anniversary of the arrival of Jacques Cartier in Canada. A cross was erected. There were there representatives of England, representatives of the United States, and there

was one representative from Canada, the Prime Minister at the time, Mr. Bennett. Every speech that was delivered at that time, celebrating the landing of Jacques Cartier, the French navigator, and all those Frenchmen on the soil of Canada for the first time, to form the new France, every speech there, from every official, including those from England, was delivered in French, except that of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Prime Minister of a bi-lingual country, who had all the opportunity, if the Government had seen to it to give him the opportunity, to learn French. He was the only one who delivered his speech in English.

Years ago there came up to Canada a celebrated man from England, a man celebrated in the field of education. I was thrown in with him. It was Sir Henry Newbold, who gave his name to the famous report on the teaching of English, "The Newbold Report". With him there was Sir Michael Sadler, the Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, Mr. Patton, the Chief Inspector of one of the Shires in England. These men attended at the Sessions where all the discussions were conducted in French. They took part in the discussions, and they spoke in irreproachable French.

And much later than that, you have but recently witnessed here Mr. Churchill, who, after making his address in English before the House of Commons in Ottawa, finished it by an address in the most perfect French. As a matter of fact, there is hardly a cultured man in England who does not know French, and yet it is not a bi-lingual country.

Let us go a little higher up. When Their Majesties came to Canada they spoke to the French people, in Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa — both of them — spoke to us in French, and our gracious Queen, even went to the point of telling us to keep sacred our attachment to our language. I am giving that, because, if we do want to work for unity, something must be done. Mr.

Speaker. I have only a few more minutes, and I will not go beyond them. It seems to me we must have unity, and a unity which can be fostered in our schools, more particularly in the teaching of history. Why do you not, in your English schools, teach that part of the Canadian history which precedes 1763, or 1700? Why do you not teach the heroic part, the epic part of Canadian history, before the days of Wolfe and Montcalm? A wonderful history, full of splendid lessons for the young, and especially it would teach your sons and daughters what our ancestors have done for this country, what they have done for Christianity here in Canada.

I was going around our bi-lingual schools for a whole week with Mr. James Hughes, who used to be the Chief Inspector of Ontario. He was questioning our boys and girls regarding English, and was being answered in English. On one occasion he said to one of the girls, "Well, can you name me a woman in Canadian history who is particularly renowned for a heroic feat?". Mr. Hughes was the Chairman of the Laura Secord Memorial, and he naturally expected to have the answer "Laura Secord". But, no, the little girl raised her hand, and said, "Please, sir, Madelaine Vercherres." Mr. Hughes looked at her, and said, "Who is Madelaine Vercherres?". Of course, Madelaine Vercherres is a heroine of a feat before which pales very much the feat, which I admire, of Laura Secord.

Then he wanted to make them speak English, and show how English was being taught in our schools, and he asked one of the boys -- he said, "Do you know who Laura Secord is?", and a little hand went up, and one did know, a little girl, and he said, "Well, my little girl, what do you know about Laura Secord?", and she said, "Please, sir, she makes chocolates."

In the boys' class he had asked the question regarding

the greatest Canadian hero, and the little boy answered, "It is Dollard Des Omereaux", and the inspector was astonished, because he did not know that Dollard Des Omereaux was a man who, with a handful of sixteen French men and about twenty Indians who had left the old fort almost immediately afterwards, succeeded in fighting for three days at the Long Sault, and were killed to the last man, as they knew they were going to be, but the result was that they had saved Montreal by their heroism, their voluntary sacrifices, and of course to the boys Dollard Des Omereaux was a great hero.

When Mr. Hughes was making a report on the way we taught history, he wrote and asked me, "What was the name of the French hero the little boy alluded to?", and he was then Chief Inspector of Schools in Ontario.

Is it not time that we in the public schools, in the English classes of this province, as well as in the French schools, teach Canadian history that begins before the time of Wolfe and Montcalm, and what a wonderful history it is, full of splendid lessons for the boys and girls, and yet we, in our French schools, I confess, up to a few years ago, dwelt too much on that history, and did not, perhaps, give enough of the history especially between 1763 and 1867.

And this is something that has to be carried on, working shoulder to shoulder, if we are going to work out the unity that we all so much desire, and we must start it with our youth when they are at an age when the mind is plastic and easy to absorb.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I put forward a thought that is always paramount in my mind, and should be in the minds of every leader in this province, (and I think this afternoon I am speaking to the leaders of the province of Ontario,) and that is that they should take every means in their power to promote the

national unity. Otherwise, we will never be a nation. If we are not as united as the three-way population of Switzerland is united, with their differences of language, it is not true unity. If unity means anything, if we take the trouble to learn one thing, we must have more culture, more progress, and be helpful, and not hinder. In Switzerland, where we find people more patriotic, and people more united, (and yet they speak three languages,) --

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Four.

MR. BELANGER: I know three, anyway. There is German, there is Italian, and French.

MR. SALSBERG: And now a Roumanish dialect.

MR. BELANGER: Well, consider Belgium; where will you find any better in the last war or the present war, where will you find a more heroic people, a more united people, and yet there are two sections which speak a different language, the Wallons, who speak French, and the Flemish, who speak a kind of German, and yet you find them united in all ways, and unless we are as united as they are, we will not be a nation. If you want us to be what is meant when we hear the expression "The Great Canadian Nation", we must be united. When our sons come back, and give us, as the reward of their sacrifices on the field of battle, our freedom and independence, we will be glad to say, "Good boys, you have made of Canada a great nation amongst the nations of the world", which you will not be able to do unless we are united.

Mr. Speaker, I am through.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the House rise to resume at eight o'clock this evening?

Motion agreed to.

The House rose at six o'clock, P. M., to re-assemble at eight o'clock, P. M.

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 8th, 1944,
8:00 o'clock, p.m.

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to associate myself with the hon. members in this House on both sides of the floor who have expressed their wishes to you, sir, in the very necessary duties of your high office, and they wished you well in discharging those duties. I also wish to say that perhaps I am the only member of this House who has had experience that would lead me to know at first hand the speaker of this House is neutral. I had the privilege a few weeks ago, of attending a meeting in a hall named the Parkdale Assembly Hall, of hearing the hon. Dr. Brass speak on health matters. I attended this meeting, which I had noticed in the press that day, and I attended the meeting that evening and was very presently surprised to meet the speaker of the House there on that occasion. He introduced me to several people at the meeting and the next thing I knew I was invited up on the platform.

After the meeting was over and the speeches were finished I discovered that I had attended a meeting of another political association altogether, without knowing it.

So that I can assure the members of the House that this is the neutral position of the speaker in his own riding, which has for so many years expressed their faith in his work.

I do not expect to be able to express my thought this evening with the fire of the fluency of the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Belanger) in this House, but there is one thing, I am able to agree with him in many things in the speech he made. One of those is that we need more national unity in Canada and in this province. And I can also agree with him that issues have been raised in this province that perhaps should not have been raised. But I would also like to at least mention that these racial and religious issues which have been raised

in years gone by, have been raised by the two old political associations of this province, and certainly never by the political association to which I have the honour to belong.

We do not believe and will on no issue raised religious issues or racial issues which tend to divide the people of this country on issues that in past years have certainly not promoted national unity. The members on this side of the House believe that national unity will only be achieved when we can provide each person in this province and in this Dominion with a job at decent wages, and with the knowledge and faith that when they reach retiring age they will be looked after.

With that assurance behind every Canadian, we will have national unity, because then, each one will have the opportunity of visiting other parts of the country and get to know first hand how the other fifty per cent of the country lives.

Now, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. W. Murdoch) in discussing a number of these issues the other evening, drew attention to the fact that the hon. member from East York (Miss Macphail) had suggested we socialize farm machinery.

I do not believe the hon. member from East York made that suggestion. I believe she mentioned that we should have municipal planning of the use of farm machinery. However, the hon. member from Essex South (Mr. W. Murdoch) became very enthusiastic about the idea of socializing farm machinery and said, in fact, it was not such a bad idea at all; and in fact he laid down, within certain limits a proposal he would favour. That is an idea which we will have to take into consideration and get otgether on that idea, because something can be worked out. Because I have often wondered why the farmers of this province and of this Dominion, -- because this is really a Dominion matter, -- should not have reached at least the stage where we would have standardized in the manufacturing of farm machinery, whereby you would not have fifty varities of simple harrows, and perhaps another fifty varities of ploughs, and perhaps ten varities of

binders; and perhaps not a single stick of wood or metal piece and not a buckle on those binders which will fit another binder. That seems to be something which needs correction.

The other member from Essex made one statement with which I can agree partly. He said we must get back to the idea that we are punished for wrong doing, and we are rewarded for doing good. All I can say that if it is a good thing, perhaps, that that does not apply to political parties in this province, or perhaps the numbers of the hon. gentlemen opposite might not be so large as they are to-day. Of course, that is just my own opinion. I do not claim that that opinion is shared by this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we face today one of the greatest problems, a problem facing national unity, namely the problem of health. Up to the present time I do not know the proposals that may be advanced by the government on this important issue. Four days ago, to be exact, I believe the minister of health (Hon. R. F. Vivian, M.D.) introduced a Bill which has not yet appeared on the Order paper, but he did give us an advance write-up on the Bill, or there was a release given to the press on this Bill, which would indicate that a proposal to go farther than anything proposed even in the famous twenty-two points that were proposed on the 8th of July.

In point number eleven we are told that medical, dental, and other halth protection will be available to all, that is as far as the province goes. But in the published statement of the Minister the suggestion of this Bill is far more sweeping than that. We are told that it will provide for and include types of medical care available to all on a basis satisfactory to the medical and allied professions. We are further told that this municipal health service Act, which, by the way, has the same name as the Act I proposed, would receive wide spread acclaim from the rural areas which have been desirous of medical services in these areas; and we are told that this proposal goes much further than any scheme proposed, such as the doctors' scheme in the west. We are told it goes much further than any scheme so far introduced in Canada.

We welcome that promise, and we hope that when the Bill is printed that promise will be fulfilled, because on this side of the House we believe that one of the first steps towards national unity and towards happiness for all the people in our province is good health; and good health is not possible under the present hit and miss system of health services.

We must have some change in the condition under which forty-five per cent of the doctors are serving only twenty-eight per cent of our people; forty-eight per cent of our dentists and forty-nine per cent of our nurses are serving only twenty-eight per cent of our people. We must have some improvement in that condition.

On this side of the House we proposed a health plan should be financed not by the people who lead the services, the burden of it should be spread over all the people of the province, and the Dominion, and paid out of the national or provincial revenues.

We believe that such a health plan should involve and should apply to all the people, regardless of their income. We believe that the principal guiding thing in sound health services is that the doctors and the staff necessary to execute that health service should be on salary.

A health insurance scheme that does not provide more doctors, more dentist, more nurses, and more hospitals, is not going to provide health service to all parts of the province; and health services that are only applied to some parts of the province, and not to all, are not adequate health services.

Now, the hon. members opposite, at Port Hope, drew up a very important document on health services, in which they advocated state medicine as a solution for all our health needs.

At Winnipeg I believe the name was changed; and at the moment, as I said before, we do not know what they proposed to introduce; but we hope it will be along the lines that we understand, that the House will be able to support.

We realize that while the only plan of complete health service would be socialized medicine in which the province and the Dominion would plan and assist the young doctors and dentists in such numbers as to provide complete health services throughout the whole Dominion.

we recognize that within the provincial jurisdiction that is not possible. And therefore we can only go as far as it is possible to go within the jurisdiction.

We do believe, however, that ultimately health services must embrace not onlyttthe province but the entire dominion; and they must also embrace not only the providing of doctors, dentists, nurses and hospitals, but the providing of drugs and pharmaceutical necessities at the lowest cost to the plan.

In our opinion it is unncessary that we should continue indefinitely to pay, for instance, ninety-eight cents for a bottle of aspirin which should sell for ten cents. This is, of course, just one example of the necessity, if we are going to provide the best service at the lowest cost, for a government investigation into such matters as that, too. These basic products, drugs, should be produced much more cheaply than they are now, if we are to provide health services which will be within the national income.

One of the most far reaching health services has been submitted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; and I would like, for a moment to deal with some of their proposals.

Their proposal, is, of course, that the plan should be a dominion plan; second, that it should be administered under the direction of an independent commission from Ottawa; third, that each province should have its separate place in the plan.

Another very important part of it is that the plan should apply to all citizens, rich or poor. Another important principal is that it should be a plan for preventing disease, whereby the doctor would see the patient before he gets sick. And another principal, of course, is that the average doctor, in his own district and serving his own people, should be the foundation of the plan.

They also believe that municipal effort should play a most important and very great part in this national and provincial health plan. They point out that municipal doctors services have proven

an ideal system for the practice of preventive medicine, in raising the standards of community health and radically lowering sickness and death rates.

Municipalities should have full time medical health officers. We are told in this brief that the present practice of a part-time medical health officer, who very often receives only a retaining fee of $50.00 a year is not a practical basis for municipal health.

The Federation believes that Dr. Davison, the Deputy minister of Health for the province of Saskatchewan correctly stated the fact in connection with health services, when he said:

> "It is an ideal system for the practice of preventive medicine" .... and "If the whole profession in Saskatchewan had immunized, during 1935, as thoroughly in their practices as had the municipal doctors in their districts, approximately three times as many persons would have been immunized against diptheria, small-pox and scarlet fever."

In other words, under private practice only one third as many people are immunized as under a public health service scheme.

A two year survey of the work of the municipal doctors in Manitoba was made from May 1938, to April, 1940, through the generosity of the International Health Division of the Rockefeller Foundation, and with the assistance provided by organized medicine in Manitoba. The results were outstanding. They found, first, that the mortality rate was nil, as compared with the provincial rate of four point three per thousand live births, and, I may say, as compared with four point six per thousand in other parts of Canada.

The infant death rate was forty point two, as against fifty-four per thousand live births in the rest of the province, and fifty-six per thousand in the rest of Canada.

The disability or sickness rate was only two-fifths of the accepted rate for the whole Dominion.

The hospitalization rate was only one third of the provincial rate. The doctors reported that three times as many people were seeing the doctor in his office, and the doctor, therefore, had more time to attend to the very necessary part of his practice. And the expenditure for these municipal health areas was only forty-four per cent of the expenditure in instances where people followed the old practice of getting sick first, and then seeing the doctor, and where the fee system prevailed.

Now, the various municipalities in Ontario have asked for municipal doctor legislation, which has been granted in the western provinces since 1916.

MR SPEAKER: May I most respectfully call the member's attention to the fact that you have a Bill before the House on Health and the Minister of Health has another one; and it is against the rules of the House to speak about impending legislation.

MR WILLIAM DENNISON: In the speech from the Throne we have been promised legislation in this respect. We have been promised that legislation will be placed before this House in due course; and we hope that that legislation will be in line with the request from the municipalities and from the Federation of Agriculture, that have been presented to the government, both this government and to their predecessors; a deputation representing the Ontario Federation waited on the Minister of Health, Doctor Vivian, in the fall of 1943.

I believe that the farm people are anxious to go forward with this plan now. This is not a plan that need wait until the federal government takes action. This is something Ontario can go forward with now.

One of the very necessary things in health has been stressed very strongly by Doctor Henry Sigerist, who recently spoke in this city, is that a doctor should be available to people before they are ill. A doctor should be on salary and should be free to devote his entire time to the practice of medicine. He should not be worried with the

collection of fees or bills, but should give his best efforts to medicine.

Dr. Sigerist pointed out that in the 16th, 17th, 18th and part of the 19th century, doctors were attached to the church, and their services were available to all. It was not until the 19th century that the fee system was attached to medicine, and even then the profession endeavoured earnestly to resist that change in their practice. And even when they were forced to go on the fee system Dr. Sigerist points out they drew up a code of ethics in order to protect the profession against the more sordid methods of competition that were being brought into the Society in which they were allowed to practice. Dr. Sigerist pointed out that for years now a doctor has been unable to settle down and practice where his services are needed most; and we have reached the point where we must now start to bring the doctor the patient before the patient takes ill.

Dr. Sigerist points out that money on a poor health plan is in effect money wasted; that health services that do not improve medicine and medical practice are not worthy of our civilization; that the future of medicine lies in group work. That in every district there should be a health centre and around that health centre there should be a proper staff to give medical and dental and the various other necessary services required in a complete health plan.

I would like the attention of the House to the fact that in Canada we have an unnecessary death rate among infants. We have improved our health services gradually since 1926; and this is evidenced by the fact that in 1940 that for the same number of births we had nine thousand less children die under one year of age than we had in 1926. That is, we have nine thousand living in this country who would have died had they been born in 1926 instead of in 1940. We are making progress, but we are making progress very slowly when we consider the progress that other parts of the British Empire have made. Our death rate at the present time is fifty-six per thousand live births.

In New Zealand the death rate is only thirty per thousand live births; which means that we are still losing needlessly ten thousand

children each year.

In this respect I agree with the hon. member from Prescott (Mr. Belanger) that we are far behind New Zealand in health matters. In New Zealand five per cent of the national income is devoted to health and social security. Not only are these not given in Ontario, but they are not given in Canada.

Nevertheless, in 1935, New Zealand had just as low a birth rate as we have had in some parts of Canada. In 1935 when the Labour Government took power in New Zealand, they had a birth rate down to sixteen, and it was over twenty-five per thousand in 1940; and to-day it is above that figure. Now, that is higher than in any part of Canada. Not even in those provinces in Canada where we have high birth rates are they as high as they have in New Zealand at the present time. In the whole of Canada our birth-rate is only twenty-one per thousand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have therefore a great problem facing this province in this question of health. I will not deal with the question of municipal health in this debate, but I would like to draw the attention of this House to another question of health which is just as important as that of those problems which I have mentioned, and that is that in this province we have thousands of streams, thousands of lakes and rivers, which are being polluted year in and year out, because we have not proper sewage disposal facilities in cities, towns and villages throughout our province. Very little leadership has been given, in my opinion, to this problem.

We have some of the finest rivers and streams in this province polluted day after day by the lack of sewage disposal facilities; and not only are the streams destroyed, not only are many fine bathing beaches ruined, but a wonderful source of humus which should be taken back to the land, and placed back on the land from which it came, but a wonderful source of humus is being completely neglected.

In Great Britain a year before the war more than one million tons of humus was recovered by sewage disposal plants and placed back on the land.

In the cities of this province I believe the Department should give leadership in this question. They should provide the smaller cities, at least, with expert assistance, people who would have time to draw up plans for those cities. Financial assistance should be given, so that in as short a time as possible Ontario may have clean rivers again; because under modern methods of disposal, the effluent of a sewage disposal plant is clear water; and the material is given to farmers or gardeners in the district who are able to use it. It can be de-watered by a very simple process, and it can be dried and processed. In one case, in Milwaukee they shipped a product which is nothing but sewage treated in enormous quantities, which it sells for many thousands of dollars to Canadians.

Therefore I would urge upon the Department of Health the consideration of this important problem, not only from the standpoint of preventing pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes but from a standpoint of returning to the soil that element of plant food which has not yet been returned to the soil in this province.

I want to say that experts are now of the opinion that mineral fertilizers are not producing grain that has the food value that grain has that is grown on land fertilized by manures. Dr. Pfeiffer made an experiment with two groups of white mice in the United States. One group of white mice was fed on grain raised on natural lands without artificial fertilizer, on rich lands which had been constantly rotated in the approved way, and the other group of white mice was fed on grain raised on minerally fertilized ground. The latter group of white mice produced small litters, with a death rate more than double that of the first group where the mice were fed on grain fertilized by animal manures.

The death rate of people in this province, where we are pouring down the sewers every year elements which should be returned to the land, and are wasting from seven to twelve million pounds of nitrogen every year, from two to four million pounds of potassium, and from one to three million pounds of phosphorous each year, because we have not appreciated it and have not provided these citizen towns or helped them provide

any proper method for recovery of those very necessary elements; and we are sweeping into the lakes and rivers of this province soil fertility which it has required centuries of life to build up, and which in effect is the very basis of life itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter to which I would like to refer briefly, and that is the appointment of a special committee in this province to study our fuel problem. That appointment, we were promised in the twenty-two points that any board appointed in this province would have represented upon it labour, consumers and the returned soldiers. It is true this is not a board but at the same time they have been charged with very great responsibilities in the matter of fuel supply and distribution in this province. There was a representative on that committee which was appointed, a representative which had long been associated with the fuel dealers in this city who bring in the coal from the United States, who import the coal from the United States of America. But there was no representative on that from the consumers, who might be interested possibly in developing our own resources, in developing lignite or peat as a wartime fuel, which might have been very scarce this winter if this had been a normal winter. We are thankful that this shortage was averted, not by any plan on the part of this government, I am afraid, but because of the warm weather.

We cannot hope to go through or to be as fortunate as that in future years; and in my opinion we should plan for the use of our own fuel resources in this province.

I also would like to agree with my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. H. C. Nixon) in respect to the very wise action taken by the last government in the matter of Hydro, in preventing this province from being deprived of hydro revenue because previous administrations had signed agreements with private firms selling hydro which agreements would have drained Ontario reserves, or hydro reserves, to a breaking point, had they not been cancelled and resigned on a more equitable basis.

We were told at the time, and I believe this is reasonably true, that in some instances the hydro rates might have been raised twenty-five per cent had those agreements continued. This would have meant an increase in some cities as high as two million dollars a year.

I can also recall that a number of years ago an U. F. O. government in this province also had an opportunity of saving hydro from a policy that had been followed up until the end year 1919, in regard to the building of hydro rates.

As you remember, in those days there was considerable disagreement, many people in this province disagreeing as to whether we should continue building hydro radials, and start building good roads.

Now the liberal government, from 1919 to 1933, appointed a commission of men to study this problem and they agreed and reported that the days for hydro radials had passed years previously; and that the hydro radials day was over; and that we should start building good roads.

(Page 576 follows)

I happened to live in North Renfrew at that time and I recall Conservative speakers in that election of 1923 telling the farmer in the rural districts in which I lived that this was a disastrous policy to start these expensive good roads. Why, they said, the Government are spending up to $12,000 a mile to build a road, $8,000 a mile to build. Terrible. When these Hydro radios would have performed the functions. Now, history has justified the action of that Government. In that period hydro was actually saved by the action of that Government and the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon), who had a hand in both actions which saved hydro and must feel certain satisfaction in knowing - although he was in two different political parties - he nevertheless had some hand in both actions.

At one time, I am free to confess, I was a member of the U.F.O. political party. I was also a member of the successor of the U.F.O. - the Progressive Party of Canada and of Ontario, and I want to pay tribute now to the two some of the measures brought in by the U.F.O. of 1921 and 1923. The U.F.O. of that day were the first to inaugurate the policy of paying large grants to rural hydro lines. When the Government took office the farmers were paying then, I believe, $6.20 service charge on their hydro. That was reduced down to $4.10 during that period. In no other period since have we made such a reduction in real service charges.

The Workmen's Compensation Board began its work under that Government and I recall the debate at that time. There was a great debate, I remember, on whether the Board should pay full returns in the small wage brackets. I remember the leaders of the Conservatives in those days insisted that the rate of two-thirds of a man's salary should apply even below $12 a week. The Government of that day insisted no, below $12 a week the working man should receive the whole salary. Well, that seems to be a long way away, but, nevertheless, it shows, Mr. Speaker, the progress we have made. I do not believe for a moment any hon. member opposite today would make such a

proposal. Now, this Board and this Act actually provides Ontario with the lowest insurance rate in existence in any section of Canada.

A short time ago the Rainbow Bridge was finished, and they built the bridge. They had to paint the bridge. They engaged working men to paint both halves of the bridge and apparently the working men on the Canadian half of the bridge were insured with the Workmen's Compensation Board and they paid rates on this side of only $5.20 per hundred dollars' worth of wages paid. That was the rate charged, $5.20 per hundred of wages paid. On the American side, where they placed the insurance with private firms, they paid $41.00 insurance for every hundred dollars of wages paid. That seems to me to be the greatest example of the value of the province establishing that service, that insurance service, one could find - the difference between $5.20 and $41.00 per hundred dollars of wages.

Now, I can also recall the word "progressive" has become popular today, but I can also recall the day when it was not very popular to stand by and say you were a progressive. I can recall certain speakers in North Renfrew telling the farmers that this was a dangerous movement, it had very insidious routs that even ran back to Russia and that it was a revolutionary movement that should be avoided at all costs. They even attempted to blame the progressive party for the march on Ottawa of 1917 when a group of farmers spontaneously went to Ottawa to protest against the action of the Union Government. I can recall in 1923 when the Progressive Party elected seventeen members to the opposition in this house, but when they took their seats on the last week in January the Government of the day, under the leadership of Mr. Ferguson refused to recognize them as the official opposition, and whether it was by agreement or not they had the Liberals with only fourteen members in the house seated in the seats of the opposition. It looked like a sort of tie-up between the old parties. Of course, we could not prove it, but it took three

bbb3 weeks of constant effort on the part of the hon. Manning Doherty to become recognized by the Government of the day as the official opposition, so great was the horror of the Conservative party of that day at the very word "progressive". It had a sinister meaning in those days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are changing and today names that were very dangerous sounding names a few years ago have become quite commonplace and have now been adopted by parties that a few years ago would have shrunk back from those names with horror. Now, whether that horror is real or whether it is just inspired for the purpose of winning elections, I am not prepared to say. I would like to speak now on a matter of some urgency because there does seam to be a lot of money spent these days in trying to build up around the C.C.F. the same fear and panic that they were so successful in building up around the progressive party of 1920.

Each day in my mail I get letters and booklets sent out by The Forward Publishing people of 92 Adelaide Street West telling me about this terrible C.C.F. organization. One day I got "A letter from the Front Line" in printed booklet, sent out by this company. Another day I got another booklet sent out by the Manufacturers' Association. Next day I got a book written by a person named Adam Smith, - this has been the name of someone else, - on the question of the disparity of wages at various economic levels, and the last book is a booklet by Mr. Gibson, "You knew what you were voting for." Mr. Speaker, these booklets, or many of these booklets, bear the same postmark, that is, they are sent out by the same meter machine; it seems they are run through the same meter. Whoever may be the publisher, they all seem to wend their way to the same office before they are mailed and they are run through the same meter.

AN HON. MEMBER: War economy.

MR. DENNISON: It may be economy, but I would like to know how much money is spent and how much money the owner of that meter has to remit to the Federal Government each month in postage alone on this great effort to frightsn people against their own movement. Because that is exactly what it is, - an attempt to frighten people against a movement

that is based on the people themselves.

The party to which I have the honour to be a member is the only political party in this House, so far as I know, that holds annual conventions and has done so for the past eight years. Our leader does not remain the leader forever when he is given that position, but he must return each year to a meeting of the members of our party and he must give an account of his stewardship and he must again seek that leadership. Now, we believe that is the proper way to organize a political party. We believe that is the only way to organize a party of the common people and therefore I believe that particular feature of the C.C.F. movement has been the reason that we have survived and stood up after those barrages of propaganda that have been hurled against us at each election for the past ten elections. I can think of no reason, after there has been sufficient money spent to beat the C.C.F. to beat half a dozen parties, if we were just an ordinary political party, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are some thing more than just a political party - we are a movement of the people.

Now, the attack by people who seek to destroy us seems to fall into two channels. Newspapers started some years ago to put "socialist" in front of our name, "Socialist C.C.F.", that was used for some time and did not seem to work very well. The results seemed to just be the reverse. We seemed to grow in strength instead of diminishing in strength so that they had to think up something else. They no doubt got their boss and he got the experts together and they discussed what next they would call us. This time they thought they would have to put something in front of "Socialist" and so they called it "State Socialist". Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that no member of this party has ever claimed to be a "State Socialist". We do not believe in state socialism. State socialism, as I understand it, is socialism run from the top. That is just the very system we are against. Surely there was far too much of that in the old parties, run from the top. We want something that

is run from the bottom and they have ceased used the words "State Socialist" now, because apparently it was discovered after some time that the Conservative party themselves - in 1934 - had used this term on several occasions and it would not be logical, of course, to apply that to other parties as long as it could be shown within six years previously you had used it yourself. So that the term is out now for the time being. They had to call another meeting of the brains to see what they would call the C.C.F. again and decide on the new label they would have for us. This time they decided if they could only get the word "national" off the front of their own name - I do not blame the hon. members opposite but the people who were conducting this campaign might be the people who were tacking this on to the C.C.F., and so it was apparently arranged that the word "national" would be dropped off the name of the Conservative Party and this would be a good name to put in front of the C.C.F., "National Socialist". Now, that term, like the others, of course, is not a proper name to apply to members on this side of the House, because "National socialist" was a term used by Hitler, who was in no sense a socialist, who was in no sense supported by labour or by farmers, but who was supported by big business in Germany and who was supported by people in Germany who, in this country, would normally support the Conservative party and so that label is not logical to apply to us on this side of the House. It is not logical. However, there is a very definite attempt to apply it. Perhaps these labels mean very little. After all, it is the program of the party that counts and the fact that the Conservative Party, when I first knew it was plain Conservative Party. Then it took "National Conservative Party" and then "Union-Government Party" and then "Liberal-Conservative Party". In 1939 they changed back to the"National Conservative Party"and in 1940 to the "National Conservative Party" and now "Progressive Conservative Party of Canada". The fact that all these changes took place have not in effect changed the party.

The party today is still the Conservative party with, of course, the new name. What will change the party is constructive legislation and that constructive legislation is the type of legislation I hope the party will introduce in this session but time alone will tell and also time alone will tell if this is the last change of name, the party that now occupies the government benches, will have.

I see the Women's Conservative Party in Toronto have changed their name officially, - they have it done properly - on the Charter and they have the notice published in the Ontario Gazette, so no doubt the leaders are hoping this will be the last change of name and no doubt they would not like to change back to another name after having made this change.

I would like to quote a warning to the Conservative Party made by the member who preceded me but one from St. David Riding. I refer to Mr. Heighington who sat in this House representing my riding as a member of the Conservative Party from 1930, I believe, until 1937. Now, this was back in 1934 when Mr. Bennett was telling the people of Canada how logical his program was. It was back in the days when Mr. Bennett was telling the pepple of Canada that co-intervention of the state of the economical field was inevitable - not to destroy freedom, not to cripple industry, but to release industry, and Mr. Bennett went further than that. He said at a banquet tendered to him at Ottawa, in one of the famous radio speeches, he said; "If this is socialism, then I am proud to be a socialist. I have been a socialist all my life."

Now, Mr. Heighington issued a warning to the Conservative party, though. He warned the government Conservative party might become the socialist party. He attacked the "quasi-social" legislation of Bennett on May 15th, 1938. He said this, "When a Conservative calls himself a socialist that does not make him one and no Socialist will vote for him. On the other hand, a lot of Conservatives will not support that kind of thing, so that we lose both ways".

Now, that warning of Mr. Heighington's

was heeded because under the leadership of Dr. Manion the Conservative party ceased to swing to the left and they swung back to the normal Conservative position on the right. However, it was soon discovered that that does not and did not win elections. Now, we find a swing back to the left again. In fact, the swing back to the left has become so great that I thought I sensed a sort of offer in the speech made by the hon. member from Bellwood (Mr. MacLeod) the other evening when he suggested to the prime minister (Hon. George A. Drew) that after all he could have a new member of the government to be the Minister of Planning and I think that might be even taken to mean that after all the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) might be willing to give it a thought.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It is not a bad idea. Think it over.

MR. DENNISON: Now, the hon. members opposite have since 1935, when they swung back to the right again, they found themselves in this province, at least, pretty close to the position of the government and on December 5th, 1937, Mr. Rowe made it plain that he himself had prevented the efforts of the Prime Minister (Hon. George Drew) who was then the provincial organizer for the Conservative Party, to effect a political alliance with the government of that day. Mr. Rowe said this, "No one of either party put more pressure on me to consider favorably the proposed merger of political parties in this province than did George Drew. As Mr. Drew now sees fit to doubt my memory, may I refresh his by reminding him of his telephone call to me at the Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, on the evening of April 29th, 1937, when he pleaded with me not to close the door on the idea of a coalition until he could see me again."

Rowe then goes on to say that at the Albany Club, Toronto, he had breakfast with Mr. Drew and again the proposal was made that the two parties unite.

Now, I believe that Mr. Drew, or the Prime Minister, (Hon. George Drew) who was then the organizer of the Conservative Party admitted on that occasion that there was a telephone discussion took place in regard to a merger of the

two historical political parties in this province. He blamed the urge for a merger on Mr. Rowe. The present prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) on December 5th, 1937, he said this, "Mr. Rowe told me that Mr. Hepburn had proposed coalition to him and had given him assurances which would have resulted in what would have amounted to a joint leadership of the government between Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Rowe with the assurance that Mr. Rowe would succeed him."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have no objection to any unity between the old parties. In fact, we think that would be the historical development, and that will be the historical development in the structure of the two old political parties. We do not expect if there was a C.C.F. government in this province that the two old/political line parties would remain separate very long. They would probably unite to prevent such a government, if it were possible or if they had strength between them to make it possible, I should say.

However, there are other warnings in this province which I must refer to for a moment before I close.

We, on this sideof the House, have always believed that changes should be made by means of the ballot. We believe that the ballot box should be supreme; the voice of the people expressed at election times should rule. However, there are those in this province who threaten that perhaps this would not be possible, that perhaps there would be a revolt if the people of this province decided by means of the ballot that they wanted certain policies adopted.

I quote from the Globe and Mail of 15th January/of this year in which it takes the National C.C.F. leader to task for suggesting to any banker that after the war is over that the Foreign Exchange situation will have to be handled in exactly the same way as it is now handled, by the Federal Government preventing the escape of capital from Canada and the Globe and Mail is horrified that the Foreign Exchange should continue to be handled that way and they plead for the investors in Ontario and say, "Today we have seven

billion dollars from abroad, which keepsthe economic life blood of Canada pulsing." They say that the C.C.F. leader must not freeze these investments and if he does they say that it will not be done without revolution. They say, "Don't let him monkey with the property of United States and United Kingdom Nationals. This would be fatal to more than Socialists."

Now, I have heard of threats of revolt after a government was established but I have never heard of threats of revolt before a government had an opportunity to be established.

I have a paper before me, "Public Opinion", which we are informed is published in the interests of the party to which the government belongs and here again we hear rumblings, very sinister rumblings of what will happen. They talk about C.C.F. being annoyed at the anti-C.C.F. attack that is going on and they say, "Why should not there be an anti-C.C.F. campaign? Do the Socialists think that the rank and file of Canadians are going to give into them without a struggle? Never." Now, Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say that in sofaras the Progressive-Conservative Party is concerned there is going to be a double barralled approach to the electorate of Canada at the next election. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to attempt in Canada, at least, to fight elections on a higher plane than just it is a case of more socialism. I believe that approach to the electors is to be regretted. It is not a case of me or socialism at all. It is a case of this government and this House going as rapidly as possible a job for the people of Ontario. It is a case of bringing in by legislative action reforms in this province and I think it is to be regretted that any suggestion should be made that the people of this province have no faith in democracy to the extent that they would attempt to impede the will of the majority of the people of this province.

Now, I want to close my remarks by reciting a little hymn to you. It is reported that this hymn is the favorite

hymn of the Albany Club in Toronto and that even members of the present government have been known to sing this hymn when they meet together in the Albany Club. This hymn is dedicated "To the Glory of Free Enterprise". Of course, we do not believe that there is any such enterprise as completely free enterprise. We believe there is just monopoly enterprise today, but, however, the hon. gentlemen opposite do believe there is free enterprise and this is alleged to be the hymn they sing.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the tune?

MR. DENNISON: I do not know the tune, Mr. Speaker, but it is not a bad hymn.

(Page 586 follows)

HYMN TO THE GLORY OF FREE ENTERPRISE

1. THE VOICE OF BUSINESS

Of freedom this and freedom that the drooling Leftist chatters,
But freedom for Free Enterprise is all that really matters;
This freedom was ordained by God, upon it rest all others,
For man's divinest impulse is to over-reach his brothers;
And so to this celestial urge we make our offering votive,
Behind all human greatness lies the noble Profit Motive.
Chorus: Then hail we now Free Enterprise,
Extol and give it praise!
In it the world's salvation lies,
Without it every freedom dies;
O glorious Free Enterprise - The Enterprise that Pays!

2. For victory we're giving all, at little more than cost,
But how will victory help us if Free Enterprise is lost?
The war's demands for well-laid plans most loyally we've headed,
But peace is quite a different thing - no planning then is needed;
So while today the State's control has stretched us on the rack,
The moment peace appears in sight we want our freedom back!
Chorus: Then hail we now Free Enterprise,
Extol and give it praise!
In armed revolt we'll all arise
If any post-war party tried
To undermine Free Enterprise - The Enterprise that Pays!

3. At periods when Free Enterprise may not provide employment
We dread the thought of hungry men - it lessens our enjoyment;
The Government must then step in, with this consideration --
That any public works proposed do not increase taxation;
Depressions, Brethren, after all, much as we may deplore them,
Are acts of God - who ever heard of blaming Business for them?
Chorus: Then hail we now Free Enterprise,
Extol and give it praise;
Of course, when profits shrink in size
To lay men off is only wise;
We dearly love Free Enterprise - But only when it pays!

4. We face today a dreadful threat from fools who would destroy us,
Of"Socialized Security" they prate in accents joyous;
Security! It's costs, my friends, would drive us to perdition!
Besides, it kills initiative and suffocates ambition;
Security breaks down the will, the urge that keeps men free,
It stifles effort, starves the soul, except in men like me.
Chorus: Then hail we now Free Enterprise,
Extol and give it praise;
While Marsh and Beveridge theorize,
Their deadly, Bolshevistic lies
Are poisoning Free Enterprise - The Enterprise that Pays!

5. Free Enterprise must not involve unbridled competition,
And cutting prices is a sin for which there's no remission;
A "Gentlemen's Agreement" is the best of all devices
To stabilize our dividends, our markets and our prices;
For taking risks we have no taste; we set our whole affection
On well-disguised monoply, maintained by high protection.
Chorus: Then hail we now Free Enterprise,
Extol and give it praise!
In it the world's salvation lies,
Without it every freedom dies;
O glorious Free Enterprise!
O wonderful Free Enterprise!
O marvellous Free Enterprise - The Enterprise that Pays!

MR. STANLEY L. HALL (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this legislative assembly for the first time. If I might be permitted for a little introduction, I would like to say that I am one of those farmers that have been talked about and I have this privilege that I drive from home into this assembly and back every night and morning and I certainly appreciate, - well, I cannot state to our hon. the Minister of Public Highways (Mr. Doucett); he is not present - but I certainly appreicate the highways that I can come in most of the way on pavement. As I have said before, I am a farmer and I am proud of it and always have been. I have the distinction of some of the farmers here that I came to Toronto 35 years ago and brought farm produce, - which has been passed back and forth across the floor of the house quite

a bit - before there was any surface on any road running out of Toronto except Dundas Street, and it was a very poor surface, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) will agree with me because he happens to live on that same road.

I would like to say that the good people of the old County of Halton and the Township of Trafalgar- which is named after Trafalgar Square, London, England - that I have the honour to represent those people here, and it is a great honour. I also know it is a great honour to be a British subject and especially, doubly so to be a member of any assembly within that great Commonwealth of Nations. I hope there is not a member here but feels that his responsibility to the people of this country and to this Legislative Assembly is just as great as the honour that he enjoys by sitting in this assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to you. I believe with your former experience and knowledge of parliamentary procedure that you will fulfil your duties with honour to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have spoken in this Legislative Assembly on Agriculture because, as I said before, I am a farmer and a farmer back in generations where we were U.E. Loyalists, who came to this country years ago and have followed the art of farming for years since, but I am not one of those who believe in too long addresses, to cover a speech as it should be covered and has been covered I hope by other speakers here, but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my very brief remarks to the new department which is to be set up by this government known as the Department of Planning and Development. I believe it is a department which has long been needed in this province because with out great transportation systems - which are not equalled any place else in the world - both water, rail, highway and air, and the great development of our great electric Hydro system, and with the great advancement in science and research and in our development of our great natural resources, should be to

the advantage of all our citizens.

With the opening of Ontario House in London, England, we should be in a position to attract to this country both industry and immigration of the right kind and at the right time when it will not conflict with the re-establishment of our armed forces nor with labour at the present time employed in war production so essential at the present time.

We not only have much to be thankful for in the past but if we develop all of our God-given resources and promote all of the great interests of this country in a cooperative and harmonious manner, there is no reason why we cannot create a condition where all the people may obtain an ever-increasing measure of welfare and happiness which they are entitled to and which will be a continuous benefit to all generations which shall follow us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said my remarks would be brief and they are brief. I think probably I will stand second in this Assembly in that regard, but, Mr. Speaker, there is just one point which I would like to leave with this Assembly and that is that we members of this Assembly and citizens of this fair land of ours should so conduct ourselves, both in this Assembly and out of it, that we shall be worthy of the great sacrifices being made by those brave men and women in are armed forces, that free speech and democratic government shall prevail and my wish is, Mr. Speaker, that we shall be worth of the great peace and lasting peace for which we all pray. I thank you.

MR.ROSS A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to say that I am sure that we all in this House who sat here during the last term appreciate very much the fact that you were chosen as Speaker of this House and I am sure we will all agree that you will rule with impartiality and in fairness to everyone.

To the mover, my neighbour, both in riding and in seat in the House, the hon. member for Huron (R.H. Taylor) he certainly gave us one of the best addresses of a mover of the Speech from the Throne since I have come into the House. He had a wealth of material and was able to present it in a very appealing manner and I think that he will make a valuable

contribution to this House. Also, to the seconder, who possibly is further across the province and somewhat more of a stranger, his remarks certainly indicated that he has opinions of his own and wishes to express them. I think this House will appreciate those things very much.

This is the first sitting of the Ontario Legislature where we have had lady members and I am sure one would not be very gallant if they did not make some mention - and possibly no one is entitled to do so more than I am, being a neighbour of the hon. member from East York (Miss Macphail) for many years and having known her - I will not say how many years ago - we travelled the same road considerably in the U.F.O. days and we think quite a bit along the same lines and I will say this that I think the speech that she gave was the product of the U.F.O., not the C.C.F. I do not think the C.C.F. can claim much credit for the policies which she announced.

The hon. member from Bracondale (Mrs. Luckock) I, too, have considerable interest in, - the very fact that she was born not very far from my home, the daughter of the rather famous Mr. J.J. Morrison, the late J.J. Morrison. I have not got accustomed to this situation yet. Mr. Morrison and I were exceedingly well acquainted and we, too, drove many a mile in fighting and pioneering the movement of the farmer and it is to be regretted that he is not with us today at the opening of this Parliament where he could have witnessed his daughter taking her seat in this House.

The Prime Minister, the Hon. Colonel Drew, he has come to this House this session, I believe, with a sincere desire to give good government and if that road and line of thought will not be obstructed by those possibly within his own party, as well as within other parties, we will see in the future a new trail blazed in the political history in the province of Ontario and I think it would be welcomed by practically the whole province of Ontario because we are living in a new age and possibly this Parliament has not kept in step with the present age. He was faced with a

difficult situation when he found the number of members that he had following him, but it was not an unparallelled situation in Ontario. We will well remember in 1919 or thereabouts that Mr. Drury came into this House with just as small percentage of the following of the House as Mr. Drew has. He formed a government and he carried on for four years and I see no reason why the present one cannot do somewhat similar; while the times are more difficult, yet the need is more urgent and all the more reason why he should.

(Page 592 follows)

Well, there has been some discussion, following the formation of the Government, that "Well, they will not last very long; we can go to the country again, and see if ~~we can~~ they may get enough support". I say that the hon. Prime Minister holds in his hand the key as to whether there will be an early election, or not. If he persists, or should happen to persist in introducing legislation that the other members of this House cannot conscientiously support, — and he can easily ascertain whether what he is introducing will get support, or not, — if he does introduce those, he, alone, will cause an election, and I would say I would like to warn him that the people of the province of Ontario are not in any temper, at the present time, to consider another election. It is immaterial to me. I suppose we can have another game of sport over it, only, frankly, my pocketbook is getting hit pretty hard, but we will be sporting, just the same.

There is one thing I think should probably follow in the wake of this, at this particular time.

Now, why should not the Parliament of Ontario have a definite time, four years, five years, somewhat similar to what possibly the United States has. County Councils, and Reeves of Municipalities, are elected for a definite term, and they complete their term, and they know when they will go to the country, and I cannot see any more reason why the province of Ontario should not go to the country every four years, or every five years, in the month of September or October, and we will then know what to expect.

We know that a great many people in the province of Ontario object to a snap election; it is not a true indicator of what the people are thinking; it is simply some little issue thrown up and drawn across the trail as a red herring, and we have an election, and it is all over. I am of the opinion that now is the time we

"That the defeat of a Government Bill ~~will be~~ would not mean the defeat of the Government" should start something like this, and if we did that, there would be no such a thing as the defeat of the Government, or the Government having to dissolve and go to the country. Personally, I do not approve of that, and I think it should be changed. That would prevent the defeat of the Government, unless on a want-of-confidence motion, over some little Bill or clause in the Bill. We who have sat in the House for some time know the difficult situation many members are placed in when that thing is put into operation. It does not demonstrate true democracy. It does not put the average member in a true light in his own constituency, and I think it is time, in this age, that we should move on and keep abreast of the times. I certainly would be in favour of a move of that kind. A little later on I will say something more with reference to the hon. Prime Minister and the Educational Department, but, for the time being, I would like to direct my attention to the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that I know something about agriculture. I have spent my life in that vocation. I know something of the ups and downs of it. I know something of the joys of rural life, and what it holds, which possibly no other vocation has. And that, alone, may have a good deal to do with my remaining as such.

The hon. member for Peel (Hon. Mr. Kennedy), who is our Minister of Agriculture, we believe him to be — I do, and a great many others do,— a friend of agriculture, and I think that most of us were fairly well pleased when we heard that he had been appointed Minister of Agriculture. Few members of this House hold the affection of as many as the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy), and I am sure that he will have the hearty cooperation of -- I was going to say the members from this corner of the house. We have heard some members from the other corner say, "Speaking for this corner" -- well, I am wondering who is speaking for this corner. I do not know whether I am qualified to do so, or Mr. Salsberg, the hon. member from St.

Andrew, or whom, but I would say, for the members of this corner of the House, that we certainly will give the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy), our Minister of Agriculture, our support, every support we possibly can.

Some of us might have expected, after the election, that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Acres) might have been Minister of Agriculture --

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. McEWING: You know the impression that some of us have had, who sat in the House during the last Parliament, and who have heard the addresses which the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Acres) has given, and we might have expected him anywhere, from the top end of the Cabinet, right down to the bottom, because, in his addresses, he used to start at the top, and take them all in rotation, but, however, I think possibly the incident that happened at the O. A. C. might have had something to do with it. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture is well advised to keep the hon. member from Carleton (Mr. Acres) down this way just as far as he can, because if he ever gets his hands on that expensive sire that is coming over from the Old Country -- well, the Lord help him.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) has had a considerable experience in this House. If I remember correctly, he sat as Minister of Agriculture from 1930 to 1934, a very trying time. I have some rather sad recollections of that period. When I took out hogs at two dollars and eighty-five cents -- I think that was the lowest -- I do not think the Government then gave the farmers any aids, and there was a friendly Government at Ottawa at that time, and there should have been no obstacles there, but they did not seem to have come to an age when they were thinking of that. The Liberal Government, which followed them, was the first Government that I know of which went out and blazed a trail and gave material

aid to the farmers in the times of crises. There never was a time I would have appreciated aid more than I would at that particular time. I do hope that the hon. Minister will keep up the work which was started at that time.

We are living, as I said, in a new age, and we certainly expect some remedies to meet the situation.

Something has been said, that the Government of Ontario -- that there is very little they can do. I cannot say that I agree with that. It has been proven recently that Governments can do something. They cannot, it is true, be the "cure-all", but in this age of research, when there are developed so many new phases to our agriculture, there is no reason why something, through that source, cannot be done to assist in disposing of these surplusses. As the hon. member for York so fittingly said, the spoonful shall not spoil the whole tub/full

That is the trouble we are in; we have found that the surplusses seem to destroy the good we might get out of the whole crop, and I think there is hardly any crop production which we have that could not be directed into some other channel to prevent that disastrous thing which happened at that time.

The hon. minister of Agriculture is going to bring in a Bill to do something about the stockyards. I am all for it; anything that will help the situation. But I have a feeling that possibly we are only scratching on the surface. There are a lot of things happen which the farmers are annoyed about, and the fact that they happen out there has given the general impression that the stockyard is responsible for it all. That is not exactly the situation. It is a vicious method adopted by the large packing concerns, who have a monopoly on the buying at that market, and not only at that market, but it is all over Ontario.

Now, people who have not had the experience in connection with that find it difficult to appreciate just how far that thing

goes. To prove that statement, I have a report here of the Royal Commission on Price Spreads in 1937, at Ottawa, which went exhaustively into that whole thing, and here is what they give in their report, which will possibly prove the point I am trying to bring out. I quote:

> "There was uncontradicted evidence given to us by a former official of Canada Packers Limited that in Toronto it was the usual practice for this firm to arrange with Swift's before the market as to the price to be paid for the purchase of livestock."

That is not competition, at all. They got together and arranged what they will pay. Then this goes on:

> "Also, the manager of a Western stock growers' association, one of the largest ranches in Alberta, gave evidence that if a buyer gave an offer for cattle on a ranch, or on a farm, it would not be raised by any other packer buyer, either on the ranch or in the yards."

Now, if that is not monopolistic control, and unfair competition, I do not know what it is.

Personally, I know of a case where a friend of mine had four carloads of cattle. They would not give him a sufficient bid in Toronto; he could not get but one buyer to give him a bid. He waited for three days, and then that same buyer, on the third day, offered him one half a dollar less, and he could not coax any other buyer to touch it.

He loaded the four carloads up, and went to Montreal, and when he got there the buyers there bid him the same, and upon making some enquiries he found that every commission firm, every packing firm in Montreal, had received a wire telling them this firm in Toronto had bid so much on this cattle in Toronto, and not one of them would raise it there. That is

unfair competition, and that is the thing that the farmer wants stopped. The fact that they are in the yards out here has nothing to do with that, but it would not make a bit of difference whether the Government of Ontario owns those yards, or not, if we did not go any further. We might say we would get a little bit better hay, and yet we might not. Some good friend of the party might have a carload of bad hay, and have it out in the yard, if he had pull enough.

But, however, if this is the age when the Government will do anything to give us a good lead onto something else, I am all for it, but I would like to see it go much further than that. It is unfortunate that these large concerns are doing this. They have a stranglehold on the beef, or bacon, or mutton, and during the last two or three years they have been fighting desperately to get that same stranglehold on the dairy and poultry products of the farm, and when they get the/hold on all those, what has the farmer left? They squeeze him as long as it is possible.

In 1933, when I sold hogs at around three cents, the packing firms made nine million dollars. We were not getting fair treatment. That is the result of that monopolistic control.

However, I believe the hon. minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is sincere, as I said before, and he will do everything he can.

Now, a word or two with regard to lands and forests. The hon. member for Kent, East (Hon. Mr. Thompson), the Minister of Lands and Forests -- well, I have a little interest in him. He is another product of Wellington. Even the hon. Prime Minister is a product of Wellington. Well, Wellington is "some county", I will tell you that.

While Hon. Mr. Thompson may not have been born on a farm, he came there as rather a small lad, and in going to

secondary school he passed by my home, and I guess he can well remember the red brick house, which is a landmark on that concession. So I have some interest in him, and his brother, who is also a neighbour, right close to our section.

But I am sure that we were pleased, regardless of our political leanings, to see him in the position he occupies, and I even might be able, if another election comes on, to get him to come out, and give ~~him~~ me a little help, although there are no timber limits up there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the thing I am interested in is this: our county is situated, so that there are no very large areas for reforestation, and, as it is designated now, one thousand acres may be purchased by the county, and the Department will supervise and plan and so on, but there is no provision for smaller areas, except for a municipality or a township, to take on more or less an experimental plot of a few acres.

We find in our county there are a great many places where twenty-five or fifty acres could be purchased by the county, and reforestation be established.

Now, I think we should make these areas smaller than one thousand acres. It seems to me that twenty plots of fifty acres each are much more valuable in our section of the country, as far as the conservation of moisture and the rest of it is concerned -- it is much more valuable than one plot of a thousand acres. How many farmers would be reached with one plot of a thousand acres, whereas twenty plots, fifty acres each, would reach many farms, in the way of soil conservation, and I would like the hon. minister to work out some scheme where this could be provided for.

Also, in the section of Ontario in which we are, when we see them attempting to reforest a certain section a lumber company comes along and buys the farm, with twenty acres of bush

and they send in some men, and they cut every stick off it. I know bushes in there now, where the lumber firms have gone in, and in one bush in particular I believe that at least sixty per cent. of the trees are under eight inches, and they are cutting everything off. Now, those trees which are under eight inches have cost us years in our progress of reforestation. The larger stuff is all right, the stuff that is fit for mill purposes, and so on, it is all right to take it out, but I do not think we should allow all of the small stuff to be destroyed. You may say that is a difficult thing to do. I do not think it is so difficult to do, because I think we could have an Act which would be applicable to the counties, — that is, each county could put this Act into operation, and if they are desirous, in their county, where there is no live timber under a certain size which could be destroyed except under the supervision -- and I think this whole thing should be under the direction of possibly the Roads Committee, and the County Engineer, who has a fairly good knowledge of this, -- then they could give some direction where in certain cases it would be necessary to cut some small stuff, and it could be done under supervision, but in general practice these small trees should certainly be preserved, and I know of two bushes, in fact, that well onto thirty years ago, not only because the mill firm owned it, but of their own idea they did not cut anything under about six or eight inches, but they took everything else. To-day there is a splendid bush there.

And on another farm, the man sold everything over ten inches, and he stayed in the busy when they cut it, and there is a splendid bush on that farm to-day, while, if they destroy all these trees, they then have to go out and spend money, and wait for years to develop the bush.

I know that the average individual business is not interested in that long-term period of reforestation, waiting

for those bushes to grow again, and the policy which we have should be sufficiently long-termed to take care of that, and I hope this situation will be considered, and something will be done along that line.

Now, I will come back to the Premier as Minister of Education. Under his election promises, naturally we expect something is going to happen, that there is going to be some change, but just what it is, we do not know. It seems to me that we have learned some lessons during this war that we could apply, and we must come to a realization that our education in the past has certainly not been for the betterment of rural Ontario.

I was hopeful, with the new text books, that the writers would be men who had a sympathetic feeling and knowledge of rural conditions, so that they could picture in those text books the things which would interest the youth in agriculture.

If I remember right, when I first went to school there were very few pieces in the text books we had. One of them, I think, was headed "When I am a Man", and I think that so many youths have received inspiration from that, that they wanted to do a job, and do it well, "when they were men", and there have been ~~none~~ some of those things deleted later from our text books, and there is very little in our text books now to give the youths a picture of the better side of rural life.

What does the youth in the urban centres know about it? There is nothing in the text books to tell him about it, and they come out to the country, and are absolutely ignorant of what happens in the country, and I think, for their benefit, we might get a lot of recruits from the cities if we had something of that sort, and I hope there will be some change in that respect.

It was said, in a statement made a while ago, that there should be more time for religion. This is rather a debatable

question, when it is put in that light. I would appeal to the hon. minister to give it a little different approach. Let us have "more time for teaching Christianity". When we discuss religion, we get -- well, it seems to me there are so many religions in the world, but there is only one Christianity, and these fundamental principles should be taught, and taught in the schools. The Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments should be taught, so the children will know something about them. I will say something, in a minute or two, about that, but when speaking about religion and Christianity, well, a week or two weeks ago a certain individual in the city of Toronto published some advertisements in the paper saying that he was going to hold a mass meeting, and he was going to discuss education. He invited the members of the House to come and hear him. I guess most of the members of this House must know him. I had never heard him, and had never seen him. This gentleman was Dr. Shields, and I wanted to hear him. I was not the only member in this House who was there, but I will let them speak for themselves.

I went down to hear him. I had never seen nor heard him before, but, to my mind, Dr. Shields does not teach Christianity, as I believe it. If we had an Ontario or a Canada full of Dr. Shields, we would never have a united Canada. He teaches sectional religion, I will grant you that, call it "sectionalism", or whatever you like. We have got so many isms now-a-days, communism, Facism, and all the rest of them, and I think history has proved that all he is teaching is a sectional religion. What I want taught in our schools is Christianity, and, to my mind, he is not teaching it. We have a lot of teachers. The complaint is made that you cannot teach these things in the schools, because a lot of the teachers cannot teach them. I do not think we should have teachers — I do not think we should have professors in colleges — who have not some Christianity. When the atheist and the communist, and those people, can get into our colleges,

and poison the minds of our youth, what do we expect in years later? I would not have one of those. I say in our primary schools we can easily give plenty of time to teaching Christianity, the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, which are the bases of all laws, and we should follow that up with a general knowledge of our every-day laws to our youth.

You will say, "Well, we have not time to teach all these". What we are trying to teach to-day, from six to twelve years, we should be teaching from six to fifteen. We are chasing our youth into adult life too fast, and our youth has little knowledge of the laws which govern our country. The result is we have a great deal of juvenile delinquency, and we wonder what is the reason for it, and the old statement that has been made many a time in courts, when a man possibly is giving evidence that "he did not know the law", is replied to by "Ignorance of the law excuses no man"; his ignorance of Law excuses for no one the right to apply that Law to-day to the youth, whom we have never taught anything about the Laws of our country. We are in too big a hurry. We dump them out into the world, and let them find out for themselves, and in many cases they land up in jail, and we wonder why.

I claim it is through education -- that has a good deal to do with it.

I think during that period we can teach a lot of health in our schools, so that the youth will know the body which God gave him, and what its purposes are, and when they come to adult age they have a fair chance of having a reasonable span of life with a healthy body.

But we just take it for granted they will come along, and be all right. When they get to be sixteen -- from fifteen to eighteen -- I think it is the grandest opportunity that this province has to make the contribution to our youth. We have been shown, during the war time, that these youth training schools have done a magnificent job, and I do not see why they cannot

be continued right along. Through the war we have given free instruction, and we pay nine dollars a week and incidentals to these young men; why should we not do that in peace time? The youth is the greatest asset that Ontario has, or Canada has, and we should not spare any money to make them the best we possibly can in this day, when we have no trades or professions — no blacksmiths, or anything of that kind, — why should not these courses be available to every youth? In the city, here, they have the vocational trade schools, but these are not available to the youth of the rural communities, unless he pays his own expenses, leaves home and comes here and lives for a while. These should be made available for the rural communities, and if those schools can be established over the province, where the boys can get a business course — and I think a business course is essential, because farming is a business, and we should recognize it — where they can get a mechanical course, soil survey, crop improvement, animal husbandry, and many other things to prepare and fit them for life's vocation.

There is plenty for them to do from the time they are fifteen until they reach the age of about eighteen years.

Then, you should take the girls, and I think there should be a school developed for their advantage along the same lines, from business courses on, so that the young ladies will be in a position to take their places, and the two of them together, the boys and the girls, can raise a higher standard of life in our rural Ontario, and there will be more attractions, because they have the qualifications to do it.

At the present time we are putting men onto the farms with little or no training. The plan I have suggested would certainly lead to better citizenship, and, as I said before, the training of the youth is the greatest asset we have.

Now, there is only one more thing I will touch upon. I would like to say a word or two with regard to our official

opposition, known as the "C. C. F.". This is a new phase in our political history, and there are some things which have been rather amusing to me since I have sat in this House this session. One thing is their attempt to speak for and advise agriculture. Now, I say that outside of possibly three members in that group, as far as I know -- and those three members include the two lady members -- as far as I know, only these three members have some qualifications to speak for agriculture, because of their background, their training and their knowledge of agriculture. Outside of that, to whom can I go in that group to consult about agriculture, and get any advice on agricultural problems?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Lots of us.

MR. McEWING: Well, perhaps so, but I do not see very many hands showing. That proves my contention.

MR. WISMER (Riverdale): It is quality you want, not quantity.

MR. McEWING: Now, I am an agriculturist, and I pretend to speak for agriculture, and on behalf of agriculture, and I am not speaking for Labour, because of the very obvious fact that I do not know anything about it, and another thing is that we have nineteen Labour Unionists in this House in that group, and I tnink that speaks volumes. I am not speaking for Labour, as far as that goes, and I cannot see that they have the interest entirely at heart for agriculture. For example, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams), speaking the other night, in his address spoke about certain things that they did not want to see happen again, and amongst them was such an example as the Campbell Soup strike.

Now, when these people staged a "sit-down strike", when the farmers' tomatoes were ready to rot in the fields, I do not consider their interest was toward agriculture, at all, when they objected to the Government's stepping in and seeing

that the farmers came in to process their own stuff. They were not speaking for agriculture; their interests were not agricultural, at all.

And there are many things somewhat similar to that. I know they are striving for a higher standard of living. So are we all, but we should not forget that there are other groups which have some rights, and I would like that group to know that somebody else has a yardstick to measure right and wrong besides the one they are using.

There is one thing I do not see. I do not see why every man shoulddemand a certain wage, regardless of his efficiency. We feel that the standard ought to be what service that man can give - that is, a man ought to give one hundred per cent. service for the money he receives, and not regimentate everything and put them all alike. If I bought a bushel of apples at so much money, and they were supposed to be good apples, and I found a few wormy ones in them, I do not think anybody could object if I threw them out. Why should an employer of labour be denied the same right?

If we are going to have groups in this House, I am all for a farm Bloc, and I think if we had a farm Bloc, we would see two or three out of that group in the farm Bloc before very long.

MR. MILLARD (York, West): We have a farm Bloc here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. McEWING: Well, it does not resemble a farm Bloc, very much, to me. I do not blame Labour for objecting, and I think they have reason to object, but I want to paint a picture to you that might illustrate what I mean.

In my mind's eye, I see in Canada or Ontario an economic table, around which we are all sitting, and which has all the good things of Ontario upon it for everyone. But, as I look at this table, it seems to me that I see up at the head of the table some men who are at the heads of large industries, packing

houses, grain brokers, combines, and such-like, and on down this table I see organized Labour, and down at the bottom I see the farmers, and when those good things are passed around, by the time they get down to the farmers, all they can do is lick the plate — and yet they produce the stuff that is on the table. And it kind of hurts a little, because when I look up at that table it seems to me I see Mr. J. S. McLean sitting right at the top, eating some of the bacon. I have heard men say, "This is an economic ladder which we have got." Well, I do not like to term it a "ladder", because if ever a collapse comes to this ladder I would be afraid that Mr. J. S. McLean would fall down upon me, and I would be just a grease spot at the bottom of the ladder, so I like to refer to it as a "table".

Now, if your problems are so closely allied to Agriculture, and you say you are an agricultural Bloc over there -- well, I want to point out the difference, and I want to ask a question of that group. Take, for instance, the hours of labour. It is not many years ago that we heard talk of a sixty-hour week, and then it was forty-eight hours, and then it was forty-four hours, and now it is forty hours, and I heard something the other day about -- what was it -- thirty hours?

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): It was a Progressive Conservative who suggested that.

MR. McEWING: But, remember, on the other side of this House, that while you are coming down this scale of hours, and demanding the same wage, the farmer and his wife are working seventy-five hours, and you are not doing anything about it, and you will never get equality along that line. Tell me what comforts a farmer has as compared with the urban dweller, and what does he get? Well, in the financial post, you may find the answer. Here is the comparison: twelve and one half per cent. of the homes have furnaces; twenty per cent. have electric lights; seven per cent. have bath tubs and running water; four per cent.

have electric refrigerators, and four per cent. have vacuum cleaners. How does that compare with the average urban dweller? What I ask is this, that organized Labour wait a little, think a little of the farmer, so that we can catch up, and then together we will move up this economic table, and get the good things that belong to us.

But you will have to wait for us, or help us to catch up.

Now, I am not going to say very much more to you, and I will close in a moment. There is, however, one more thing I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and possibly it was brought to my mind vividly the other night when I sat listening to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams). I believe there is a rule in the Ottawa house that speeches by the hon. members, outside of the leaders of the groups, shall not be longer than forty minutes.

(Page No. 608 follows.)

I left this to the last to see that I would not be over forty minutes. I think that we ought to adopt a rule in this house that speeches should not be over forty minutes.

A. HON. MEMBER: An example.

MR. McEWING: I think a person can say all they want to say--unless it be a lawyer--in forty minutes if it is worth saying, and I hope that thehouse takes this seriously and I think we would all abide by it. I may trespass on it five minutes, I don't know, but I think the house would save and we would save a lot of valuable time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK (Wellington, South): Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late, but fortunately for me my good friend, the hon. member for Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing) stimulated my thinking and I did not know that I had such a good neighbour in that part of the world. As you all know, or most of you know, I am from Wellington, South. This is rather a happy coincidence that I follow the member from Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing) and he has said many things with which I entirely agree, though some of it, of course, I reserve judgment on, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in the future I am going to get along pretty well with the member for Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing).

I would like to congratulate, of course, every one of those who have already spoken in this Debate, but I trust that in the interest of proceeding with all due speed with the Debate you will pardon me if I just refer to those who have particularly impressed me.

First of all, the hon. member for Stormont, (Mr. McDonald) the seconder of the motion, I must say that I thoroughly enjoyed all that he had to say and would also like to get to know him better. Those of us who are new in the house possibly get the greatest thrill out of hearing those older members of the legislature whom we have read about but have not had the privilege of meeting. In this

respect the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) were specially interesting to me and their message and their attitude towards the questions of the day actually intrigued me.

But of all those who have spoken--and there have been some good speeches--of all those who have spoken and of the message which they have left with the house, I think perhaps the appeal or the plea of the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) for the new Canadians impressed me most. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be included in that great company. I was born in south-east of England and my good mother still lives there, not far from the white cliffs of Dover, and is still taking an active interest in affairs and has come safely through so far this second great war.

I would like to reassure the hon. member for Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing) that I am not going to make an agricultural speech. I would like, however, Mr. Speaker, to deal with a subject which has so far not been dealt with in the house and to which I may humbly claim some qualifications to speak, though it is too great a subject for the study which I have given it, and that is the subject of the conservation of our natural resources. Now, this is a subject, as you all know, which covers a wide field--not only on the earth, but all that is under the earth to be mined etc., and this is so great a subject that I wish especially to-night to deal with a very important phase of that subject, and that is the first six inches of the top soil and everything above it.

Now, in this respect the hon. minister of agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has received quite a number of felicitations and congratulations. He is not in his seat to-night but I would like to pass on to his staff, possibly through one or other of the ministers of the government benches, my appreciation for the visit of Dr. Bennett, a great American, who visited this country and was the chief guest speaker of the Agricultural Society and Crop Improvement Convention. I had the privilege of meeting Dr. Bennett and, as I say, I do want to thank the government for bringing him to this country because I think he was probably one of the finest speakers and the most opportune, Mr. Speaker, that has been brought here for many years. He is the head of what is known in the United States as the "Soil Conservation Service," "Federal Soil Conservation Service". That is a great work which has been started for some years and has achieved really good things in the

country to the south.

I would also like to express appreciation--and this, by the way is not connected with the government, but I would like to express appreciation of the effort of those organizations of Scientists, Naturalists, Forresters and Engineers who were represented in what was known as the Guelph Conference.

This Conference was held in Guelph in February, 1942. The Conference met to come to some sort of general conclusion as to what should best be done in connection with the conservation of the soil. As a result of their deliberations the Conference came to certain inescapable conclusions, and recommendations, for an overall conservation program, but to date these recommendations have not been acted upon in any adequate way.

The subject, as I say, that they dealt with was the subject of the treatment of the first six inches of top soil and everything about it. The soil is our greatest natural resource. It is our basic national heritage from which all life springs. What we do in regard to the soil in our time will depend the health and well-being of our children. On what we do to-day will depend whether future Canadians will live among green and well-watered hills and valleys, or whether this great land will have returned to rocks and desert wastes.

Now, what is the picture at present? We have literally mined our land. We have drained off every possible swamp area. Some might think this is a good thing but in the United States in certain cases the Conservation Service has actually had to undo the great drainage project in the interest of bringing back natural waters. We have lowered our water tables and dried up our springs and wells. We have reduced our tree acreage in Southern Ontario to below the danger point of 15%. Now, this policy has eroded vast amounts of top soil annually into our streams and lakes. Not only that, but we have upset the balance of nature. We have spoiled the nesting place of birds and we have created conditions for encouraging floods.

I might at this juncture just illustrate in the words of a great Scottish poet whom we all love and admire, Bobbie Burns. Bobbie Burns when he was ploughing turned up a little wee mousie and he caught the little mousie and patted it and talked to it, and these are the words of Bobbie Burns:

"Wee, sleekit, cowrin', tim'rous beastie,
Oh, what a panic's in thy breastie,
Thou needna start awa' say hasty
Wi bickering brattle,
I wad be laith to rin and chase thee
Wi murdering pattle.

I'm truly sorry man's dominion
Has broken nature's social union
And justifies that ill opinion
Which makes thee startle,
At me, thy poor earth-born companion,
And fellow mortal!"

Now, that is the position, I think, in regard to the whole question of conservation. We have gone in with modern machinery; we have thought about how to make quick profits. We have done this in agriculture in exactly the same way we have done it in forestry, the idea of getting rich quick and with no concern for the replacement that is necessary for the future.

Now, all this is being done in the name of progress, a word which we use a great deal nowadays and one might well ask, progress towards what? It seems to me somehow that a man has to be schooled first before he can be wise. Many of us may have had experience at some time of working and clearing and breaking new land. Possibly the member for Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing) may not concur with me, but I have, Mr. Speaker had that experience. You know that soft litter of decayed leaves and twigs and grass which covers the ground sometimes inches deep. We call it woodland soil and the foresters call it the "forest floor". The scientists call it organic matter or humus. But whatever namewe call it, the thing I want to say is, we should know its great value and function. Whereas clean sand, for example, can hold 50% of its own weight in water, that forest floor, that layer of top soil or woodland soil, made up almost entirely of decaying vegetable matter, can hold four or five times its weight in water. It is like a

sponge. When this material is abundant over all surfaces of the land, think of its enormous retentive power which it holds.

That was the situation before we cleared the land. There was practically no erosion. There was a steady feeding in springs and pools from this great reservoir, this great sponge which absorbed the rainfall and kept the water and soil from washing into the streams and lakes.

Now, the financial aspects of this question, six inches of top soil, may interest the house. Here are some figures from an experiment with woodland soil in Georgia. The cost of fertilizer in 1935 prices washed from one acre of woodland soil in one year--was only five cents. The cost of the plant foods which were washed from a similar acre, that is in the same region of bare soil, in one year was $59.15. The same areas were tested for soil erosion. The woodland soil in one year lost only 115 lbs., or rather, an area nearby of bare soil in one year--that is fallowed and without humus in it---lost 112,000 lbs. of soil.

Now, this, Mr. Speaker, is washing away wealth. It is possible as real estate that the lands may not be worth very little more than the plant foods which leach out of its soil in one year.

What are we to do about it? That is the point. I have said that the greatest natural resource of the country is the first six inches of top soil and everything about it. All our food, all our clothing, and much of our means of shelter are dependent upon it. Where forests or well-developed natural vegetation exist, there is no danger of losing this great resource. It is in the great agricultural areas of Southern Ontario which need help and need it quickly. Good farmers know these things. I am not trying to tell farmers anything---they know it just as well as I do. The difficulty is that the economic pressure forces them to get an income from their lands when they would fain leave it to get a rest and farmers, too, are dependent on the type of implements they get.

In the United States they have already developed plowing methods which do not turn in stubble but leave it on top and

the stubble in part stops erosion from wind and rain. How can we counter-act it? The Conservation Service of the United States has instituted one of the greatest single changes in farming methods for many a year and that is known as contour plowing, or strip farming, which means that the hills are never plowed up and down, they are always plowed along the side of the hill and those who may have been fortunate enough to see photographs of this plowing and this cultivation will appreciate that if you plow along the contour--that is scientific contour laid out to plow to start with--if you plow along the contour and continue to plow the whole hillside along the contour, there is practically no run off. That is, the entire rainfall is held in the contour. Not only do they plow in contour, but they plant crops along the contour and they scuffle corn and potatoes in the same manner. Now, what is the result of this changed method? They have increased the yields where this conservation practice has been carried out, they have increased yields 20% and that is not counting the increased which they have gotten from the use of better seed or fertilizer.

Now, to illustrate that question of contour plowing. Just listen to this story from the south of the United States. Some conservation men went into the south and talked to the poor farmers--and I might say here that where you have poor land, you sure have poor farmers because if your natural resource is wasted there is no chance whatever that you can have wealth in it--and they went into this poor farming region in the south. The men said, "We are poor. How can we pay for engineers with instruments to come and make new layouts for our farms? How do you suppose we can change from the way we have always done?" One of the government men replied: "You can find an empty bottle, can't you?" "Yes." "Well, fill it with water. Leave a little space for an air bubble at the top and cork it up." "No sooner said than done." "Now, get a couple of forked sticks and balance the bottle horizontally until the bubble stays half-way between the two

ends of the bottle. There you are !" Just in the same way as any spirit level. "Now sight along the bottle and lay out a course of stakes for the plowman to follow." I hope you have followed me. In other words, the poor farmers of the South did not even have to buy a spirit level to start conservation farming. Thus simply, thus easily, was the change made over in those distress areas of the hilly lands in the South.

Now, this Conservation Service helped farmers in other ways. It has increased the natural water control, brought the benefit of improved springs and wood lots have been established in the most logical positions.

Another thing they have found out. I am a worker on the land, anyway, so I must say I should be included among the farmers. Now, I know and you all know who are farmers that you cannot get a crop within 15 or 20 feet of wood lot. That is, the roots of the trees run out into the field and it is practically useless to plow to the end of the forest. Now, what have they got in the United States? They have found a certain type of legumes and bush growths which encouraged the game and not only encouraged the game, but there is one which provides a very fine crop of honey, and in this one strip alone, I studied, utilizing a piece of land that could not be used for crops--they have increased the benefits to the country from wild life, they have improved the chances for larger honey production, and furthermore, they have made the country more beautiful.

Now, Dr. Bennett--I am referring to him so much, but as I say, his visit was so important I think the house should know about it--he said, "We used to talk about 'idle lands'. There were 33 million acres of odd corners in the United States. We now know there is no such thing as idle or useless land. It can be used for encouragement of wild life and beautification, and every foot should have a meaning."

I believe in that as a landscape designer, I believe that the earth should be not only useful but beautiful.

I will tell you in the depression times, when so many men were out of work and I could not conceive of a young country

like this with a possibility of supporting 50 million people and right near my home in Lakeview there were people who would have given their eye teeth to go to work and approached municipalities for work rather than relief and they could not do it. If we had anything like they have in the United States this could have been done. Not only could we have put the men to work, but actually our soil and our general agricultural outlook, general community outlook, would have been vastly better.

Now, perhaps I may be allowed to refer to my personal, or to make a personal reference in this paper to China. I was for four years resident in that country and perhaps because I met my wife there may be a reason why the recollection of that country is rather vivid. I must say that I greatly enjoyed living among those people and learning their old, ancient ways, understanding them, and perhaps it might be of interest to the house to hear how they have learned to do things there. I know that the economy of China does not compare with ours, and it is ancient. But then, you see in Europe they had to learn their lesson. If we could farm in this country like they farm in Europe and if we could have a conservation programme--if we could put back on the soil as much as we take off it, we would have better farming conditions too.

(Page 616 follows).

In China, poor though they be, they have learned to make running water walk. Now, that is an important thing. There is too much running water in this country. It should walk; it should go slowly, as it did in nature, before we cleared the land. Now, how do they make running water walk? Nearly every piece of agricultural land has the water drawn from it, and it feeds into some small pond or pool, and from that small pone or pool it overflows into another pone or pool, and so on into greater ponds, or greater lakes, until it finally reaches the rivers. Now, these people understand the value of natural water conservation; they understand the value of natural water control, that water is very useful to them. I do not expect we will ever come to the stage where we will have to take it out in the way the Chinese coolies do; I am sure we will not, because modern science has now come in, and every one of these little pools and larger pools is filled with carp, and they take care of those fish, and when drought comes to the pools, and appears about ready to dry them up, they remove the fish, and sell the large ones, and the little ones they take down to the lower levels, where they can get water, and after the pond dries up you see a very strange thing -- strange, that is, to us. The whole community gets together, and where there is a big pond or pool, they go in there with their bamboo poles, or baskets, and they pick out all that black silt which is in the pond, sometimes to a depth of six to eight inches. Of course, they do not do that every year; they do it in certain drought periods, and they tow that earth back onto good Mother Earth, and their land is enriched thereby.

You might say that is what these folk do in ancient countries, but that is exactly what the soil conservation service has done in the United States. After the new economic system came in, under Roosevelt, when they made these large

funds available for those who were unemployed, they put a great many men to work in the Three C's Camps, and they imitated this great practice of ancient China. They took out of the reservoirs and catch basins and river channels sixty-four million cubic yards of silt, and put it back on the land, where it originally came from.

Now, possibly some of you would think "This is not a question for this House", but I think it is one of the most vital things which we need to attend to in this country - that is, to see to it that these erosions should be progressively stopped.

Now, I do not wish to suggest that nothing has been done in Ontario. A great deal has been thought, and a great deal has been said about what should be done, and some things have been done.

Now, the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) referred to sewage getting into the rivers, and lakes. There was a project brought about a few years ago — some of you know about it -- called the "Grand River Project", near and around Galt, and my good friends from the House, who come from that vicinity know all about that. They spent a great deal of money making a big dam, known as the Shan Dam, and one of the chief reasons for putting on that project was this very thing which the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) spoke about. The Grand River was so lacking in flow of water in the middle of the summer that the sewage just laid in the river and became a nuisance for the community, and they said, "If we can put in this big dam, we will get a stronger flow of water through the Grand River Valley during the summer, and we will not have this public nuisance of the sewage. Of course, I am for that. I am for getting rid of sewage, but not by the old Hercules method of knocking a hole in the water, and letting it wash out. I am for not putting it into the rivers and

lakes, at all, and I think we all are when we give the matter any thought.

But, not only have we done that, but there is one thing about the Grand River Project which perhaps I should mention: they have found out in the United States that some of their fine reservoirs, which they built at a cost of a great amount of money, have become, in the course of time, almost filled to the top with silt, and became almost virtuously useless because proper conservation methods were not practiced. Now, the Grand River Dam is a fine thing. I do not wish to detract from what is being done with it, but unless they practice soil conservation methods to a nicety above the dam, there will be, in the course of time, a lot of soil carried down.

Now, no doubt we will hear from the hon. minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) about the Ganarska Project. You will pardon my telling the House something about this important thing. This project was inspired by the fact that Port Hope was very seriously flooded a few years ago, which allowed the water to overflow. They have surveyed the Ganarska River Valley at the watershed which feeds it, and a very constructive piece of reservoir work has been done in regard to mapping out the area and making certain recommendations as to what shall be done there.

Now, this is a very fine thing, and the point I wish to make is this, although nothing has been done, as yet, on that project: what we should have, and what we need, and urgently need, is such a scheme, or, rather, such research and such planning, not only for the little Ganarska River Valley, but for the whole of Ontario.

Now, I would like to say something about education and conservation. We need special training in this subject in our public schools. So far as I know, there is no such training. The lighting of grass fires by children and irresponsible

people is something which is causing us a great deal of annoyance in Southern Ontario, in areas relatively highly populated. However, it is a hang-over from pioneer days, when people had to burn the stuff off their land to enable them to get the land cleared. But, somehow or other, tradition is a strong thing in all of us, and when spring comes, the farmers like to do a bit of grass burning to clean up the fence rows. That is all right, as far as it goes, but we should educate our children that it is fundamentally a bad practice, this burhing of the grass. You never see such a thing in Europe, or any of the older countries, and it should not occur here. I know the Fire Chief of Cooksville has all kinds of trouble going around and putting out grass fires, and even homes burning, and I have seen rows of fences all ablaze at the base, in dry weather. I believe we should have legislation covering the need for permits. I believe they have those permits in Northern Ontario, and I think it should be applied all over the province, even though it may offend a few farmers who may think this is an undue infringement of their liberties. I think we should have some legislation sufficient to act as a deterrent; at least, we should put on a strong educational programme to offset that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be pardoned for referring to the Ontarion Agricultural College, of which I am a graduate, and was for six years an elector there. The work of the Ontario Agricultural College ties in very closely with this whole question of soil conservation, but what it needs is a course in this very special subject, totrain young men and young women to be able to go out and do missionary work, if you like to put it that way, all over Ontario.

Now, we have been informed that the buildings of the Ontario Agricultural College will soon be returned to the

province. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members of Government, that what is needed more than the return of the buildings is a thorough reorganization of the work of the Ontario Agricultural College, and that is not said in any sense of criticism of the staff. This college was set up for this purpose, and from my experience there, we are losing out. We are not keeping step with the advance of the times, and we need to bring our higher educational work up to date. I will not say more. I will be glad, at any time, to serve in any way, to help the O. A. C., in order that it may better solve the problems of Ontario in the future. I have a great love for that institution. I would like to see it, Mr. Speaker, not just a Government College, but an institution that is serving to the fullest capacity the farmers of Ontario, and, in order that that may come about, I feel, personally, very strongly that the Ontario Agricultural College should be a farmer-owned college.

Now, I have spoken about the need for a better scientific approach, and in this respect I have said a good deal, too, about soil conservation, because I feel that the house should know what is needed, and I would like to now deal with the Department of Planning and Development which has been promised.

We warmly welcomed the decision of the Government to set up this new Department. I heartily agree with its purpose and with those who have stated that the establishment of this Department should be a job for a full-time Minister, and may I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the soil conservation service, such as exists in the United States, be a major part of its activities.

This new Department will be starting with a clean slate, without any hampering traditions, and here is a splendid chance to use competent scientists to the utmost.

The Department is already planned, and should not be a

dumping ground for a thousand unrelated schemes. There should be a blueprint, and let me stress again that I know of no work of more lasting or permanent benefit to the country as a whole than the reclammation or conservation of the soil anywhere that it is in danger of being washed away to the sea.

On this policy and this programme we can all unite. We are all agreed, I think, as to what should be done with vital and most important natural resource. Regardless of who owns the land, we all depend upon it for our substance, and we should love to lavish all our efforts on the good earth from which we sprang.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and I thank the House for listening to this rather technical subject, and I would like to say to the hon. members of the Government that anything I can do to promote the work that I have outlined I will only be too glad to do. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Goodfellow (Northumberland) moves the adjournment of the debate. Shall the motion be carried?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do now move the adjournment of the House.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Would the hon. Prime Minister advise us as to the business for tomorrow?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): We will proceed, first, with one or two second readings, and then go ahead with the debate on the speech from the Throne, and continue on tomorrow evening. I think we should try and finish this debate very soon, as we are now getting into the third week.

And I might say, without interrupting the speaker, that I think perhaps a lot of us would welcome that forty-minute

limitation, if anybody takes it seriously.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the House do now adjourn. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until three of the clock in the afternoon tomorrow.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Speaker: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 9th, 1944.

The House met at three o'clock.

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. THOMAS N. DUFF (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Kennedy), an article appearing in the "London Free Press" March 1st, headed "Province soon may drop subsidy on hogs".

I am interested in this, as is every farmer in the province, and I would like to know if there is any foundation for this article. I take it this paper is very friendly to the Government, and it possibly may have a "low-down" on it.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I, of course, recognize that all but perhaps one or two papers are very friendly to the Government, but

that, in itself, gives no special weight to the comment.

I would only say the hon. minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) happens to be home with a cold to-day. I am hopeful he will be here tomorrow, and, as it affects his department, and can be answered more effectively by him, I would request that the answer to the question be deferred until tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKERS: Order of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): First Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third readings: First Order. Third reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act", Mr. Challies.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: In Mr. Challies absence, Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frost moves third reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Before calling the next Order, perhaps it might be possible to get an indication from the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Nixon); the next is a Bill we are rather anxious to get ahead with, a bill in regard to sugar beet subsidies, which we went into rather fully on second reading, and if the hon. members can indicate that there will be not a great deal of discussion, it might proceed through committee to-day, even though the Minister of Agriculture is not here.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: That is okay.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Is that satis-

factory?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Bills.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 44, " An Act to Amend the Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944," Mr. Kennedy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 44, "An Act to Amend the Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944". Shall Section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 42, "An Act to Amend the Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 42, "An Act to Amend the Power Commission Act". Shall Section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the Bill?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, with regard to Section 2, subject to the comment of the Commissioner, I would be prepared to withdraw the words "has become unfit to

continue in office", because I think the observations made by the member for York, West (Mr. Millard), were very proper, and it is effectively covered by the words "Is incapable of performaing his duties", so I would move the deletion of the words in sub-section 8 of Section 2, "has become unfit to continuein office".

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Drew moves the deletion of the words "has become unfit to continue in office", in sub-section 8 of Section 2. Shall the amendment carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2, as amended, form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 6 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order. House in Committee on Bill 47, "An Act Respecting the Ontario Research Foundation", Mr. Drew.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 47, "An Act Respecting the Ontario Research Foundation". Shall Section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 form part of the Bill?

MR. LESLIE HANCOCK: (Wellington, South) Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he would inform me as to the relationship of sub-sections "A" and "B" of Section 3 -- just what is in the mind of the Government with regard to the relationship of this Research Foundation with the new Department of Planning and Development. The wording, as I understand it, is somewhat ambiguous there, and I would like a little clarification as to what relationship the Foundation would have to the new Department of Planning and Development.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Simply, Mr. Chairman, as I explained before, the Ontario Research Foundation is available at all times to the Department of Planning and Development, if there is any research the Department of Planning and Development should wish to initiate, under the usual terms between the Research Foundation and the Department. These, of course, are simply the powers that are being conferred upon the Foundation and the Governors who will administer the Foundation.

As you notice, these particular powers cover the very field of research that the Department, itself, will be interested in, and one of the most important ones.

This merely is extending the powers to cover every field of research in which we feel the Government, as a whole, and the people are interested in, because we cannot designate in which particular Department there may be overlapping of interests. For instance, the Department of Planning and Development may make a request for research into a soil conservation, which the hon. member for Wellington, South (Mr. Hancock), spoke about last night, and other matters of that kind. The very same subject might come up at the initiation of the Department of Agriculture, or even the Department of Municipal Affairs. So it may be taken that any powers conferred on the Research

Foundation are powers which can be exercised at the request of any Department of Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 3 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 4 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 5 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 6 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 7 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 8 form part of the Bill? Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 9 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just a question about Section 9: Is there any particular reason why it is not proposed to pay any remuneration to members of the Board? What I have in mind is that there might possibly be some persons who would be of value as a member of the Board, but who might not be able to accept appointments if they were not compensated in some way. I am not quarrelling with the Section, but I am wondering what the Government's attitude is.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Actually, it follows the same practice that has been followed before with the idea as distinguished between the Board together with the staff, which might be a permanent staff or a special staff engaged there, and there are perhaps good reasons for not putting it on the basis of compensation, but rather having it on the basis of independent contributions of effort, and with the provision that expenses can be paid, and I would feel that that term could be liberally interpreted as involving expenses not merely of travelling, but such expenses as

would be incurred by the withdrawal from some other occupation for the time being.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: As long as it is not too liberal.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): We will not make it too liberal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 9 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 10 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 11 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 12 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 13 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 14 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 15 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 16 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 17 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 18 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 19 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 20 form part of the Bill?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I suppose the report will be made public?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Yes; these reports are public, except -- I mean, I should possibly put this reserva-

tion in, that there might conceivably be some matter of such secrecy, as has happened during the war, where reports would be giving information to the enemy. Subject to that, all reports are public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 20 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 21 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 22 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 23 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 24 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): May I ask the hon. Prime Minister if there is any particular reason why the Act comes in by proclammation instead of in the ordinary course of events?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): The only possible reason for that was to make the actual operation of the Bill coincide with the arrangements being made for the transfer of the affairs of the Foundation, from the present structure to the new Board.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: And the appointment of the Board?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): And the appointment of the Board, yes. There is a legal problem involved in the actual transfer of the assets from the existing foundation to the new Board, and it was felt it should be made to coincide, so that the proclammation would coincide with the appointment of the Board in handing over the assets.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee now rise, and report

certain Bills

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Drew moves the Committee now rise, and report certain Bills. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole House begs leave to report one Bill with amendments, and two Bills without amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the whole House reports certain bills, one Bill with amendments, and two Bills without amendments. Is it the pleasure of the House that the Report be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; second reading of Bill No. 48, "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act", Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of Bill No. 48, being an Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, I do not feel that I need to make any prolonged explanation. The amending section really speaks for itself.

As I stated to the House previously, this amendment is being offered by the Government at the request of the Department of National Defence, to enable all commissioned officers to take affidavits, instead of officers of the rank of major and up. That is all I think I need to say about it. I move, therefore, the second reading of Bill No. 48, being an Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves a second reading of Bill No. 48, being an Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the Motion for the Consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the Session, Mr. Drew.

MR. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in joining with the other speakers who have preceded me in expressing the confidence which I have in you, and your ability to carry on the duties of the honourable and important office which you now occupy.

I am sure, from your long service with the city of Toronto, and in the larger field of the provincial politics, as well as many other very worthy public services to which you have given so much of your time, it was quite fitting that your services should be recognized, not only by your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly, but also by the decoration which you received some time ago.

As a matter of fact, this is my maiden speech in the House, and it may be my last one — that remains to be seen — but last night I had decided not to make a speech. Since then I thought possibly I might be able to make some little contribution to this debate, inasmuch as the ground has been fairly well covered.

The agricultural members of this House seem to predominate. As a matter of fact, from the speakers I have listened to, I would say that about seventy-five per cent. of the members must be farmers, from the knowledge which they seem to have of agricultural problems.

Last night, when one of the members suggested that the length of speeches be limited in this House, I was thinking it might be a good idea if he had cut them out entirely, as

far as I am concerned.

However, I am just an ordinary back-concession farmer, who has tried to take a interest in the public welfare over a period of years, as well as trying to operate my business as a farmer.

The reason I am here in this House to-day, a s the member for Northumberland, is not because I had any use for petty, party politics, but it was simply because I believe in the two-party system of Government, providing those parties are progressive and trying to carry on the general welfare of the whole public.

I also must say that in coming into politics I was prompted by a great faith which I have in the present leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of the Province of Ontario, our present Prmier.

I like that name "Progressive Conservative". It fits in very well with me. I am not one of the old Tories, although I must say that my grandfather was, but being one of the younger generation, I like that word "progressive", and I think in these times we can well use it to advantage, because in these changing and serious times, we must keep up with the times by being progressive in our legislation.

And I also like that word "conservative", because I think there is danger that possibly we can overstep the mark, and go too much on wild goose chases in these times, as well as any other times. I think we must watch the extremes both ways.

One thing that impressed me in this House was this: I must say it has been a pleasure to me to notice the apparent cooperation which exists between all parties of the House, and in my opinion that is as it should be. I think there is no room for any petty, political quibbling at this time, when there are so many serious matters confronting us as a nation.

It is true that I am a farmer, and I think possibly that

is one of the reasons why it was not difficult to be elected, because even the urban people in my riding realize that unless the farmer people are enjoying a certain degree of prosperity, then they are not enjoying prosperity, either.

I am pleased to see so many different professions and avocations represented in this House. I think that is important. I think it goes for good Government, that there should be representatives from Industry, Labour, Agriculture, Tradesmen and Professional Men. I think all are necessary; it should not be, in my opinion, the attitude of any one group to try and keep apart; we should all try and work together for the common welfare.

I think it is the duty of Governments to give general direction, and to give legislation which is in the interest of the welfare of the majority of the people.

(Page 635 follows)

My own opinion is, judging from experience I have had in municipal affairs, that there seems to be a tendancy for too much domination from higher up governments; and I think we could well free the decentralization of a great deal of power, and give it back to the municipalities, where, I believe, we get the most efficient government we have in the province of Ontario.

It is regretable to see what in my own case I saw when I came to sit in nomination meetings for the municipal council, that only half a dozen rate payers are present. And, without casting any reflection upon the work done by this Legislature, I believe there has been a tendency to take in this Legislature to much of the work out of the hands of the municipal council. I think there seems to be a habit of giving too much control all along the line.

I think the black market would not have troubled us to-day if more money had been spent on education and advertising through the newspapers to show the people the real need, from a patriotic standpoint of rationing. And we would not have needed the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, and men who have been placed in those offices, who seem to have very little idea of the administration of these controls.

From the very viewpoint that we hear expressed in this House, from the great amount of legislation, that some seem to feel should come down, I have been wondering why it is that they do not bring down the budget before the speech from the throne. In my own case, I was brought up on the farm, where we always figured that the first thing was to know where your taxes were coming from, and then where your other bills were coming from; then, after that, the kind of Christmas you would have depended upon what was left.

I feel that in this Legislature, — I hope that if I happen to be here until next Spring, that I shall be able to see the Christmas trees growing around the Parliament buildings grounds, because I do not know where all the money is coming from that members expect to

get. I think the government should be more or less a distributing bureau to hit the high spots off those who perhaps get more than their share, and give it to others less fortunate. But, on the other hand, I do not think the government should be giving too many handouts at any time because I am wondering whether all this extreme legislation which seemed to wish for would interfere with private enterprise.

I would like to say a word about hydro. In our particular district the farmers nearly all use hydro. We in central and eastern Ontario are running on a high rate, and that puts a curb on the amount of hydro power we can use. I think also the Commissioner has presented to us the intention in regard to looking into the matter of procuring new appliances, which will be more or less standardized; and in that way, no doubt, they will be put out more in volume, which will greatly reduce the cost.

Now I am coming to the subject which I think I know something about, and that is the subject of agriculture.

I do not like to be a pessimist but it is discouraging, when going through the rural parts, especially in my own part of the province, and seeing the state that agriculture seems to have got into, run out farms, perhaps farms that never should have been cleared in the first place, farms on which the first settlers got along, are now worn out. But that does not bother me so much as to see the number of worn out farmers in the county.

I think one of the pitiful things is that farmers have had no policy in this country. I think every woman and man in this country should have been put in the place where they belong before this war, because it is true that farm prices are better than they were, but yet they have not been, up to the present time, able to keep people on the farm who can possibly get away from it.

I say that, in my humble opinion, there is going to be a dropping off of production in the year 1944 on these farms for that reason, perhaps more than anything else, that the farmers cannot carry on with the help that is available, and from the fact that

they have been overworking during the past three or four years.

In our riding there are good farms, especially large farms, because no one can touch a large farm because they have not the help, on which a great deal of them are seeded down; some of them were not harvested last fall; and they are not going to be able to sow as much grain this year because they will not be able to get the help with which to do it.

I think the Legislature should consider very seriously the getting of the available help which can be procured, so that it can be allocated as the need arises.

As far as agriculture is concerned, I think the Federation of Agriculture is the hope for the future of agriculture. I have been a member of the federation in Northumberland since the first year of its inception, and was made president; and when I became candidate I resigned because the first thing to be done by the Federation is to keep out of politics.

In spite of the legislation put upon the statute books by it, I believe it was the worst thing that U. F. O. ever did to go into private politics, and that it has put agriculture back many years in this province.

Farmers should have a united voice. Knowing the farmer, he is after all an individual. He is a capitalist, although it is unfortunate that he has not had any capital in late years; yet he is a capitalist. When agriculture does get organized to a point where they can dictate, I do not think they will dictate, because, after all, agriculture and industry must work hand in hand in order to have sound economy in this or any other country.

There is a great work for the Federation to do. Controlled marketing, in my opinion, is very important, to keep the little surpluses off the market. Possibly, if the department of agriculture could see its way to loan money with which to build cold storages, that would be one of the best ideas I have yet heard; for, after all, it will look after the farm surplus produce.

I would like to say a few words about the proposed county committee. I honestly think that the county committee can be of value to the province; and I think, from talking with the Minister, that that is one thing he feels very keenly about, that it must be kept out of party politics.

In the county there is much work they can do. I think one of the first jobs they could do would be to make a survey of all the agricultural lands in the county. In some counties we have great areas that never were fitted, and never will be fitted, to be tilled again. I think that is one job they might do, to advise the government as to reforestation projects. In my opinion reforestation must be done by the government or it will never be done, for it is a long time policy, and an individual cannot be expected to do it because it is a long time policy and he would not get the reward from it, and he would be rather hesitant about doing it. I think it should be done by either the provincial or the federal government, but it is something that should be done, not only to create assets for the future, but also for the safety, it will well repay from the agricultural point of view, and also it will be of benefit to the community because of holding back flood waters and preventing soil erosion, as well as retaining the soil moisture, and also besides that it will add to the beauty of the landscape.

But, on the other hand, these county committees, -- this is only my humble opinion, as I do not think that the farmers in this province are in a position to speak of it with much authority, -- I think these county committees should be more or less just to lead the farmers along and show them the way, rather than to order them about; because the farmer is an individual who does not like to be told just what he can do.

I would like for a minute to refer to the rural section. I think it is very necessary that we should have municipal health services, because there are three classes of people, as far as doctors' bills and hospitalization are concerned. There is one fellow

whom the municipality takes care of, -- and it is right that they should. There is another fellow who is independently rich and does not mind a doctor's bill. And there is the ordinary man who owns his property, and, as you know, it is almost crippling at times when large doctor's bills roll up. I think something should be done, and done at once to take care of hospitalization for the ordinary citizen who is confronted enormous bills; and in the case of a family man, it will almost cripple him for many years.

There is one subject which I think of in regard to agriculture which needs more attention at this time than anything else, and that is the matter of education. I think it will pay the largest dividend on capital expended, larger than anything else upon which it can be spent in this province, to help to educate agriculturists. We know that the present system has robbed the farms of their young people, the system of education that we have had in our high schools in this province has been of an academic nature and agriculture has not been brought to the forefront to a sufficient degree to interest these young people so that they would want to go back on the farm after being away from it for a while.

I am a firm believer in the larger elementary school areas, but I think a concerted effort should be made to educate the people on the back concessions, who still hold out against school areas because it involves the consolidated schools. I think a good deal of advertising could be done which could point out the advantage of the school areas. I think the department might make the grant a little more attractive in the establishing of school areas, because I have every reason to believe, and I think most of you will agree with me from your experience, that the school areas have been very satisfactory over the period of years.

I think our continuation work in high schools needs overhauling. I would prefer the high school, but there is a lot of money locked up in those buildings, and in most cases they are well suited to the

localities where they are situated.

I know many trustee boards in towns or villages who get as many county pupils in as they can. In our own municipality four point five mills of the county rate has to be paid for pupils from our municipality to the county. That represents approximately twenty per cent of our taxes.

We would not mind so much the high school education amounting to twenty per cent of our tax bills, if we were getting value for our money; but I do not think we are getting over twenty cents on the dollar of value in the high schools. The result is that our boys and girls are being educated away from the farms. The farm needs the boys and girls; and the boys and girls need the farm. There is no better place for them. I would not want my family to be at any other place. I think we should have education in our schools as to the fine things that agriculture has for them. I do not think a high school should have a grant unless they fit themselves to give the proper training in agriculture; because, after all; very few of our boys and girls who go through the high school go on to the higher professions. They are coming back. I think, in order that we should get value for our money, we should consider the teaching of agriculture and give it a larger place in the high schools. I think it should be taught by highly trained, technically educated teachers, men who understand farming from the ground up.

It might be a little far fetched at this time, but I really believe if agriculture were made a more important part in the high school, it might be worked in conjunction with the agricultural representative's office, where the children would go out on to the farms and do practical work throughout the district. I believe that the agricultural education would give the largest returns.

We have no time to waste in considering the important phase in the post-war period that is before us. Those boys, whom you might say know this country better than anything, because they have been living for this country are over there as our representatives.

I came up between two wars, -- a boy at the time of the first war, and a man in this war. I think we are the ones who owe our country something because we have had a living out of it. I think the least I can do, and the least we can do as an assembly is to consider that this is something which requires the greatest amount of thinking that we may get on with our post-war planning, not in words, but in acts. Thank you.

MR. GEORGE LOCKHART: (Rainy River): My Speaker, I am completely in accord with the remarks which have been made upon your elevation to your high office. I have also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address from the Throne.

I think I can justify myself, as a farmer, especially in relation to the point raised by the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. A Kelso Roberts). I am a farmer. I have lived in a rural area thirty-six years of my forty-two years, in the country, and am now living on a farm across the corner from the place where I was born.

I might also say in answer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Ross A. McEwing), that I have no apology to make for this group of union men who are my colleagues in this party. The farmer himself is not the individualist; that has been pointed out so much in this Legislature by the hon. members. In Canada to-day we have four hundred and fifty thousand of the six hundred and seventy-five thousand farmers belonging to some cooperative organization or other. We are just as much labourers on the farm, and I think we work relatively longer hours; but we have to take the same position to justify getting our rights.

This is the first time that I have had the opportunity of speaking in this Ontario Legislature in the interests of the people in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and I would like, first, to acquaint the hon. members with some of the features west and north of the great lakes in general, and the rainy river district, in particular.

The Rainy River district, -- and with few exceptions we do have ample rainfall, -- is located in the extreme western portion of the

province, with the Manitoba border on the west, and the Rainy Lake and the Rainy River itself forming the southern boundary along the state of Minnesota.

I have found, upon my contact in this older part of Ontario several times since 1919, that it is hard to visualize the vast extent of this great province of Ontario. It is a fact that I live over twelve hundred miles from the City of Toronto. It takes me about two days and two nights to get home from here. It is almost nine hundred miles west of Sudbury.

I very much appreciated the sincerity of the approach to agriculture of the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. John L. McDonald), and, although we live at the extreme ends of the Province of Ontario, we find we have had exactly the same things to contend with when we have discussed our agricultural problems in detail. We have been brothers in the misery of the depression, and I think, we, as agricultural people generally agree as to what is wrong with agriculture; but I note that there has been some hesitancy on the part of some of our farm members as to the solution. Many think we can correct the situation with half way measures; but I feel, from my own long experience, from working long hours, sixteen to eighteen hours many days, and I am certainly sorry to report many Sundays during the depression era, producing great amount of goods on our land and stock to enable us to get a sufficient amount of money to meet our obligations. I think it is generally agreed that one of the great causes of our agricultural difficulties is the packing plants in our country. We find these two great industries, owned by two companies in this country of ours, controlling eighty-five per cent of the processing of our animal products. It is quite true that we could probably do something about this in a cooperative manner; But I would suggest that these industries have become so centralized and have gained so much control over this very important portion of our premier industry, that it would be very difficult competition to meet.

I would suggest to the farmers in all the parties represented here that we must take over the packing plants themselves and we must operate them in a co-operative manner. Socialization of industry is just taking a broader viewpoint of the co-operative ideas under Rossdale principles instituted 100 years ago and we just have to take a little broader viewpoint of this plan. Those who have been protecting, so to speak, this idea of free enterprise--that we know as monopoly enterprise--have no solution to this matter. This question of taking over our Union Stockyards,--I went down there to have a look at them. It may be all right as an approach to the problem, but from the enquiries I have made and what you have already heard from our hon. member from York, East (Miss Macphail) it does not look like a very healthy proposition to take over at the moment. I believe that it might be misconstrued in two or three years into an idea that socializing these things that would not work. I have looked over the proposition to a small extent down here at Keele Street and St. Clair and from the look of the offices of those brokerages that have been set up, I would say that they have not hardly kept pace with the magnificent buildings put up by these large packing companies. I would say that if they were taken over that it would be a very good idea to squeeze a little water out of the proposition.

I think it is generally agreed that we as agricultural people have to take the same position as those who have pointed the way in our union organizations in this country. I said that I had spent 36 years of my life in agriculture or from the time I was born. I also had an experience that a good many farmers have not had--I spent 6 years practically with and for big business in the city of Chicago in a retail organization and I believe that I would be qualified to say that I know something about the way that large monopoly organizations carry out their programs. While working in that institution, I had many opportunities to go through the factories in the city of Chicago and I saw the girls there working under great difficulties in places that we know as sweat shops and it was at that time that our union organizations were just finding their place in the world. I well remember placards going up

and down, in front of buildings saying "This place is unfair to organized labour" and from my experience in the large organization I was with I would say that it was high time that those working people got an organization of their own to bargain collectively for their rights and to raise their standard of living.

I lived in the city up until 1932 and I saw the start of the depression in the city and I might say that the people on the farms--while we did not receive any wages and while it was difficult for us to get enough money to carry on all our obligations--if we were willing to hustle we always got good food and we had fresh air at least to breathe and I saw labouring people in the city and, by the way, this is the first time that I saw this thing called fear enter into the lives of working people, and when they left their jobs they had no recourse except to take relief and relief and the pavement are pretty poor substitutes for decent wages when it comes to filling your stomach, and I think in that respect while we farmers feel that we have had a tough time, we still can look with pride that we are in that position as primary producers that we can feed ourselves well.

A large majority of the people in the North country feel that in the past we have contributed a large portion of the revenue from the wealth of the natural resources and have not received in return many of the advantages that have accrued to the more settled parts of this province. I think that in the past at least we have been under rather great difficulties in that our seat of Government is so far from this north-western part of our province. I may say that the present Government has done very well because I have met several of the Ministers up in that area.

I have a story that illustrates quite well how things went on sometimes in the past. This is a true story. A friend of mine up in the north country - and he is still alive - a farmer, who also was in the timber business in a small way came down to the Parliament Buildings to meet the

Minister of Lands and Forests back in 1920, to take up some matter concerning limits that he had in mind and while he was in conference with this Minister, an hon. Minister from another department came in and was introduced. My friend had a matter that concerned all the people of the district in our area and he thought this was a splendid chance to take it up with this particular Minister. He received very good attention to his story and when he was through the Minister was very cooperative and clapping him on the back said, "In the spring I will charter a plane and fly up to Sudbury and take care of it personally." Of course, we were 800 miles further away. That does not seem possible, but that has happened in the past We have had a Minister of Highways in a previous Government come up to look over the roads in our district in an aeroplane. I can assure you that the hon. members from the North, who are here in numbers will take care of some of these things in the future.

Our timber resources have provided to a considerable extent to the employment of our people in the North. We have several large pulp and paper mills and some saw mill industries. Some of our larger saw mills have moved out of the country but we still have many large portable mills. In my lifetime I have seen these forests depleted and exploited in every possible manner. And nothing done to perpetuate this very valuable industry in the North. I am very pleased to see that our Government at the present is taking steps along this course.

We also have evidence of extensive mineral resources in our north country. I would just like to mention the Steep Rock iron ore development, which is in our particular Rainy River District. I would like to see in the future with the development of this mine that we also - with the great hydro possibilities we have in the North - set up an electric smelter installation some place in our district

to take care of the furnishing of iron and steel for use west of our area.

Other members will speak later on these timber and mining resources who are more qualified to do so.

I am going to take some time on another industry that is a great potential source of wealth to Ontario and to Canada, and that is the tourist industry. From Sudbury north-west we have possibly one of the most potential tourist countries in the world dotted with lakes and it just means that we must get highways through that area to take care of the people who may come into this great country. I think that one of the very things that we should do at the close of the war is to finish the highway from Sault Ste. Marie along the north shore of Lake Superior to the head of the lakes. This should also be extended, the portion that is left, from Fort Willian and Port Arthur to the town of Fort Francis. The existing roads at present in that area, including the Henry Highway should be paved. It is very disconcerting for our American friends who bring very large stores of wealth, great sums of our medium of exchange, into this country, to drop off their well-paved roads to some of the washboards that we have up in our district. The matter of highways directly is certainly an income or revenue producing department, but indirectly in this tourist industry would be one of our greatest assets in the future.

Then we have felt in our district - and this goes for the people who voted Conservative, Liberal and C.C.F. - that our highway department under our previous administration has spent a lot of money in administration and not enough on the roads. I would be very glad at any time to go into this with the Minister of Highways. I believe this is due in effect to the great distance that we have been from our seat of Government, and for the reason probably that our member has not taken sufficient interest in this particular project.

Within one days's travel of the town of Fort Francis we have a potential tourist population of 25,000,000 people. With improvements to our highways I have just mentioned, I believe that it will become in the future probably our greatest industry.

Now, there are three things that we have to do. We have to invite these people, tell them what we have. We have to take care of them when they get there, provide them with food, good roads, courteous and efficient service and there we have to protect our forests from fire, restore the depletion of our fish and protect our game. We also must encourage good sportsmanship in our visitors by setting a good example ourselves. There are three kinds of sportsmanship. There is the one who comes to the area with his camera and likes to see the things alive, and takes pictures of those animals and birds. He is very desirous. We also have the tourist or good sportsman who comes in and takes the legal catch and is satisfied. I think he also is desirable. But the other person who comes in, unfortunately, and takes illegally and in every way spoils the things that we have to bring him in. We people in this particular district have not had the protection in the past that we should have had. In that great area of our own district we have two game wardens. I believe it is the intention of the Department to place more in the area from the returned men at the conclusion of the war, but I would also suggest that these men go through some course of training for this very important business.

I am going to deal with agriculture in our northweat area for a reason. Although we farmers west of the Great Lakes live in the province of Ontario, we have not had some of the advantages that have accrued through free rates in the feeding of our livestock. We have had to pay the freight to the head of the lakes. Then we have to ship our stock to Toronto and pay the freight on the stock. I believe

in the future that it should be remembered when anything is done in Ontario that we have a great agricultural area in this Rainy River District. We have a considerable agricultural area at the head of the lakes. We have some around the Dryden area, but the Rainy River District has the largest strip of arable land. We have a strip in the valley of an area of farm land 65 miles long and up to 20 miles wide, of the very best land in the province. Our farmers in that area have in the past done as much as they could for themselves along cooperative lines. Some of our older members in the district have set up small cooperative institutions, and they form the basis of what we in 1941 set up the Producers Cooperative Creamery Company Limited. We have two creameries in the area, a honey-processing plant, a feed marketing and cleaning plant, and in the year 1942 we did two hundred thousand dollars of business and I believe in the future cooperative organizations will be recognized in all parts of our province.

I congratulate the present Government of Ontario for their initiative in setting up this Agricultural Commission of Enquiry under the direction of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). I also congratulate the Government in the manner in which it was set up. I believe that it will be a good thing. I would like to see bodies of a similar nature set up across Canada. We must have an orderly production of farm products, raw and processed, to exchange for these goods, which is necessary to bring into the country to complete a balanced economy.

After more than four years of war, this national direction of our primary industry has not served to create any feeling of confidence in those who are in charge of this very important contribution to the United Nations, namely, food. The powers that be have been misled by the unparalleled production that our farmers have kept up in the face of very little consideration and the greatest

difficulties with scarcity of labour, machinery and supplies. Every other major war industry has had backing in every possible manner, even to finance. And the fifth year of war, the farmers are fed up with many contradictions.

We are engaged in an industry that requires consideration. We are engaged in an industry that requires consideration -- not from day to day, but in a manner which will allow us to plan, in some department at least, for two or three years in advance. We are still in the position, so to speak, for the most part, of paying for goods and services at sellers' prices and taking from the buyer that which he is willing to pay after manipulation of the markets, sometimes to create temporary surpluses and even in the face of the crying need for food in Britain and rationing in our own country, the farmers in this province have not had the consideration that they should have had in regard to labour and these other things.

Two years ago we were asked for an increase in our sheep population. We produced this increase and last fall ewes were sold in the market in Manitoba, in Winnipeg, at prices that would have made us blush at the height of the depression. We were asked to produce pork for Britain. Then through some means or other word came out that our contracts had been cut and feed was scarce and farmers put their breeding sows on the market. This glutted the packing houses, and they were not able to take the butcher hogs and we had in Winnipeg the unfortunate condition last fall of carloads of hogs standing on the tracks in Winnipeg for two or three days and sometimes there were many dead in these cars and the farmers had to take this loss. We also had the same trouble last fall with our Beef cattle owing to the fact that there was a scarcity of feed grown in the East and when it was recognized there were not sufficient cars to transport this grain here. We had our stock or cattle coming on the Winnipeg market which, in the normal course of events, would have

been bought in the East, having to put them through the processing plant and thus depressed the price of cattle except for very choice.

It is true that in the past year we have been given some consideration by the armed services for to keep our boys on the farm, but with our farm prices still low in comparison with the products of other industry our boys left in great numbers to industry and enlisted in the army service. I predict there will be a shortage of food in the near future.

Farm prices must be given a definite floor that will cover the average cost of production plus some return for labour.

When we talk of cost of production on a farm it is a very indefinite statement but I believe most all who are farmers are not graduates of any agricultural university, but we do use good farming practices and use the best that we have at hand. We have been required to adhere to quality and grade in this war and I believe we have done a good job. On the other hand, many of the articles that we buy are of a decided inferior quality to those produced at the time that this price ceiling was set and if we buy an article and it only lasts half as long in effect it costs twice as much.

To establish policy for prices of farm products sold outside of Canada, we should have to enact a National Marketing Act and export our produce through an Export Board. Imports should be obtained through an Import Board and there should be producer representation in both cases. We do not like in the future to anticipate that our farm prices in this country for internal consumption will be based on articles of a similar nature that can be bought probably outside at a lower price due to the fact that they have better climatic conditions or they can exploit labour to a greater extent. The average industry can figure very closely the cost of any given article and farming as a business, to get right down

to the basis itself, we start with the soil. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Hancock) has pointed out that we must keep a high state of fertility to ensure maximum production. We believe that we should keep the farm family or the family unit on our farms. In farms of 50, 100 or 160 acres it is difficult to operate at the lowest possible cost in some part of our operations. It is quite practical that we should buy some of our farm machinery at least on the cooperative basis and we should use heavier units cooperatively in the future.

Successful farmers still must use the old, reliable practical methods of farming, - modernizing them where possible, in the breeding, feeding, culling and housing of live stock. In breeding we cannot say that there is any best breed, but I think we should have the best in the breed. Personally, I believe it is to our advantage as farmers to have a uniformally good product over a large area. I think that Denmark and Holland have pointed the way in this regard. Great strides in feeding have been made by agricultural schools. The advice that they send out has enabled us to do a better job. The commercial feed companies have also done something along this line. Culling of animals and birds has not been done to the extent that it should be in this province. We still have too many scrub sires and too many unproductive animals and birds on our farm.

In housing, due to our very low farm income in the 30's, our farm buildings have deteriorated to a great extent, and I noticed the other day that our prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) pointed out that in England there were many places that had not been painted for the last four and a half years. There are many farm buildings in Ontario, both in the west and the east, that have not been painted in these last forty years.

The health of our live stock is an important factor in keeping down our cost of farming operation, and I think that is one way that the Government will be able to extend more help

in the future. We can use the fact that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We still, in spite of the fact that we do practice good breeding, feeding, culling, housing of our animals, we have still to take care of some of the diseases that occur.

Bang's disease is very serious in our province at the moment, and fortunately there are many veterinaries covering the province. Due to our low farm income it has not been conducive to young men learning to be veterinaries, and we are quite sure of that.

The T.B. test should be extended until the whole country is covered.

We are giving considerable thought - and rightly so - to raising the standard of living in our rural districts and the most important advance along this line would be in the installation of hydro in all portions of the country, and I am very glad to hear in the last couple of days that much more is being done in this regard.

-Page 653 follows-

Electricity to pump water, wash clothes, grind feed, milk cows, separate milk, light our buildings, and run all the appliances on the farm, would do a great deal to cut down our cost of operation, and also, as was pointed out, would cut down the cost of putting in the Hydro.

In our northern areas, unfortunately, we have no rural Hydro -- not in the Rainy River district, at all. We have plenty of water power, but we have not had the necessary population, and in the past couple of years this has been slipping, but I believe something can be done through the soldiers' rehabilitation to settle large areas in our north country. I believe that the Governments of our country, both Provincial and Federal, will have to do something along this line. The fact is that a great many of our farms are in very poor condition, and it would not give a soldier coming back, even with the provisions of Bill 65, a very good chance to go on and meet the obligations necessary to carry on the alterations to his farm and pay those obligations which he has taken on.

Probably the most important cost of operation of a farm is the debt. We have seen in our northern areas many of our farms, due to our economic situation, have gone back to the municipalities and to the Government. Many of these obligations are loans, which were taken on back in the 1920's, when prices were comparatively good, and in the depression era something should have been done at that time to readjust these loans. We have seen very many cases where the farms have been taken away from the people who probably settled on them; they love their land, and they did what they could to make a home there, but finally, through becoming discouraged, and through the economic factors across the country, had these farms taken away from them, and

in many cases sold to some of their neighbours, or other people coming in, for one third or one half the price. I have seen many cases of this, and I think, in the future, that people who buy articles of any nature, or land, should be protected, at least to some extent, as to their equity in the farm.

We have, in Canada, a Canadian Farm Loans' Board. Well, we have not heard very much of it in the past. It has not been advertised to any great extent, and I think it has proved, since 1929, quite conclusively that it is possible to set up a loaning board in the country, and make it stand on its own feet.

This Board was set up in 1929, with a capital of five million dollars, which was loaned by the Dominion Government, interest free, for the first three years, and then the Board, paying to the Government three and one half per cent., in turn loaned it to the farmers, and last year, with this one-and-one-half-per-cent. spread, they made a profit of over two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars. I think this is the approach to the farm loan proposal on a long-term basis, and for the larger amounts of loans. Our credit unions, which are developing to a great extent, and are operated co-operatively by the people concerned, are doing a great deal in the short-term loans, and may be a great factor in the future.

The hon. member from South Essex (Mr. Murdoch) has mentioned farms selling in his area at five thousand, ten thousand and, fifteen thousand and twenty thousand dollars. He surely is in the "banana belt", because from my experience, and from what I have seen and from what I have read of farmihg conditions in any part of this province, I cannot see where it would be possible, under this economic system we are living under, for any person to take on an obligation of that nature,

at least if it was a small set-up, and get any returns, at all, on his investment, or be able to keep up his taxes or the costs of operation which would enter into that picture. Some day I hope to go to Essex South and have a look at these very favourable lands.

I believe that the solution to the farming problem, as a whole, is to do everything we possibly can to help the farmers help themselves.

I believe that cooperation is democracy in action, and cooperation will lead to an ideal situation, where the incomes of farms and industrial workers will be such that each can buy enough of the products of the other to maintain at least a decent standard of living.

There is, further, the human factor. Cooperation must cooperate. A man must learn to get along with his fellows, to respect the other people's opinions, to sympathize, and, in addition, from the very good ground to work on, to do his thinking for the good of the group, to bar criticism, and to subdue jealousy. More important than the statistics of the cooperative farming are the reasons behind it, and the fundamental education of going into making good cooperatives.

The new adjustment can be brought about by changing our economic set-up, and if democratic institutions are to live, the cities cannot continue to drain people from the farms and villages, without full value in return.

People who work in mines and in offices and in stores, or on railways, are brothers to the farmers. Let us raise our standard of living together. Rural society must be allowed to develop, and must have, in developing, a way of living of its own, and be raised to a standard of the dignity of a fully balanced life.

MR. ROY DOWNIE (LAMBTON EAST): Mr. Speaker, at the outset,

allow me to congratulate you upon your appointment as Speaker of this House, and also to commend you for the fair and impartial way in which you perform the duties connected with your office. I might state, Mr. Speaker, that while there is a little Irish in my blood, I have never kissed the Blarney Stone, and when I extend these congratulations to you, I hope you will take them for what they are worth.

I also wish to commend the hon. Prime Minister on his array of capable-looking Ministers.

I might draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) the fact that if he makes as good a success of his Department as he has of the bean business in Southern Ontario, his will be a going Department.

I commend him on his Land Tax Bill, although the experience in certain local municipalities has been that when you make tax penalties lighter, people are more indifferent, and do not make the same effort to pay their taxes. However, this Bill pertains to the taxes that are returned to the County Treasurer for sale, and these people are not in a position, at all, to meet their obligations, and there this tax Bill relieves them of some of the causes.

I do not wish to touch upon all of the items mentioned in the speech from the Throne, but I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) on his weed-control act amendment. While this may seem like a somewhat insignificant act, I have had some experience with it, and I did not think it was worth very much. The registration fee on the threshing machines -- the forms generally were not available until practically time to pull out and get to work, and the fees were sent in in a rush, and the certificates often were not back in time to commence operations. However, I do not think I would be able to commend him to the same extent on

his stockyards' Bill, although we may have further information along this line as time goes on.

As far as stating that the farmers are going to run the stockyards, I would like to ask if they have ever asked for this privilege. If so, I submit they would be doing more toward the war effort in farming their farms. After all, food may be, and, in my humble opinion, it will be, a determining factor toward winning this terrible war in which we are engaged.

The Department of Education's scholarships, inaugurated by a former Government of Canada, was well received by the public, and the public wish it continued and increased, if possible, especially in quantity.

Down in our part of the province — we join the County of Kent, and are not too far away from the County of Essex — we have a situation there in connection with gardening areas, and, as the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Murdoch) said, we, too, have our problems with gardening areas and tobacco and that sort of thing, and there have been farm-labour camps set up in these areas in the last year. Last year there were camps which accommodated the high school pupils, and in the holidays these pupils occupied these camps, and were available to the farmers in these localities, and I maintain that these camps assisted materially, and the assistance procured from these boys and girls did a great deal to alleviate the shortage-of-labour situation. In fact, some of the farmers in those localities maintain that the camps saved the situation.

I submit that the hon. minister would be well advised to continue this plan again. These pupils did such work as hoeing, fruitpicking, gardening, driving tractors, stooking grain, and different things along that line, but, as has been stated here before, the farmer help situation is getting more serious as time goes on. The older farmers are beginning

to show the strain and worry during these last few years, where they have been doing their best to increase production, under a difficult labour proposition.

There is another avenue of farm labour in my contention, where there could be a great many hours of seasonable labour later secured, and that is within the realm of the old-age pensioners. I would not, for a minute, suggest that these pensioners be given the privilege of working against labour in ordinary times, but under war conditions and during war times, and as a war-time proposition, there are many of these pensioners who are willing and well able to work in the harvest periods, and they should be given the privilege of doing so.

The reason that holds them back from so doing is that if they go out and earn a few extra dollars over and above their pension allowance, the pension is cut off. If this Government could work out a plan in conjunction with the Dominion Government, whereby these pensioners could be guaranteed no cut in pension, due to the fact that they earn a few extra dollars, I think it would relieve the situation quite a little, especially down in some of the southern counties. I might cite an instance to explain my point there. There is a great deal of ship timber being shipped out of our country down there. The price is good, and there is one firm buying in there who hew their timber before loading it onto the cars, and the men who we find swinging the broad-axe in this particular industry down in our part of the country are men who in some cases have been on the old-page-pension allowance, and have taken up that work because the younger generation, of course, does not know anything about it, and are unable to do it, and some of these pensioners even ask to be taken off the pension allowance when they go out to do this work, and are quite satisfied to be taken off. Others,

of course, we find are not quite willing to fore-go that privilege.

I did intend to touch upon the Hydro a little, but I think the question has been thoroughly covered by the former speakers. However, I may say that I wish to make this observation, that we consider that according to the 1941 census there were only 37.3 of farm homes equipped with electricity, and I am sure the Commissioner will agree with me, even in the face of these four thousand applications they have o.k.'d, that there is still a great need and room for expansion along that line.

Now, this seems to be the day of short speeches. Perhaps I should not say "short speeches", but it is the day of maiden speeches in this House. I happen to be one of those, and I think I will try to go on the record with competition with the hon. member from Kingston (Dr. Stewart) in making a record from a short speech.

However, I do concur heartily with the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Kennedy) when he made the statement in his speech the other day that if this House could so function as to enforce sensible legislation for the common man, we would be doing our duty to this province. I contend if that is the basis of the legislation the farmers, together with the other larger groups, would be automatically taken care of.

There is one other observation I might make at this time, and that is that this province, in my opinion, might set the pace in showing their sincerity toward returned soldiers, who have offered their lives that we might enjoy the freedom here which we are enjoying to-day.

I submit that this Legislature of the province of Ontario, and especially those on the Government side, have a great chance to set a lead in that regard, and show that

we are faithful in our thoughts in the fact that when there are any political"plums" to be passed out, perhaps they would be well advised not to step into it too hurriedly, but to look into the prospects of passing out some of these "plums", in practically all cases, to available returned soldiers.

With regard to wondering about elections: many of the speakers have brought up the subject to elections, which I contend, if they followed the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Kennedy) the other day in regard to passing legislation that is good and sound and reasonable for the ordinary citizens, we in this House, at least, would not need to worry about elections or the possible way of procuring the soldier votes by proxy or otherwise, and we hope and pray that this terrible war will be finished long before this Legislature needs to go to the country again, and we can save ourselves that worry by holding up elections until the boys are back and have free access to their own ballots. Most soldiers are modest men and boys. I speak with some experience along that line, having served in the army in the last war, and I resent the name "soldier" being made a political football.

I think that is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BERTRAM E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to congratulate you on your elevation to the high office you hold in this Chamber. I trust that nothing will occur to break the good relationship which ought to exist between the Speaker and the House.

Before entering upon the subject which I intend to handle in the course of this debate this afternoon, I would like to answer one statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" of November seventeenth, nineteen forty-three, when the Prime Minister was dealing with a speech that I made in Orillia - I presume he was - and had

the following to say in the "Evening Telegram":

"A C.C.F. member of the Legislature, Premier Drew pointed out, had said in Orillia that it was not the intention of the C.C.F. to take the property over, but that the C.C.F. would not let the owner pass it on when he died.

"In other words, you become tenants or serfs of the State", commented the Premier.

"A farmer would not be able to leave land to his son. It would be the same in urban municipalities if a father left a home to his family. When they step in and take that home, they are breaking down the very basis of our society."

I wish to state emphatically on the floor of this House that no such statement was ever made by me in Orillia--

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. After all, it is only the accepted practice in this House to keep the record quite straight. In the speech referred to, I said that it was made in Orillia, and I did refer to that speech, and referred to the fact that the "Orillia Packet and Times" of October twenty-eighth, in reporting a speech of the hon. member, had carried these words:

"FArmers could stay on their farms as long as they wished, but they could not will the property, on their death, to anyone else."

That stood uncorrected in the "Orillia Packet and Times".

MR. LEAVENS: Mr. Speaker, I still wish to state that I emphatically deny the truth of that statement, whether it was in the "Orillia Packet and Times", or where it appeared, but what I did say was, in reply to a question from one in the

audience as to whether a farmer could will his farm to his son under C.C.F. administration -- I did say that under the security of tenure of the C.C.F. the farmer would not only keep his farm -- that we not only would not take the farm away from the farmer, but would see to it that nobody else took the farm away, either.

I also went farther, and said not only would we guarantee the security of tenure to the owner who now occupied the farm, but it would pass on to secure the tenure of that family farm from one generation to another.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make that correction with regard to this editorial, which appeared in the "Orillia Packet and Times".

But it does seem passing strange that the Prime Minister and his colleagues on the Government Benches, and the Liberals who are not on the Government Benches at this time, should suddenly become so concerned about the farmer and his farm! They were all strangely silent when during the ten depression years thousands of farmers and home-owners lost their farms and homes, which in most cases represented the labours of a lifetime. I would ask them to remove the beam from their own eyes, before they try to remove the mote from ours.

Thousands of homes in this country went by the mortgage route, and I did not hear any great clamor either from the Progressive Conservative Party or the Liberals during those ten long, dreary years in regard to confiscation of farmers' homes.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Leavens) if he ever heard of the Dominion Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act and the Ontario Farm Loan Adjustment Act.

MR. LEAVENS: I wish to answer, Mr. Speaker, that

I have, but it has nothing to do with the statement --

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: It has a great deal to do with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. LEAVENS: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, --

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker rises to make this comment. I do not want to interfere, especially as we have kept the record pretty straight so far, but I think it should be understood when there is any misstatement made hon. members have the right to make a correction, and by your own resolution you are having all the proceedings recorded, and should either side make a misstatement it should be corrected as early as possible, to keep the record clear.

So far, we are in order, and I trust, with the explanation given to each side, that we will go on and try and observe the rules of the House.

MR. LEAVENS: I might say that I was well aware of the fact that that Act was on the Statute Book, but I am also aware of the fact that it did not operate in a great many cases, and thousand of farm homes were lost during the depression.

My intention this afternoon is to deal with the subject of welfare and social services. We, the C.C.F. opposition of this House, stand for social security for all the people. This involves, in the first place, employment for everyone at adequate wages and under decent working conditions. It also has a foundation in agricultural prosperity.

The provision for the economic base for social security is primarily a Federal responsibility, and the necessary legislation can be best administered under Dominion auspices.

Nevertheless, so far as is possible in the framework

of our provincial limitations, this Government should take whatever steps it can to utilize to the utmost the natural and human resources of this province.

In this way, it should provide the essentials for full employment for all, and set the stage so that each man's attainment of his own vision of the good life may be set less far from his grasp.

We, on this side of the House, know just what those limitations are, and just what revenue the Provincial Government has at its command, and we say that within those limitations this Government should see to it that it does, to the utmost of its financial ability, everything it can to alleviate and remedy the social condition that is now so rampant, not only in Ontario, but throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion.

The old emphasis of keeping down financial expenditures, which has brought the fine word "welfare" into disrepute, must be changed to stress upon social and human values a concern for rehabilitation and the maintenance of a decent standard of living for everyone.

This province should give courageous and intelligent leadership to all our municipalities in raising and maintaining standards of services and their administration in all branches of the welfare programme. Such services must be adequate. In the long run, the cost of continuing to perpetuate human misery is far greater than the maintaining of a high-efficiency welfare programme.

(Page 665 follows)

It is not a question of whether we can afford to provide these social services; it is a question of whether we can afford not to provide them.

Social insurance and welfare services, no matter how comprehensive, can never, of themselves, provide social security, which rests in the main upon a proper social and economic order. Nevertheless, good social services can do a great deal to supplement the security furnished by a healthy body politic and a constructive welfare program is of cardinal importance to any party interested in the fundamentals of good government.

We on this side of the house have been accused of being many things, accused even of being "nationalist socialists", and we used to, in the early days - well, I remember in the early days of our organization, we were even called "communists".

We are a social organization, and we intend to follow along certain lines of socialization, and we believe that until that socialization has taken place, you never can have this country or any other country an adequate system of social service.

Our social services are less the stretcher bearers of society than constructive, integral components of the social good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to keep within my time this afternoon, and I hope to end before my time is up, so I will just sketch a few of the things in regard to welfare and social service, which we feel this government should take into serious consideration.

The first is "Children's allowances".

This particular question has caused a great deal of discussion across the Dominion of Canada since it was first suggested by the Federal Administration. The question of children allowances, or as it is called in many countries "Family allowances" is a form of legislation which can only be put in when you have under wages a floor sufficiently high to maintain a high standard of living. When we use children's allowances

only as a means of lowering the pay envelope from a larger to a smaller level, it is not properly "children's allowances" or "family allowances", and it should never be used unless this protection is given, and children's allowances should never be used to bolster up low-wage marketing scale either in industry or in agriculture, and should never be used to bolster up an inadequate pay envelope.

Now, in regard to the question of children's allowances, I believe children should be -- and we on this side of the house believe that children should be the first care of those or any other government.

Now, I wish to speak on the subject of mothers' allowances. We have heard a great deal in the past few months about juvenile delinquency. I am not one that thinks that all juvenile delinquency rests in the inadequacy of our mothers' allowances, but I think that I am safe in saying that a great deal of it could be corrected if the mothers' allowances were put on a proper basis.

The Mothers' Allowance Act passed in 1921 by the Ontario Legislature for the purpose of assisting mothers of young children whose husbands were either dead, or totally incapacitated. These allowances were supposed to cover all expenses. It was expected that the mother's earnings with some supplementation from those of older children or relatives, would be large enough to raise the family income to an adequate level.

This has worked out alright where the mother's allowance was supplemented by older members in the family -- older children -- or by relatives or others who gave funds to the mother to give her sufficient to carry on.

But where there was sickness in the home, where there was somebody in the home who had to have a mother's care, where there was possibly an incapacitated husband who was ill, the mother's allowance never did provide an adequate living for those, under those trying circumstances.

The Mothers' Allowance Commission set up the following allowances under the Act:

"Maximum allowance: In cities, mother and child, $35.00 per month, $5.00 for each additional child.

"Same, $50.00 for mother and one child, and $5.00 for

each additional child.

"Rural, $25.00 for the mother and one child, and $5.00 for each additional child.

These amounts were increased by twenty per cent in the spring of 1943, under belated recognition of the pressing need for such action.

This legislation has worked quite well for such families as have been able to help themselves, but is not suitable for many families where the allowance is quite inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living. I might say that we on this side of the house feel that the mothers' allowance should rest on the following basis:

1. An immediate increase of 50% in total amount spent by province, to be allotted mainly in harder cases mentioned above.
2. Maximum allowances must be considerably increased to deal adequately with large families needing special care.
3. No reduction on account of earnings until total income reaches necessary standard of health and decency.
4. No stoppage in allowances (as done now) pending investigation whether mother fit to look after children or for other cause - to avoid children suffering.
5. Invalided father not in receipt of pension or compensation to be counted as an extra dependent.
6. If mother regarded as fit guardian, then allowance to be made for illegitimate child - (present ignoring of this child penalized it and the other children)
7. Appointment of competent and trained staff - which is not now the case.

And, as number eight, these are immediate proposals, pending establishment of overall scheme of social security.

I wish to recommend to the government that they give particular attention at this session to our Mothers' Allowance Legislation, and I think in all the fields of our welfare work, this should receive the serious attention of the government and of this house.

I now wish to deal with old age pensions.

I think that we, in Canada, should hang our heads in shame at the pensions we allow our old folks, our old folks who have gone through the heat and toil of the day, who have reached the sunset of life at seventy, and we give them twenty dollars a month, with a recent advance by the Federal administration in the form of a cost of living allowance. We give them twenty ~~eighty~~ dollars and some cents - sixty cents I think it is -- as an old age pension. I do not think we have anything to be proud of in this dominion, that in one of the richest countries in the world we have failed to provide adequately for our old people, in the sunset of their lives.

I know the limitations of the province with regard to revenues , to increase this old age pension, and I know the limitations in regard to the Act, but I do say that the government can do a lot more in Ontario than it has ever done in the past, to make the last days of our old people more comfortable and happy.

Just who are these old folks? Who are the old ladies who reach seventy? Well, they are the mothers, along with all the other mothers of that generation, who brought their children into the world; they made one dollar go where they should have had two to spend; they made over Willie's clothes so that Johnnie might have something to wear; they stayed up half the night seeing that the socks and underwear and all the things which pertained to good housekeeping were mended, and when the children reached the ages of from eighteen to twenty-one, and the war came upon us to save democracy, they presented their sons and daughters to the state, so that they once again could go to the battlefields of the world, to save our democracy. That is all they did. That is all they did. I think it was a lot. I think the mothers of this dominion demand the respect ofall the people of this country. I think the mothers who have reached seventy years of age should be assured by this government and the Federal government that they will be adequately looked after for the balance of their days, and not under a Federal allowance such as

is given to our old aged folks at the present time.

MR. MILLER (Elgoma-Manitoulin): What would you suggest would be adequate?

MR. LEAVENS: I suggest that the province could now raise it to thirty dollars each month and establish an old age limit at sixty-five. That is, along with the Federal law. I think that should be done immediately by the Provincial government. It is all they can do, instead of continually "passing the buck" and saying "Oh, this is a Federal law. We cannot do anything". There are things we can do. It does not speak well for this province when it sees thousands of mothers at seventy or over with nothing but penury for them to the end of their days.

Who are these fathers at seventy? Where do they come into the picture? These fathers and the other fathers of that generation are the ones who produced all the natural wealth. That is all they did. The produced it, but they did not get it. All they get out of it is barely sufficient to eke out an existence and not even, in thousands of cases, an adequate living.

And if they are both drawing pensions at the same time, they do not the same. The government is running on the old policy that was told to me just before I was married, and which I found out to be false, that "two can live cheaper than one". We all found that to be untrue, and the old folks they found that to be decidedly untrue. They get a pension of thirty-five dollars a month, which in itself is very harsh; if they own their home it must be deeded to the government in order to enable them to draw the allowance, and in spite of all the things that are said to make it appear that the old folks are getting more, they still cannot receive more than three hundred and sixty dollars per year. So, after all, the old age pensioners are very little better off, even with the little extras they are allowed to earn and keep without deductions being made, and I appeal to this house on behalf of the old folks of this province, who are worthy of our respect and who are worthy of our care, and who look to us to look after them properly and adequately for the balance of their lives.

I feel for these folks, and I urge that this government

do all it can in bringing down the legislation to increase, at least to some degree, the happiness and comfort of that portion of our population.

I want now to draw attention to another Act that is on our statute books. To me it is an Act which should have been removed a long long time ago. I refer to the "Parents' Maintenance Act". It is assumed by the government and the department which looks after this particular Act, that the children are automatically handing over to the parents so much of their money to maintain them when they are no longer able to maintain themselves. As I say, this is assumed by the government, and assumed by the department, but both the government and the department administering this Act know perfectly well that this is not the case.

Now, father and mother will not feel at all inclined to take the son or the daughter into court and sue for maintenance. If we respect the sanctity of the home, we should not have this law on the statute books, which only creates the greatest disharmony possible within the family circle. In many cases these sons and daughters are the fathers and mothers of children of their own, living in a competitive age, where every dollar they get extra in their pay envelopes has only been after they have put up a mighty struggle to induce the captains of industry that the laborer is worthy of his hire.

(Page 671 follows)

They would some day have to face an old age. They would, unless they wish to come to that old age depending upon the mercy of an Act that is insufficient to give them comfort and happiness, they would face that old age, as the only way of overcoming what their fathers and mothers faced, by putting sufficient by for a rainy day.

I think this is an Act which this government would do well to abolish from the statutes of this province. It is not observed, and nobody expects it to be observed; so why leave that Act that assumes that old age are receiving aid from the sons and daughters, when everybody knows perfectly well that they are not.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I know that the Speaker wishes to be fair, but he does not infer that all the children of the old people in this province are handing over to the province the money to keep their parents, when they are looking after them themselves. I think the hon. member is open to a good deal of understanding.

MR B. E. LEAVENS: I did not say what the hon. member has stated. The very fact that I have mentioned it would infer that I know it is a fact. There are thousands of children looking after their parents.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): And they love to.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS: But again there are tens of thousands that are not and never will be able to do so.

Now, the blind. I think the blind in all our society should receive a great deal of consideration. Nature has denied them a great deal. They are not aware of the beauties of nature. Their sight is gone and they are denied more than any of us who have our sight are capable of knowing. And I think, of all people, our attention should be given to the blind. The blind can only receive a pension on the same basis as the old age pensioner at the age of forty. You must be forty years of age before you can receive your blind pension, and at forty you receive exactly the same scale as on the old age pension. But, if two blind people happen to be married and they both reach the age

of forty, then one of the blind persons must drop the pension. So again we run on the assumption that two can live as cheaply as one.

I think we should revise the Act in the case of the blind people. They have had their case before the Securities Commission of the Federal Government, and it was a very good brief which they presented. This is the brief which they presented. It may astonish us that they require $30.00 a month for a single person, and additional for married persons; compensation for blindness irrespective of age. Single persons should be allowed other income up to four hundred dollars; married people up to $1,000.00. They should be allowed to have cash in the bank or securities up to $600.00.

Applicants should be allowed to own property up to the value of thirty-five hundred dollars. Cash and property should be free from assignment to the government after the death of the owner.

No deductions for blind persons marrying each other.

Now, I think that this government should go on record as pressing the better administration. Even though the Act as it now functions be retained, at least one amendment should be made. Two blind people are married and reach the age of forty years, that both should draw the pensions in their own right. I think that is the least we could expect.

I think this is some way in which we can compensate in a little way at least, these people who are denied so much of the value of living.

I believe there are other speakers following me, and I hope on the budget debate to have somet hing to say on this subject; and I would like to say this in conclusion: that we have reached the point in the history of mankind when we have to make a different assessment of human values. We have reached the point so far as humanity is concerned when humanity and human need should have the first consideration; and that health plans, welfare and social security and social service should be the first charge on the wealth of this

entire country, because upon the health of our citizens, upon their welfare, and upon the type of social services that we passed in this province and in the dominion will depend the future type of citizens that will have to carry on in this country after we have gone.

So I implore this government, and I assure you that the opposition on this side of the House will give you any assistance in anything of progress along the lines of welfare and social security. Thank you.

MR. H. CONNOR (Hamilton East): A point for information. Mr. Speaker said that when a point wanted to be made clear one could rise.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say that. Has anything transpired this afternoon to which you take exception.

MR H. CONNOR: Yes sir.

MR SPEAKER: Do you rise to a point of order?

MR. H. CONNOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. H. CONNOR: That the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Leslie M. Frost) stated and protested in regard to a statement made by the Speaker, the hon. member from Woodbine (Mr. B. E. Leavens) with regard to the Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act. I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member and state as follows, --

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless you and I are thinking of two different things, there was nothing said by the member for Woodbine about the Mortgagors' Relief Act.

MR. H. CONNOR: This was in the last address.

MR. SPEAKER: I heard nothing of that matter. Proceed.

MR. H. CONNOR: On March 4th, 1943, an Act was passed known as the Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are in error, my friend. I heard him make a reference to the Creditors' Relief Act.

MR. GEORGE BENNETT (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, after having gone on through so much oratory, it is with a degree of timerity

that a man of lesser calibre, like myself, rises to make comment upon the speech from the Throne.

For fear I forget, I want, first of all, to add my words of congratulations to those which have already been expressed by former speakers. First of all, Mr. Speaker himself upon his appointment to the high office. I think he has a lot of patience and tolerance with us, that he is a mighty decent fellow, and that he is doing a mighty fine job.

I want also to express my congratulations to all who have received the confidence of the electorate and are now sitting as members in this House.

I also want to compliment the two members of the Labour-Progressive party for the very well delivered addresses they have made to this House, although I am somewhat perplexed as to their manoeuvres. I cannot figure out yet just why they have throne the old text book into the ash pan. I suppose that when they did that, they called up the Department of Public Works and asked them to rush it with all speed to the incinerator.

Now they have got a new book. I think we might entitle that new book "Before and After Taking". We can only hope that the new book will be an improvement on the old book, because the old book was awfully bad.

Then the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. A. MacLeod) finished his remarkable address with the words of a person known to him and well known to myself running something like this:

"We will not cease from mental strife,
Nor shall the sword rest in our hands,
Until we have built Jerusalem
In Canada's fair and happy land."

Noble sentiments, lofty idealism, wonderful ideology, and yet may I remind the hon. member of this truth, and he knows it just as well as I know it, that free enterprise as we know it, is not interested in building Jerusalems of plenty and sufficiency; they are

only interested in profits. That is the only language they know. That is the only system that they are interested in. And, because they are only interested in profits they did not create for us a new Jerusalem, but they created for us a veritable hell upon earth known to us as the depression, a depression which broke down the banks of economic security and spread itself in devastation upon the dwellings of men. A forest fire, an earthquake, could not equal the desolation which extends from that with its sorrow and shame. And so we are called upon now to cooperate for future security, for post-war rehabilitation, by these two addressed of the Labour-Progressive party, with tears streaming down their faces, and with voices husky with emotion, and with deep sobs, they asked us to cooperate for future security.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you not going to do that?

MR GEORGE BENNETT: You might just as well ask the canary to cooperate with the cat. Because, if we cooperate again with the profit making system, then we are going to be gobbled up until there is not a vestige of a feather of us left.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you going to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GEORGE BENNETT: Then I want to congratulate the Conservative party upon their coming to office in this House and in this province. Although I cannot understand why they tacked on the word "Progressive" to the party name, except perhaps to confess and to admit that the party had been non-progressive until the advent of the super Superman who stuts with intense swagger across the political firmament professing to have a magic formulae to cure all our social and economic diseases. But when the Premier of Manitoba, the people under his premiership had more difficulty in securing food than in any other province of the Dominion of Canada, telling the same old story, —

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister) They kept him there for twenty years.

Mr. GEORGE BENNETT: It is the same old party with a new suit

and a new tie. Yet it is not a new suit that makes the man or the party. It is what is beneath the homespun. It is not the personal adornment that counts, but the beautification of the heart culture, and the culture of the conservative party all down the years has been excessively cruel.

As a member of the C. C. F. party, and having been associated with labour for a good many years, I had hoped beyond everything else that the speech from the Throne would have given some indication of an ushering in of a new dispensation for those who toil and spin for the common good, no matter whether by hand or brain, the wealth producers of the nation; because there is no wealth but that which is produced by productive toil.

Farmers, industrial workers, families bereft of the wage earner, the aged, the less fortunate, all having been looking forward to the immediate future, to the new heaven and the new earth of economic security and freedom from the fear of want, based upon the pre-election promises of this government. And the electorate of the province had every right to be enthused by the lofty conceptions enunciated by the government to give leadership in blasting of a new trail and in the blasting of a way to the promised land.

I want to say this: It took the children of Israel forty years to reach the promised land; and if we are going to depend upon the provisions of the speech from the Throne and the twenty-two point program of the conservative party, it is going to take the people of Ontario at least one hundred and forty years to arrive. And, of course, the phrase "blasting the way" is familiar to all of us.

The one time premier of this country, of conservative persuasion trumpeted loudly that he was going to blast the way to the markets of the world, that he was going to solve the problem of unemployment. And, instead of putting callouses on men's hands, he put them on their feet tramping the streets looking for work and finding none.

And, instead of blasting your way to the markets of the world, he blasted his way to a title for himself, a baronial castle, to one

of the highest places in the strata of English society.

Why, we even named a ship after him in Canada.

And they call that the Canadian way of life, and we are supposed to be fighting a global war for that kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this, with all the power I can bring to words, that the Canadian soldier on the battlefront is not fighting for that kind of thing; and the farmer and the worker in this country is not working and sacrificing to perpetuate a condition of that character . They are fighting, working and sacrificing for a way of life upon which they can reap and gather the sheaves of full employment, work, opportunity for men, increasing and developing expanding wealth and economy.

They are fighting to have the right to access to the supremem joys of life hitherto closed to them by reason of the machinations of reactionary forces.

We believe, on this side of the House anyway, -- I do not know what you believe, because you have never expressed any definite belief in anything, -- but on this side of the House we believe that the true test of progress in any civilization is not to give more to those who already have too much, but to give enough to those who have less.

Conservative governments and liberal governments in the past disregarded that vital, fundamental, cardinal, prerequisite for progress; and this eleventh hour conversion on the part of the conservative party to reform is not going to be swallowed by the public in this province hook, line and sinker, because in the background of that confession lies the contribution of the conservative party and the liberal party made to the abominable, despicable conditions of the depression.

If the government is now making pretence of going out to the woodshed to saw the lumber of reform, there must be a reason for it. What is the reason? The reason is just this, that they are confronted with the stern law of self-preservation and self-preservation is still the first law with individuals, as it is with governments.

Now, much has been said with regard to education, and I am in

love with education also.

I do not know what the future holds in store for us in respect to education, but I do say this, t at the people of this province emerged from the depression with an acquired knowledge, with an education of the utmost importance, that they will never again, not so long as time shall last, follow cunningly devised political fables

(Page 679 follows)

That is all that this Speech from the Throne amounts to; that is all the twenty-two points practically amount to. So far as security for the future is concerned, it is a presentation of half measures, of half solutions. It is a cream puff creation, because, after all, ~~xx~~ depressions are man-made and depressions therefore can be prevented and corrected by man. Poverty is not the result of providence and neither is economics the result of Divine dispensation. Nature has never been niggardly in her gifts and there is no earthly reason why any man or woman or child should go short of the necessities of life in this land of plenty. Land of super-abundance.

You know, it used to be a favorite past time with governing authorities to point with pride to the record of the past. They have discontinued that practice. I wonder why? Is not the past pleasant to theorize upon? Is it something like a cemetery filled with ghosts at midnight? Is it a cupboard stuffed full of skeletons? Governments are conveniently forgetting the past record but the people of Canada, and more especially the people of this province, can never forget.

What does the record reveal? It reveals an economy of increasing impoverishment, harsh and cruel treatment. It meant the bread line, soup kitchen, hostels, miserable welfare grants, despicable shelter accommodation. It meant regimentation. It is not the C.C.F. party that has regimented the people. The old line governments regimented the people during the depression. I was Mayor of Windsor at the time. Thirty-five thousand people on relief, a third of the population objected to despicable conditions - finger-printing, the third degree, the means test, and these things are written into the records and they cannot be erased, and we will never forget the lost homes and the lost farms. You know, in England tens of thousands of farms and homes have been taken away by reason of the war, lost by enemy bombs, by enemy action and our sympathy and our regret goes out to

these heroic people as they again saved the world for democracy. I suppose lost homes are part of the price we must pay for war, but in Canada tens of thousands of people lost their homes and their farms not by enemy action, not by enemy bombing - they were lost and they were taken away from them by so-called patriotic Canadians. Not in a time of war, but in a time of peace. I will never forget the lost homes and lost farms and lost insurance policies, the eviction notices, distress warrants, lost savings, economic dislocation, the maladjustment of human relationships and the disintegration of family life and we can never forget the theme song of the Government in those days. We can even how hear the chorus in rising crescendo. I can hear voices supporting the chorus - the manufacturers' association, the disciples of free enterprise, the coupon clippers, the two and a half percent of our population who live by virtue of descended ownership of profitable investments in stocks, bonds and real estate - those who live by the wages of money - what is the theme song? We have no money today. That was the answer we got in Windsor from the provincial government and got the same answer from the Federal Government - a sound financial reputation must be our first consideration. We must pay as we go. Budgets must be balanced. We cannot spend our way into prosperity.

I wonder what we are doing now. We are spending money in unbelievable fantastic fashion, and the old theories of money in respect to the depression have been exploded. War is creating a romance in financial statistics such as the world has never known, above and beyond anything that the average kind of layman can comprehend and we are spending this money. What for? We are spending it for democracy and saved democracy to the highest form of conspiracy known on earth. If we have not prosperity in democracy then democracy becomes a mockery, and that is what we had before the depression. That is what we will have after the war is over because the war itself is simply an interlude as between

depression and the present, if we accept the half measures in the Speech from the Throne. I say that if we can unbalance thr budget to meet the emergencies of war then we certainly can and we must unbalance our budget for the emergencies of peace, and so long as there is a man without a job; so long as there is a home without proper furnishings; so long as there is a farm without the necessary equipment so long must budgets go unbalanced.

Of course, we can continue to conduct the affairs of the nation and this province on the basis of the gold standard, but we cannot have the gold standard and the golden rule at one and the same time, and I am so proud because the party to which I belong gives priority to the golden rule. We give first consideration to human betterment and for that reason we have opened up a second front in this house, and we shall open as many fronts as are necessary throughout the houses of governments in this country as may be necessary to achieve our legitimate and democratic rights. We do not look unlike any other men although we have been dubbed with every label under the sun. We are just ordinary working people. There is nothing queer about us. We are alright. We are almost as good as the Speaker. I am afraid we fall a little short, but we have opened up the fronts so that when free enterprise fails again, as it surely will fail, as it always has failed, then we shall be in a position to make effective the economy of abundance and sufficient for all.

You know there is a new thought abroad in the land today, and the new thought is this: that the old stereotype traditional government, with its traditional Speech from the Throne, and the traditional twenty-two points must go. That is definite. It is inadequate. His pdicies are out-worn, out-moded. New occasions teach new duties.

I am not going to finish by six o'clock. So when it is six o'clock, of course, we can adjourn, and I will return to it after adjournment.

I am thinking now of traditional government and the new thought. Henry Ford taught a new thought.

AN HON. MEMBER: A peace ship was not it?

MR. BENNET: It was a horseless carriage and he put the world on wheels, and he parted from tradition in transportation. Graham Bell had a new thought to bridge distances and to talk to people in far off places and he parted from tradition in communications. Adam Beck, he had a new thought - and I am sure you are going to agree with this - he had a new thought. He gave to us hydro and we departed from the tradition of the tallow dip and the paraffin lamp. We have departed from tradition in industry. We have mass production. We have departed from traditional things in agriculture and we grow now two blades of grass where only one grew before. We have departed from tradition in medical science and the span of human life has been lengthened. But we have not departed from tradition in government and we are still thinking in terms of modern day problems with horse and buggy methods. It just cannot be done.

After all, as I said sometime ago, the Speech from the Throne is too full of half solutions, half propositions. May I say something about half measure of opening of Government House in London. It may help but the full measure for that would be rather than open up Government House in London to build a house of security in Ontario. That would be the finest type of monument that we could erect for those fine boys who are giving their lives xmd on our behalf. Take the half measure of creating research councils. Fine in their way to create blue prints and new dies for industry. The full measure would be a new design for fuller and better livhg. Our need is not so much a new machine to smash atoms; it is a new economy to smash poverty and to smash depressions and to do away with unemployment. Take the half measure of re-capturing foreign markets. I do not know just what that means. Perhaps it means selling your scrap iron to Japan. You know, a Japan plane was brought down in China just a short

time ago and it was found to be powered by two American engines. It was found to be equipped with machine guns made in Birmingham, England, and I have heard the Conservative press quoted, it was made of aluminum sold by Canada. All of you know something about the cheap toys that flooded our department stores prior to the war from Germany and from Japan, brought in by loyal Canadians supported by the governments of the day, to perpetuate a system of cheap slave labor, for quick profits, to sabotage the rights and the heritage of working men and Canadian workmen.

Then, of course, something has been said about the half measure of a five point system of education. I am not going to attempt to demean or belittle education. Not by any means, but the irony of education is just this: that we are spending more money on education today than ever before in the history of the world and we find ourselves in the deepest pit of all time, which leads me to the conclusion that education is not the all-important thing as some people would have us believe. We know that depressions can be prevented and corrected. We know that it is wrong and evil and wicked to create artificial scarcity in a land of plenty and to throw coffee back into the ocean, and to plough the cotton under. We know these things, and we paid farmers money not to raise hogs. One Canadian farmer said to the other "Have you entered the new government competition?" And the other said, "What is that?" He said, "It is a new competition, the more hogs that I do not raise, the more money I get." We know that national budgets can be unbalanced and national treasuries opened and money taken out of refrigeration and made liquid. We know that Canada cannot only supply her own needs and fill the bread baskets of the nations of the world. We know these things, and yet we fail to employ our knowledge to wisdom and wisdom is the all-important thing. That is what our forefathers had. They did not have very much education, they did not have very much university training, but they tilled this country for us without education

and they made it a land of fertility and productivity, of plenty, but they had wisdom.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being the hour of six o'clock, the House will rise, to resume at eight of the clock this evening.

The House rose at six o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

(Page 685 follows).

Toronto, Ont. Thursday, March 9, 1944.

The House resumed at eight o'clock, p. m.

Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment of the debate this afternoon I was speaking of the provisions of the speech from the Throne and the twenty-point program of the conservative party, and the Juvenile kindergarten class, half questions, half solutions, and half propositions contained therein; that the vehicle was travelling in low gear, travelling hesitatingly and timidly to meet the challenge of the job of this hour and to meet the challenge of the job in the post-war future; it was simply trimmed to patch up the old system, an attempt to patch up the crazy quilt hanging rags and tatters from the line. It cannot be done; it cannot fit into this change.

Whether we like it or not, the old system is doomed. It has outlived its usefulness. It has come to what is described in the volume of the book, the end. It must be buried so deep that there never will be any possibility of a recovery. We are not going to patch up the old crazy system. You cannot build a new house with old bricks. You cannot prop up a house with old timber; you cannot patch up a cloth with moth eaten material; and that is what the twenty-two points are, moth eaten, decaying timber, and old bricks.

This afternoon I have spoken to the House about the half measure of creating a research foundation, and I was speaking to the half measure of a more intensified system of education, and I attempted to draw a distinction as between knowledge and wisdom. Knowledge, of course, is a secondary consideration. Wisdom is the primary consideration; and wisdom is the right application of knowledge.

There is no dearth of knowledge, and the government knows this just as well as I know it. The whole trouble is this, that we continue to go to school and we refuse to learn.

Take the condition of the depression, when our young men came forth from our universities and halls of learning, eagre and ambitious, poised like atheletes, eager to do their duty to society and their day

and generation, only to be confronted with a condition of no work. Unable to find work, they were cut off relief. In the City of Windsor they were cut off, and those young men to-day are writing the name of Canada in letters of gold across the sky, and every man a hero of the battle of the Atlantic, of Britain, of Africa, of Italy, -- heroes of the highways, of the air, and of the ocean lanes. And that is the kind of treatment that they received at the hands of heartless, souless, inhuman governments in the day of depression. To-day they are heaping coals of fire on the heads of those who refused to provide or lay aside a portion for those for whom nothing had been prepared.

That was the situation, and I am wondering whether the heroes of to-day will again be the forgotten men of to-morrow. I am wondering again if governments, after achieving their ends, will forget their obligations. It seems very much like it, that is, if we are going to fill our plate with the provisions contained in the speech from the Throne and in the twenty-two point program.

I would like just for a moment to refer to the half measure of appointing outside commissions and committees by this government; and to my mind the matter of appointing so many committees, -- and that is all the government has done to date; they have been in office for eight months, and all they have done is to appoint committees for this and for that, National resources, and all the rest of it, -- the appointing of these committees is abundant proof that the government has not the knowledge of the mechanics to be employed to implement the twenty-two point program. Committees to the left of us, Committees to the right of us. It seems to me that the first matter on the agenda is the appointment of a committee, What shall we appoint a Committee to, to inquire, report, and make recommendations? All that, is in spite of the fact that the valley of the Ottawa and the grounds around this historic building are white with the bones of committees appointed to accomplish nothing, men to whom no monuments will be erected, and to whom no awards ever will be made.

Then I wantto talk for a moment upon the half measure of removing hydro out of politics. I doubt very much whether that can be done. Everything we touch and handle to-day is in politics. Every phase of life's activities is in politics. The local bread standing upon your table, the coffee you drink, the magazine you buy, the tobacco you smoke, even sugar beets are in politics now, -- I am not saying anything against that of course. Transportation is in politics. The stock yards are in politics now that the government has got hold of it, and I do not know what they are going to do with it.

A friend of mine said that it was a futile effort on the part of the government to try to get control of the stock yards. I do not know anything about that; I leave that to you. But you can no more take hydro out of politics than you can stop the waters of Niagara, or stop the sun from shining or the rain from falling.

But, while you cannot take hydro out of politics, I will tell you what you can do, you can take the broad public ownership principle upon which hydro is built, — one of the greatest experiments, in economic democracy the world has ever known, and we all admit it is a fine organization and it is working grand for the people of this province. Hydro is swell, magnificent, grand; it is built on public ownership. Then let us take the base of public ownership and extend it to all utilities. If it is a good thing for hydro, it is a good thing for industry, and it is a good thing for any phase of life's activities; and I am confident of this, that if we were to apply this public principle in other spheres of life it would create advantages which would be just as great a miracle as it has done in the spere of hydro light and power.

I promised I would not talk very long and I am not going to talk very long. I see the government would be very happy for me to cease talking.

They say/something about me in my own city.

When I was pleading with the provincial government for a little better shelter and a little more coal, and the government here in Toronto said, "No, we have no money", that was the situation.

Now, I criticized these half measures of the government and I suppose I should be prepared to offer some solution to the chaotic condition of the world to-day. I have a little story here, — I have never told one before in this House. It is one of a school teacher taking her class in geography, and she went over this and back. To make it short she said at the end, well, can anyone tell me now what shape the world is? and one little fellow put up his hand quick and said, Yes, I can, teacher. And the teacher said, Well, what is its shape? and he said, It is in a hell of a shape.

I offered to-day the solution of full measures, full proposals for the post war future, the prerequisites for progress and prosperity, shall I say the new imperatives of political science. We have heard them spoken of in this House during this debate and I want to emphasize them here again.

Of course, the first imperative is full employment. Workers do not want charity, they want a job; they do not want a place in the bread line, but they do want a place on the assembly line. They are asking that poverty and unemployment shall never again become permanent conditions in Canadian life. And unemployment can be corrected and prevented by legislation. We could correct and prevent unemployment by enacting legislation to compel major industries to guarantee eleven months in any calender year, and failing that we could compel industry to give at least eleven month's wages in any calender year, based on eleven months' work. And again, unemployment could be corrected by legislation, by reducing the pension age limit from seventy to sixty-five or even sixty; allowing our young men to go to work and to contribute their share to this day and generation. And it might be corrected by reducing the work day. There is some suggestion on the part of the government to establish a forty-eight hour week and to give a week's vacation with pay. Let me tell the government that labour long ago established a broad principle of a forty-eight hour week and not one week's vacation with pay, but two weeks vacation with pay. I only work forty-four hours a week, and I get two week's vacation with pay;

and the union established that condition. All that the government is doing is extending the broad base already established by organized labour.

I say that unemployment can be corrected along that line. And if industry fails to give employment, — and it is going to fail, — then I think this government should be prepared to take over industry.

I do not mean to say you are going to have the courage to do that; but let me tell you this, that when the C. C. F. comes to power, and they are going to come to power just as sure as the sun will rise, then we shall enact legislation to bring about, if necessary, a thirty hour week. That is the situation.

It is so silly to have all the world's work done by half of the world's men, and the rest of the men remain idle. Put all the men to work; and if a thirty hour week is to be exercised on the basis of putting all the men to work, that is the system that must be adopted, so that men shall have some advantage and benefit from the machine age, so that the machine will not become a frankenstein or a juggernaut by which men perish and go hungry. Full employment, — that is the challenge. That is one of the new imperatives of political science.

The next imperative is maximum wages. I know that does not agree with the profit making system, but the profit making system has to go. That is the only way by which we can build social security.

You cannot liquidate impressions by eradicating ideas. Work and wages have to apply to all men, and if there is no money for the worker, then there is no money for all the rest of us. We might as well get that soon as later. If there is no money for the worker, there is money for the national treasury, there is no money for the insurance treasury, there is no money for the landlord, there is no money for the farmer, no matter what you say. No money for the worker, no market and no prosperity for the farm. Worker prosperity, farm prosperity will build national prosperity and municipal prosperity. If you take the foundation away it is like taking the corner stone from the arch and the whole superstructure will collapse. That is what

happened before and that is what will happen again. There can be no help for the countryside unless all men are working. The mechanism of work and wages means security. There is no other answer. Work and wages form a chain of benefit in which is incorporated ~~the~~ not only the worker but the man for whom he works, and men in every walk of life, men in the professions, the doctors and the lawyers, — I would think that the lawyers and the doctors on the opposite bench would be interested. That is the only answer. There is no other solution: full employment, maximum wage standards are the only foundations upon which we can build the recovery programs.

So I submit the new imperatives of political science to you; and work will give that opportunity to the limit in establishing the life requisites in this Canada of ours, which we so much love. Surely you want to establish that for the returning young men. Surely you want to meet the challenge of the demobilization.

There can be an excuse for not being prepared for war, but there cannot be any excuse for not being prepared for peace. It would be the unforgivable sin of this government and it would be an indictment against this great country of ours.

I want to say that we can have a new day, we can have a day full of happiness and contentment. I think my friend, the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. John L. McDonald) said something about the full and happy life. That is what we have been fighting for all these years and that is what we will fight for to-morrow. Will you not fight for those things with us, so that we can have a happy and full life? Is not that the heritage of the men, women and children of Canada. Do you not want to guarantee the future of your children and of your children's children yet unborn? Are we prepared? We are not prepared if we accept the half measures and half provisions, the juvenile provisions of the speech from the Throne and the twenty-two point program. That is like a bird pecking at the rock of Gibraltar seeking to destroy that huge stone.

I trust you will accept these new imperatives of political

science, full employment and maximum wage standards, so that we can travel together the ways of prosperity, contentment and peace.

MR T. P. MURRAY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to get up and take the time of the House, now that everybody is advocating shorter hours. Some of these hon. members should practice what they preach. I feel we should have shorter hours here in Parliament.

I am away over here by aisle, and all you have to do with me is to give me a little push and I will be out of it. I do not know whether I can put over my speech to-night as well as I would like to, as I have a cold and to know I am quite a piece away and at this distance I am afraid I am not going to get the ball over the plate.

I am an old timer in the House. I am one of the six survivors of the election of 1929; and that was one reason why I thought I would say a word here to-night. I know something about the difficulties the Speakers have to contend with, and the honours that go with that position, and therefore I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, to-night, and know that you will carry on the work in a very fair and honest way.

Also I would like to congratulate some of the hon. members who sit on the treasury benches. Some of them are very well known to me. Take my old friend, the Minister of Highways, I think all he knows about politics he learned from me. I met him down at the county council twenty years ago, and I was a pretty big man at that time, I was chairman of The Roads Committee of the two counties; and he was only an insurance agent. He was a kind of a handsome young man and I gave him the benefit of my knowledge and my experience and I am proud of it.

The hon. the Minister of Hydro (Hon. George H. Challies) is somewhat like the apostle Paul.

All along the line, I am glad to congratulate the premier; it is quite nice that he, an old soldier, should be premier of this

province in wartime and peace time.

The Minister of Lands and Forests (Hon. Wesley C. Thompson) has done a lot for the lumber business. They claim he is a farmer raised on pork and beans; and lumber has to be taken out on pork and beans, you cannot take it out without pork and beans. That is the principle diet in the camps and that is the reason I feel sure he will make good.

I want to congratulate my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Edward B. Jolliffe), and the other gentlemen in the front seats.

I am in a back bench, but I am glad it says in the Good Book, that he got a position in the eleventh hour shall get as good wages as the man who came at the first hour. That is why I am proud of my seat at the present time.

I felt rather surprised when I listened to all the complaints and the melancholy speech of the hon. member who delivered the most melancholy address I ever heard. It almost surpasses the lamentations of Jeremiah. I think the hon. gentleman should have more faith and more courage in this country. When I think that my father came out from Ireland in 1855 or 1856; he had no complaints; he made progress. I think I have made progress myself.

My friend talks about work, and I can get work not only for myself but for one hundred and fifty men besides. I cannot understand how men can get up in this House and complain so bitterly. I see the great open spaces, and I see the progress that many men have made.

Then he talks about everything being in politics. If anything in the world is wanting everything to be in politics it is the C.C.F. They want me to go out of business at sixty-five. I am pretty close to that now, — and they are going to send me to the poor house, take my business away from me, and so I am going to the poor house.

I am going to go into politics then because I want a salary from the government.

I know that the hydro is in politics because anything that is owned or controlled by the government is in politics. But free enterprise is all we want. We want every man and women to go out in this country and be able to make a living for himself or herself. I say if a man has a fair amount of intelligence and a little luck, such as God gave to the old pioneers, there is no question at all but that he is going to get along.

Most men like to try a little gambling and play the game. They want to get out in the open and make a living. That is why I do not want to go out of business at sixty-five and go to the poor house.

I am going to do some scolding and go after the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Williams).

I asked a friend of mine the other day what was the difference between an Englishman and a Welshman and he said there was no difference. I am going away back to one of my friends who came out from the old country. They came out and found they were in a free country; they were to get two hundred acres of land, and then they were to own that land; they were to have the privilege of electing a municipal government, and that municipal government had a right to have police. They had the privilege of electing the provincial government, and they had the privilege of electing a dominion government, -- that was there business.

Mr. Speaker, when you elect a government you want that government to go. What does the word "government"mean? Doesn't it mean to govern?

It is all right for agitators to go out through the country and tell the people to practice mob rule; but when you come into the legislative assembly and advocate the same thing, you are going too far. I mean this, and I am very strong in this opinion.

Here, a few years ago I was sitting in a member's room and my hon. friend from Elgin, who was Premier at that time, was having this trouble with the people in Oshawa, and I formed my opinion and said a government should govern. The government of Ontario should form a t ribunal, and that tribunal should have the power to go down to Oshawa, Kirkland Lake or any other place, and they should have the power to investigate. They should have the power to enter my sawmill, if there was trouble there, and I should let them look at my books and

investigate, and their word should be final; and no other organization, whether C. I. F., or anything else, should rule over that order. If the police of the country cannot control mob rule, then of course, the government resigns. That is what happened over in France, and you know where France is to-day. I am serious . I felt so disgusted and displeased after listening for the hon. member for Ontario, I felt like sending for my son to come home and not fight for the Englishman any more. I am a loyalist Irishman and was born in Canada. The speech I made in this House ten or twelve years ago on the seventeenth of March proves it. I have a son in the flying force, a flying officer who is fighting for England. But when my hon. friend from Essex got up, it was hard to console me, and I wondered if it was worth fighting for, if the people from Europe are to come over here and ridicule our country, — I don't mind criticism of our government but this is the second war, and we have sent men by the millions over there to make peace. Now, I have another thought that is not perhaps going to be so pleasant, — but it is/my opinion.

I feel sure that if the labour government of England had their eyes open Hitler would not have got so far. I am not saying I am a hundred per cent correct, but I am convinced from what information I have that is that the governments of Europe, the British government, as well as the others, have done their duty, while they were wrangling over labour and other things that did not amount to so much, they let Hitler get his gang together; now we do not knowwhen it is going to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I am disgusted and, as I have said, displeased when men come over to this country, that were not born and raised in this country, and try to tell us what we should do.

I think it is true, if my history is right, it was Lord Durham who came over here a hundred years ago, and recommended this system of government for Canada; and we have had this system of government for a good many years, and the older it is the better it is. Like liquor, which, they say, the older it is the better it is.

I think we have a good system of government if the people would

only get to understand it.

With regard to the government of Ontario carrying on, I feel that it should carry on. Things have gone on in county councils and in the back concessions, and we have heard questions here, that the government should not carry on. We have all taken an oath to serve the people of Ontario. I want to tell you this, that I did not come here to serve any creed, class, occupation or other master. I came here to serve everybody.

I am a lumberman, and before I get through I am intending to talk to farmers and labourers. It is very easy, because all you have to do it to do your duty and you can talk to the farmers and also to the labour men.

I am very pleased we have carried on this long, even with those radical speeches which have been made, those mistakes which have been made by different speakers, we are still good friends, and it looks as it we are going to have good legislation and good government.

As I said, I am one of the six who came back after the last election. I take no credit for that for myself, because the good things which the last government did in my county, and, I think all over Ontario, made it easy in a good many of the cases, for us to come back.

Down in Renfrew county they developed hydro power at Calebogie, and put in a dam along the Madawaska River, and built roads and bridges; and they have had the advantage of all the social legislation.

(Page 696 follows)

And for that reason it may be very easy, but there was something happened in different constituencies. A lot of people thought, I suppose, that we should not have an election, at all, but I felt, and others also, that the soldier's vote was not properly arranged, but we in Renfrew County, of course, were pleased with the work, and I am proud to look back upon it, and I look ahead with hope that we will go on, and we will prosper.

Now, the speech from the Throne: well, I did not study it very much, but there are several good things in it, and one of the things which is proposed is a more efficient education. Now, I am not an educated man -- well, I am an educated man, but not in a school. I never saw a school teacher until I was thirteen years old, and I did not meet her in school; I met her at the Post Office. I also claim to be a religious man, although I never saw a clergyman until I was twelve years old, but my mother taught me my prayers - and my father taught me my politics, and other things. My father was educated at Bally Bay in Ireland, and he thought he was a scholar. He was a fifth-book scholar, but in that country, in those days, we had no schools and we had no churches, but we had good parents, and sometimes I think we got along as well as my hon. friends opposite me.

We are, indeed, living in a troubled world. We have what I would almost refer to as the "Tower of Babel", with everybody talking, and nobody seeming to understand them. We are building a structure here on earth, but it seems the higher we build the structure, the lower we go down.

Now, education has cost me a lot of money. I know what education costs. As I have said before, I think I have the largest family of any man in this House — nine children. I think they went to school a total of some one hundred and

twenty-six years, and it cost me a lot of money, but I am not begrudging that money, at all. I had the money to spend, and if I was raising another family, I would educate them just as well. So I do not owe the schools or colleges anything — I do not know whether they owe me anything, or not.

Now, a point that I am going to bring up is rather a vexed one, and that is religion in the schools. As I said, I do not know whether it is necessary to have religion in the schools, or not, if you have religion in the home, but, considering the fact now that mothers are away from home so much, engaged in war work and other industries, it may be a good thing to have some religion in the schools. The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Belanger) explained that very fully. He is an educated man, and I was very proud to listen to him the other day. I do not know whether the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario has in his head what I think he has, but I think he will propose a Bill somewhat the same as the one which went through the British House last summer. I am told he was over there studying that Bill, but I may be wrong. However, there was a Bill went through the British House last summer. I do not know all about the Bill, but I saw in the Journals of Parliament of the Empire something about the Bill, and I noticed what the Archbishop of Canterbury said about the Bill. I do not want the hon. members of this House to be shocked when I read his remarks. I am not a very good reader, but I will try to read it as best I can. The Archbishop of Canterbury is a good and holy man, a good Anglican. I think he is to the Anglican Church about the same as the Pope of Rome is to us, so I feel he would be speaking for his people. He said:

"They are now offering for the first time a complete

national educational system. He was disappointed that there was not any fuller provision for adult education, and he suggested that some of the heroic, great houses of England, which would no longer he used as private residences, should be turned into adult educational colleges. Referring to the importance of the religious quality of education, he remarked that all education must be of its very nature either religious or atheistic."

You will see that he said there, "either religious or atheistic". It could not be neutral.

"He was happy to think that the white paper that was offering education freed it from denominational schools, and an offer which comes from a free state must be regarded generally."

Then he went on to say:

"If it had been suggested for us ten years ago", the Archbishop said, that the state would offer fifty per cent. of the cost of renewal and maintenance, and still leave the schools in the hands of the denominations which control it, it would have been regarded by us as beyond our wildest dreams.

There is the difference in the attitude over in England, according to the Archbishop of Canterbury. So that for that reason I say to the hon. Prime Minister of the Province that he has no reason of being afraid of the good people of Ontario if they do teach a little religion in the schools.

As I said a minute ago, if you have good parents to teach you religion, and go to Church, as you should, perhaps that is all that is necessary.

Now, I never saw the Bill in England, but I have read you the comment the Archbishop has made upon it, and

that is all I have to say on this Bill for education.

There is another very important matter, and my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Belanger) spoke of that the other day; that is in connection with immigration and the increase in the population. I think, myself, having faith in Canada, and never being out of work and seeing the great open spaces which made it possible for people to make a living, that Canada should have at least one hundred million people, and I do not know why we have not, and I think one of the reasons that Canada has not the population is that so many of our good men and women leave the country every year. I do not know what the figures are, but I do know, from my experiences, looking back twenty years and seeing so many men and women going to Detroit and New York and other places, that it is something which has been occurring regularly.

Coming up on the train the other day I noticed, when I changed cars at Carleton Place, there were four very good-looking men took the seat opposite me, accompanied by two rather good-looking women, and I was wondering where they came from, and where they were going. When we got to Toronto, one of them came to me and said, "You are Mr. Murray", and I said, "Yes", and he said, "You should know me; I am from your constituency". He said he had been raised there. And there were six people in that group who were born and educated in Renfrew County, and yet they are now citizens of Detroit, and have been living there for over fifteen years. In Detroit itself there is a whole colony of Canadians, many of them from Renfrew County. It is a strange thing that the people of Canada, born and educated here, with all the possibilities of making a living, do not stay here. Of course, those who go to the United States andother countries have a perfect right to do so.

Now, in regard to bringing immigrants into Canada. We might go back into the old days for an example, up in the County of Renfrew, and take the Township of McNab. About a hundred and twenty years ago, or more, John McNab was a Highland Chief in Scotland, and he was a landlord, and he started the Township of McNab, and he got control of about sixteen square miles, and he had some of the good Scotchmen on there, and he dominated them for quite a while, and they paid tribute to him, but finally, with the assistance of a good fighting men and some French and Irish and Scotch, they chased him out, and the result was that the Township of McNab was established up in Renfrew County in the province of Ontario.

Then, going up the line, you get into the settlement of St. Patrick. When the Irish came out here, they naturally went on the highest land to try and make a living. Then, as you proceed and get up farther into the rougher land, you get the German settlements, the Polish settlements, the French settlements, and even the English settlements. Oh, I could talk for two hours if I wanted to tell you about the work and achievements of the old pioneers, but if you would only come up and spend three or four days with me, and go around through the county, you would see for yourself what these men have accomplished. You would see the stones they have picked, and the buildings they have built, and the farms they have made, and the land they have cleared, and then you would agree with me that if you could get men and women like those, we would then have a real Ontario.

Now, then, we have had men who came even from the centre of Europe, and they came here with Kodaks on their backs;- I think some of them were spies - they are different.

I was going to pay a particular compliment to the

Polish people. I saw a picture in the Toronto "Evening Star" recently of Jacob Labetsky and three or four other farmers who were farming up at Wilnough. The Polish people have come out here from Central Europe. Some of them came out as long ago as about eighteen fifty-five - just a few - and others in 1862, after the Bismarck War. In eighteen seventy-two quite a number of Polish people came to Renfrew County. They were tired of war. Some of them had fought in three wars, and had been decorated with the Iron Cross and other things, and they came to Wilnough, and some of them got into politics.

In eighteen seventy-two there was a heated election. The Conservative candidate was a man named O'Reilly, from Kingston, and the Liberal candidate was a man named Bannerman, and one of the Poles, who had come out here in eighteen fifty-five, and had learned English and was teaching school, was a good Tory, and they told him to get hold of those two hundred or so men, and they told him if these men voted for O'Reilly they would get two hundred acres of land. Of course, they were not on the voters' list at that time, and it was an open fight, and they lined them up, and there were a bunch of big Irishmen from Renfrew down the line, and they were sent up there to protect them. They were all good Tories, and at the line-up at the first poll they asked whom they were going to vote for, and they said, "O'Reilly", and "two hundred acres of land". So they voted for O'Reilly, and he was elected and they got their two hundred acres of land. And when you go up to Wilnough now, you can see what these people have done, all the stones they have picked, the buildings they have built, and so forth, and they came there and were happy, because they were in a free country, and they danced and made merry, and they got married and stayed married, and they raised large families, young men and women to per-

petuate their names, and now they are scattered over the different parts of this province and are making progress and are happy.

From this particular section there are from two hundred and fifty to two hundred and seventy-five young men who have enlisted and have gone Overseas to fight for the British Empire. They are in the Air Force, and in all branches of the Armed Services, and if you can get immigrants like those to come out now, and go onto those farms which are deserted, it will would be of great help to the province of Ontario and to the people as a whole.

Now, I said I was a lumberman to start with, but I seem to be doing a lot of wandering around, and am forgetting the lumber business. I came in here as a lumberman first, and there was a row raised, and they ordered me out of the House, but finally I got the opportunity to talk lumber.

There seems to be a wrong impression about lumbermen in this House. When a lumberman comes in, they point their finger at him, and say, "Oh, he is a lumberman, and is only out for himself." But I say to you, but you should have in this Legislature a good representation of lumbermen who will protect the farmers, the Labour men, and all the citizens of this province, because we all have a share in the great forests of Ontario. Every person in Ontario is a shareholder in the forest resources of this province, and the only man who knows the tricks of the trade is the practical lumberman. The argument has been used against me in several election campaigns that I was a lumberman, and therefore was only here for myself, and that the people of my riding should have a farmer representing them, and not a lumberman. Well, I am about the only operating lumberman in this House. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Scott)is a lumber dealer, and he is a good fellow, and we get along well together, but

there are a lot of tricks about this lumber game which only a lumberman can know, and I maintain that the rascalities which went on in the olden times should not be repeated. I am not complaining, because we are making progress. Things have been going better, and the politicians and the men who are running the Government of this country are, I think, honest, and are giving the timber a fair deal.

Now, I remember a great many years ago it took about seventy-five thousand dollars' worth of timber to elect a representative in Renfrew County. In the last election, I do not think they got seventy-five cents' worth. There is not any timber being given away. Away back in nineteen hundred and eight, the whole township was opened up for the occasion of an election, and there was a rush in there like a gold rush to get votes to elect a candidate. The same thing happened in the township of Lyall. I made reference to that years ago, when I was a fighting member of this House, and our late lamented friend, the hon. William Finlayson, said I was telling the truth. He said, "Murray Brothers hold a timber license for the township of Lyall," -- which was right --"and he is the only man who can steal timber, because he holds the timber license." It was a matter of politics all the way. I have already mentioned the township of Burns, and in Lyall the license was held by a man named Cameron, and they went and opened up the township for the election, and pretended farmers went in and took up ten thousand acres of land, with the pretense that they were going to farm it, and they did not want the land, at all; they wanted the timber, and they sold the timber to whoever would buy it, and the Government got no revenue.

Now, this thing has been stopped. Away back in nineteen seventeen there was an Order-in-Council passed in this Parliament of Ontario stopping a lot of that kind of

stuff. Previous to that, you could go into my timber limits -- you might be in there hunting, and you would see some good timber, and you would go home and put your gun away and come back with an axe, and pretend you were going to go in there and farm, and I could not put you out, and when you cut the timber off then you would set fire to the underbrush, and burn the bush, and it was all right. However, they passed an Order-in-Council in nineteen seventeen which stopped all that. They made it unlawful for any person to go onto the land and cut the timber on the pretext that they were clearing the land, until they were first located. They had to go in, and take two men, and examine the land, and then go to the land agent, and then the Government sent an inspector, and if the inspector said the land was fit for farming they could get located, and then they could ahead and farm. It was a move toward the betterment of conditions, and it succeeded.

Now, before I forget it, I am going to bring up now two knotty problems for the hon. minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson). I think I am a clever lumberman, but I cannot find a solution for these knotty problems. I had an argument with some of the men in the Lands and Forests Department the other day, and they are all very well trained, and although we did not agree, I got called down severely during the last election campaign. Up in our country, and in different parts of Ontario, the lumbermen have timber licenses, and in some parts of Renfrew County they have licenses to cut pine on the farmlands. There might be the third generation of farmers living on that farm, but the pine belongs to the lumbermen and the Government. The lumberman puts down his license on the table, and he owns the pine. The farmer puts his patent on the table, and the pine is reserved.

During the last election campaign I had quite a time with my conservative opponent on that. Some of them pointed

their fingers at me. We met in joint debate in some of the back concessions, and some of the front concessions, too, and they said, "Well, here is Tom Murray, the lumberman, all in favour of the lumbermen, and here is a poor farmer who cannot cut the pine on his own land." I went back at them, and I said, "Don't sneer at Tom Murray, but sneer at some of the big politicians who are up around here to-night. They are the men who made the mistake."

This limit was first owned by MacLachlin Brothers. They cut the big pine timber, and made a few million dollars. Thirty-five years ago they sold it to M. J. O'Brien, and after M. J. O'Brien had paid the grants and the fire taxes for thirty-five years, "What will you do about it?", they said. They said, "Will you take it from him?". British fair play said "No". I said, "If the big politicians you had out here years ago knew their business, when the timber license was transferred from MacLachlin to O'Brien, you would have had those lots inspected, and had them taken out of the licenses, and then you could go ahead, and there would be no obstacle in the way, and you could give the farmer a title to his pine, and it would be settled for all time", and now we are in that position, and I am sorry to say that my Tory friends have not made any more progress on it, as yet. I think they are not doing as well.

I am one of these generous lumbermen, and I told some of my friends if they could find one stump on the farmers' land I would resign. That was a pretty fair offer to make. I said, "Find one pine stump on our timber limits that I cut on the farmers' land when I held the license." I held the licenses for a few, but I was wise enough, years ago, to cancel the licenses on nearly all the occupied land, and for that reason I had no trouble with our timber limits.

Now, here is another knotty problem, and it is the

boot on the other foot. This is in regard to the difference between unorganized territory and organized territory, and there is a great difference. My hon. friend has some organized territory in his constituency; I have none. But we passed a Bill here about four years ago. I did not like the Bill, but it went through, and I will try to explain this very unfair situation, and I expect this very fair and wise Government may have a solution.

In the township of Lyall, which I mentioned before, certain people in the unorganized territory — I do not know just how many — had a Bill put through this house, which covered a situation where if you had paid taxes in arrears, and found you were not the lawful owners of the land, you would get your tax rebated, and interest on it, and consequently there was a lot of money paid out by the Department of Lands and Forests to men and women who thought they owned the land, but when they investigated they found they had not a proper title, and the Government said, "We received your land tax; we will pay it back to you." That was in the township of Lyall, in an unorganized territory.

Then go to the organized territory, across the Lake, and what do you find there? It is an organized municipality. You find farms occupied for thirty-five years, perhaps forty or fifty acres cleared and set to buildings. These farms were turned over to the merchants for storage purposes, when the farmers were moving off them, and now the merchants find out that some of these lots were just located, but were not patented, and my friends in the Lands and Forests Department have no solution, and as much as five hundred or six hundred dollars of municipal taxes have been paid into the Municipal Governments in the last twenty-five years, and yet they will

lose these places. If you are on a farm, you have a chance, because if you live within five miles you get a patent. But the merchant or lumberman does not get any chance, at all. That is what worries all of us. Some of these municipalities are poor, and they will lose all that revenue. I want some hon. member of this house to suggest something that will eliminate that. I think these people who bought this land in good faith, and improved it and cleared it, and occupied it -- they are working men, some of them merchants, and some of them may be lumbermen like myself, and they say to me, "Well, it does not make any difference to you; you have lots of money", and that is the idea.

Well, we should not have two laws. They should have the same law for every honest man and woman in the province, whether wealthy or not.

Now, if I got to talking about trees -- I promised to hold the fort until Mr. Millard comes in, and I can very easily do it, if you have the patience to listen to it. It is much easier for me to stand up here and talk than it is for you hon. members to listen.

Well, you hear a lot about reforestation, and this Forestry Commission which is to be appointed. I don't know whether that is going to help any, or not, because, as has been said here, and I think very truly said, although the Hydro is a subsidiary of this Parliament or Government, from what I have seen of what Hydro has done, there is not much difference between Hydro and the Department of Lands and Forests.

(Page No. 708 follows.)

I think a commission should run the lands and forests and just as efficiently and just as fair with the public as the Hydro, and this is no new thing. We started a long time ago. I see by this book here in 1855 a Committee of the House of Commons under the Honourable H. E. Gault, Chairman, they investigated on this thing and they made a report. In 1865 the Honourable A. Campbell, Commissioner of Crown Lands, they appointed a committee and they investigated and for that reason this is nothing new.

When we talk about reforestation I know something about that. I would go down to Norfolk only I would be accused of going down for the by-election. I am going to wait until after the election is over because I would not be accused of going into politics in that end of the province. I have so far failed to see, what I call an artificial plantation, that compares with our natural growth of timber. I might take members and you might drive from where I came from, if I was not with you, and say that this country was not much good but if I went along with you we would stop here and there and I would prove that we are going to be wealthy with the growth of timber -- with all the rascalities of timber being stolen and given away, burnt up -- where the young growth of timber is going to be very valuable; we are going to have better lumber in thirty years or fifty years from now than we are today, and that is the lumber situation at the present time. Wood is coming into Barry Bay and mills all around there and thousands of men working and living off the products of the forest. I find that if the fire is kept out and the timber properly protected things are all right.

Here is a thing, before I forget, my hon. friend last night from North Wellington (Mr. Hancock) he gave me a tip about cutting the small timber. I was afraid that this House was perhaps going to blame the lumber men. He said lumbermen come on certain lots and cut the timber down until nothing left. There are restrictions on us lumbermen and sometimes we obey them. We do not cut pine down smaller than thirteen inches on the stump and eighteen inches from the ground. The farmers down in our constituency -- there are a lot of them not lumbermen -- and now they can get a good price and they are cutting the baby pine and stripping the whole thing bare. It would be far better if they would pick out certain trees

and leave the others to grow. That is all right in some places. Then there are other places they should not go into at all. I want to tell the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, (Mr. Thompson) if they want to have any good pine in fifty years they will have to cut sections right back, but if they let them go in on this selective cutting they will never have any really big trees because they will cut them when they get that size. I see my hon. friend over there now and I am taking up more time.

I think even my good friends the farmers were suspicious of the lumbermen; I think they would appreciate what I have to say because I am different from a lot of lumbermen. There are good and bad lumbermen.

Another thing, I am telling you, I am here to represent the people of Ontario. I am not here to represent the lumbermen of Ontario. They do not come near me at all. The way they do it, they have their associations and conferences and confederations, I pay one hundred and seventy dollars a year to belong to them but I do not attend their meetings. I do not go near them. Lowe, he is a great big lumberman now. Today his picture is in all the lumber magazines. He got wise and he went into politics and he is going to get rich but I feel that it is my duty to help the government of Ontario to protect the forests of Ontario for the people of Ontario. So I think that the lumbermen they approached the Department of Lands and Forests and met the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Thompson) and of course there are a lot of good people among them but me, as member of this House, I am here speaking for the people of the province and the lumbermen don't know much about me.

I am going to tell a joke I had on the Canadian Lumberman. It is a very practical magazine printed in the province of Ontario and last election they told about candidate in Renfrew County and they said John E. Egan was the conservative candidate in Renfrew and they said he was a prominent and a strong lumberman and they said his opponent was Murray, the previous sitting member. Now, John E. Egan is dead fifty-seven years. The conservative candidate was John James Foran. He talks like myself, an Irishman, not a bad fellow. John James Foran tried to

follow in my footsteps and he thought all he should do is to marry a girl from the same township that my wife comes from and copy after me -- raising a large family, and that he would walk right into the Parliament of Ontario and he discovered after the votes were counted it was not quite so easy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take longer on this lumber situation but I have already talked far longer than I expected. There may be a lot of things I have forgotten here because I could talk about the raising of sheep in the county and the wolves killing them and all that sort of thing and I could tell you about the north country. I think some day it will be deserted and given back to the Indians and they will make an apology for the mess we have made of it, the white man. These men -- Charlie MacRae among them did get up in this House and they would tell you about the north country and Charlie MacRae, you know, he was nickelplated. You could not puncture his armour when he come up from Sudbury. When he introduced a Bill in the House it had to go through. He was full of talking about the silver resources of Ontario and when he talked about the gold resources of the province you would think the northern lights was a reflection of the gold hills of Northern Ontario. I never thought so much of Northern Ontario. I think it is too cold to farm and their timber is not going to grow the same as our timber but with the assistance of good legislators and good laws and good people it may increase in population but of that I am very very doubtful. I think good old Ontario -- central Ontario and Western Ontario and the other part of Ontario that is being deserted and I am going to say something before I stop. This is for the C. C. F. I want to see to put you in good humor before I sit down. We did not have any C. C. F. candidate in my county because I am quite a logical man. You have heard a lot about hours of labour and reduction of the hours of labour. Well, any person with any intelligence could tell that is impossible. We are going around in circles. We are now producing three or four times as much as we require ourselves and when these five hundred or six hundred thousand soldiers come back there will be a lot of unemployment and there is no question about it. I think that we

will be able to provide the necessities of life without working so very long. When you with your machinery go and finish up our road in our municipalities you use a big bulldozer, you do not have two hundred men working, and naturally we are leaning that way. Now, it is a foolish way for me to talk because they will say -- why don't you cut the hours in your own saw mills. Under the present situation you have money in the bank to pay them and I do not see how you are going to get it if you don't work so long. I often think there will be a solution for all this trouble. I would like some educated man in this House to tell me what the government is meaning. What is the meaning of this government? What does the people expect it to do? Do they expect it to go to work and do everything for them? The government is only composed of men and women employed by the people of Ontario to do their bit - that is, to look after their education and a lot, of course, of other things, but at the same time the men and women of this province they have got to look out for themselves. They do not expect surely that the government is going to spoon feed them and surely they have some instinct that they will get out and take a chance on something. Do like our lumbermen and cut a bunch of timber and we do not know if we will even get it out. They are stalling around the city, doing nothing. I am afraid if you bring in the same kind of immigrants -- I think those people would be glad to get out of Europe and do as the old pioneers did and start with a hen and cow and horse and live as some of them did in shacks, and soon they had a brick house. I do not think it is possible for any government, although it can assist.

I want to thank you for your attention. I need not chop up my speech for I am a good chopper. I have not attempted to make a speech in six months; I have not had any practice.

MR. GARFIELD ANDERSON (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, commencing I want to add my voice with those who have already spoken in congratulating you in your high position. I know you will fill it with dignity. I would like to compliment the Mover and the Seconder of the Address.

This is my first experience in Parliament and I have really enjoyed listening to all these debates. I think they have been

rather lengthy and I can assure you before I start that I won't tire you with a long talk. I have two or three matters of importance to mention to-night and when I finish with that I will sit down.

I had intended speaking on labour matters because I come from a city that is highly industralized. We have many plants that work in peace time and one very large war plant employing between six and seven thousand people. But I feel the whole labour question has been so thoroughly covered by the hon.member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) that anything I might say would be merely repetition. We have been very fortunate in Fort William indeed. I see the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is not in his seat but if he was he would agree with me that he has had very little to complain about from the head of the lakes. I think that is worth keeping in mind because by some of the addresses I have heard here one would think that labour men were real trouble-makers but there we have, as I say, thousands of men and women engaged in industry. They are organized to a far greater degree than I think in most cities. The figure is well-up ahead and the results are very good indeed. Labour and management in those plants got together and the management gave the whole responsibility of appealing for war bonds to the representative of labour in the plant -- labour management committee -- and in each and every case they have gone away over the top.

I think the working people do their best when they are recognized and when they feel that they have an interest in the work they are doing, and they are being recognized by the firm that is employing them. I want to quote you a few figures here. I just had them recently. One industry that has allowed labour-management committees to function have paid out forty thousand dollars to date as rewards for employees' suggestions and this has been the result. These suggestions have resulted in over $600,000 per year savings in labour and material and over $475,000 in machines. There, I think, is an excellent example of not trying to quarrel with workers, but recognizing the fact they are human beings and giving them the right to co-operate with management.

In the Speech from the Throne--and I am not going to criti

cize the Speech from the Throne a great deal. In the Speech from the Throne there is mention made of labour legislation--at least an Act--that will guarantee a 48-hour week. That would be considered the length of week and with one week's holidays with pay. I think that is very good. That is at least a step in the right direction, but I hope when this legislation is being brought down it won't interfere with those organizations and industries that have already recognized a 44-hour week with two weeks holidays with pay.

We have heard of the four freedoms initiated by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt--freedom from want, freedom of speech, freedom to worship God according to our wishes. There is another freedom--freedom from fear, and I must admit I have a little touch of that to-night because as mayor of Fort William I have to go back and face all those people who thought, and I have thought quite sincerely when I left there about three weeks ago to come down here, if I went back and did not have a cheque for half the cost of education in my pocket, I at least would have a good bargain. I am going to leave to-night on the late train for Fort William and I have a little fear of how I am going to be treated when I get off the train and tell them it is going to be considered. I have some hopes in the settlement. I hope that if the promise is not fulfilled 100% that we can get a good bill. It is a big cost and many of the municipalities find it difficult to raise the money that is necessary to carry on that important work.

AN. HON. MEMBER: We won't forget Fort William.

MR. ANDERSON: There is another matter in connection with education. The Speech from the Throne mentioned the fact that many of the teachers had been called into the service and many more had left the profession because of the war. I agree with both these statements, but I think there is another reason. There is another reason that is not mentioned and I hope and I feel sure that the Prime Minister of this province (Hon. Mr. Drew) will do what he can towards raising the salaries of some of the underpaid teachers.

I have in my hands here a list--it is not up to date; it gives the figures for 1937 to 1938 but I know there has not been any appreciable change--and it states in Canada there are 64,000 lay teachers in the public schools, 32% received less than $600.00 per year or $50.00 per month. Over 60% received less

$900. per year or $75. per month, and over 73% received less than $1,200. a year or $100. per month. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is not a very remunerative way to expect these young men and young women who have such important work to carry out as the teaching of our children, and I believe that if the wages were more in line with the cost of living we would not have so much difficulty in securing teachers for our schools, even in wartime.

I want to mention briefly one or two matters in connection with the Department of Highways Act, not in the form of criticism because I realize that with the war on it has not been an easy matter to secure the equipment that is necessary--and I am going to do what very few members have done, I am going to mention my own constituency. After all, it is pretty near myself. There we have very little snow plow equipment. We have had one of the mildest winters this year since 1887. Had we had a normal winter we certainly would not have had the snow plow equipment necessary to keep roads open in that big area because it is large and many of the farmers have to bring in their cream and milk, and it is necessary to have the roads open.

The other thing I would like to mention is the wages that are paid to some of the employees. I think they are abnormally low. I got a list from the local engineer, Mr. Smith, and I am not going to mention them all, just two or three of them. I find out that labourers are working for 45 cents an hour with no cost of living bonus. I do not think that is enough and I am sure that this province of Ontario can afford to pay steady employees who are doing faithful work, some of them with families to keep, a little more money than that. I think we must try and do it anyway. The skilled power unit operators--this is what they are rated at least on the list I got--are getting as low as $4.40 daily, and then there is another category that are listed as getting $93.75 per month. None of them receive the cost of living bonus, I was told by the engineer. It is not a large matter and I realize it will run into a little money, but I think it is very important that these men should get an increase in pay if at all possible.

There is another thing that I would like to mention to the

Department of Highways to keep in mind and that is this; that one of the largest businesses we have in that country, apart from farming and timber, is the tourist business, and I think possibly some of the speakers may have mentioned that. I have been out of my seat a few times during the day but there are two links in that part of the country in the roads that I believe the money that would be spent in completing them would soon be received from the extra tourist business just as soon as the war is over, and that is from Schreiber to Sault Ste. Marie along the lake shore and from Shabaqwan Lake to Port Frances.

The Speech from the Throne mentions setting aside two new provincial parks. Well, I have a letter in my pocket from an organization at the head of the lakes known as the Fish and Game Protective Association asking the government not to set aside the whole of those parks. I can hardly believe that that organization represents all the people in that part of the country because the City Council of Port William before I left passed a resolution, forwarding it onto the Government, commending them for setting aside one of those parks, the Sibley Provincial Park near Port Arthur and then another at Sault Ste. Marie. I think possibly what this Fish and Game Protective Society had in mind the Act governing parks. I am going to read one sentence from their letter. I have not checked up on the Act, but this is what they say: "Our association, however, went on record as being opposed to certain clauses in the Act governing provincial parks which we understand will govern this proposed park--at discretion may be leased for a period of 21 years for cottage sites and summer resort stores." I would read more of this letter but I feel copies have been sent to the Department and they will know its contents as well as I read it here.

I would like, however, to read a little editorial here dealing with parks, because I think it is very important. This editorial was written and appeared in Toronto paper recently in connection with the Quetico Park, just west of Port William, and this is what the editorial has to say:

"This park, a lovely domain of wooded wilderness, interspersed with lakes, rivers and streams, in the northwestern corner of Ontario, is separated by the Rainy River from a similar park in Minnesota called the Superior National

Forest. Together they form one of the largest areas of unspoiled wilderness in North America, and, since the poverty of the soil precludes agricultural settlement, it seems desirable that this region should be kept as far as possible in a state of nature for the enjoyment of the public. Year after year it has been attracting an increasing number of people, chiefly from the United States, who want to spend a health-giving holiday in the wilds. It contains within its bounds fine fishing grounds, and offers unique opportunities for long canoe trips and camping parties.

The conditions prevailing in and the problems of the two parks are virtually identical, and in 1927 there was launched a project called the Quetico-Superior program, which sought the conclusion of a treaty between Canada and the United States for the administration of this international lake-land under a unified plan of conservation. Interested persons belonging to both countries formed the Quetico-Superior Council, which, if it has made no serious headway toward its ambitious objective, has done very valuable work in getting sound principles of conservation applied on the United States side. There logging operations on the shore lines of lakes and rivers, which would leave disfiguring stumps instead of fine growing trees, and further damming of streams and rivers, are forbidden by law. Logging on public lands is strictly regulated in the public interest, and permitted only on a selective basis. The result is that the natural amenities of the Superior National Forest are being effectively safeguarded.

But there has been no reciprocal effort on the Canadian side. When the State Department at Washington a few years ago tried to open negotiations with Ottawa for a common program it was blocked by the refusal of the Provincial Government of Ontario to give its consent. Such regulations as may exist about lumbering operations in the Quetico Park have been more honored in the breach than in the observance by certain lumber firms which are operating inside it. They have been ruthlessly denuding the shores of lakes and rivers of their trees and, through their erection of logging

dams, have been flooding large stretches of country. Here is a picture of the devastation which is being wrought on the Big Turtle River, given by a leading official of the Quetico-Superior Council:

"Let us see what that means. It inevitably means swamped rivers and dead timber. It means blocking off the bays and tributaries by boom timbers. It means dams in places of natural rapids and waterfalls. It means portages wrecked by buildings, logging equipment and traffic. It means that, for years and until the river is ruined for wild life and recreation, the river will be practically closed in summer for all other travel. That has been the history of all these streams. All during the spring and a great part of the summer rivers like the Namakan, the Seine and the Little Turtle are closed to trabel by canoe -- cloded by the simple fact that they are impassable.

Here is reliable evidence that a region of great natural beauty, which has been set apart as a public heritage and could be a valuable source of revenue through the tourists allured to it, is being ruined by the unchecked exploitations of commercial interests."

I read that to you, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those two parks which have been set aside along with Quetico Park will be handled in a little better way because it is very important. We have not got [illegible] to consider the amount of Crown lands we used to have at one time. We have a great field in the way of public parks and the parks, we think, are very valuable, not only for the tourist business but for the Canadian people and I feel that we should protect the parks in every way and retain their beauty.

Now, there is just one other item in that regard and that is another local affair. The people in the section where I live, they are organized into what is called the Thunder Bay Municipal League. That takes in the farmers of Port Arthur and Fort William constituencies. Before I left to come

down they had a meeting in Fort William and they presented me with a map showing an outline of a piece of property they would like the government to set aside as a park at Kakabaka Falls. That is a beautiful falls, not quite as large as Niagara, not quite as wide, but it has a higher fall and I would say the department could do nothing to please the people of that district more than to see that ample ground is set aside at that particular location for another park.

There is just one other matter. I cannot do it justice tonight because it is a big question. That is, the timber policy in the northern part of this province. It is a tremendously big question. It would take some hours to deal with it correctly, but I will just run over it very briefly.

Recently, oh, within the past couple of months, the council of Port Arthur and the council of Fort William held a joint meeting and they appointed a committee to make some study of the timber policy up in that part of the country with the hope that they could make suggestions to the government here that would be of assistance to the government in forming a timber policy. They have held a couple of meetings before I left and since I arrived in Toronto I received a rather lengthy telegram. It is not so bad as it looks. It is double spaced and I want to read it. I want to put it on the record because it represents the thoughts, not only of the committee and councils, but a number of citizens there were a little bit alarmed about the rapid depletion of the forests in that part of the country. As you know, we have a number of pulp mills there. During the so-called normal times they were just running a fraction of their capacity. Now that the war is on and a market for manufactured goods is obtained in the States they are running at near capacity, but a peculiar situation has developed and that is this; that although we have bunches of timber right at our back door, you might say, I have the figures for export last year for that part of the country - that is the year 1942 - and the exports amounted to 350,000 cords of wood. In the year 1942 350,000 cords of wood according to my figures. That

is a lot of wood. Now, while that is being exported they are shipping wood as far away as from Saskatchewan to help keep one of the mills going there. It seems to me that is not sound and people are a little bit alarmed and I will read that .....

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: Could I ask you a question, to be fair to the house. Is it not spruce that they are bringing in? Is that not jack pine?

MR. ANDERSON: No, I am not speaking now of the Thunder Bay District. This spruce they are sending over and the figures I quote is from export woods from Crown Lands in the Thunder Bay District. This is dated 29th of February and addressed to myself.

"Joint committee of councils of Port Arthur and Fort William in meeting Saturday passed following resolution quote whereas we understand the Provincial Government is now considering radical changes in existing timber policies and whereas the District of Thunder Bay possesses in our opinion the largest stands of merchantable timber in this province and whereas at a most representative meeting of all the Lakehead citizens held in Port Arthur, Friday, February 25th, 1944, grave concern was expressed by all in regards to the method of handling our forest resources which if not remedied would lead to their ultimate depletion and whereas we are convinced the financial stability and whole economic future of northwestern Ontario including the Lakehead cities is dependent in a large measure, on the proper control and orderly marketing of our forest wealth, be it resolved that at this meeting of a special Lakehead committee in session at Fort William, Saturday, February 26th, 1944 we recommend to the Ontario Government that consideration be given to the following important factors in drafting any new or revising existing forest legislation;

"1. That all agreements for timber leases now in effect be carried out in full or cancelled.
2. That all new agreements for timber leases should include provision whereby existing district hydro electric power shall be used for mill operation in preference to generating power from imported coal."

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, might I ask this gentleman from Fort William, at that meeting that he refers to as public meeting or private meeting by invitation. Did that municipality petition this Government for export business a short time ago?

MR. ANDERSON: IN reply to the first question in connection with public meeting that was called, I prefaced my remarks first and I informed you in the house through you that sometime ago the city council of Port Arthur and Fort William had appointed a special committee. This is the committee that sent me the wire. I think the hon. Minister, (Mr. Thompson) is referring to a public meeting that was called since I came down here by the mayor of Port Arthur in connection with the location of a mill, but I am not mentioning that and I don't intend to tonight because it has nothing to do with the general timber policy of the country. What was the second question?

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Did the city of Fort William petition this Government to permit exports from the head of the lakes?

MR. ANDERSON: Answering the question asked by the hon. Minister (Mr. Thompson) was to the effect that he wants to know if the cities at the head of the lakes had petitioned the Government, and in looking through the records they did. As a non-employment measure they came down and persuaded the Government to permit an export on Crown Lands, but, as I said, they are alarmed at the tremendous amount of wood that is being exported. I will have something to say when I finish the reading of this telegram.

"3. That the present policy of exporting enormous quantities of wood from Crown Lands be reviewed and some reasonable policy adopted that will prevent the cutting of our accessible timber at the now abnormal rate.

4. That the present vast holdings of pulp and paper companies should be studied and if found in excess of actual requirements for mill production in perpetuity under a program of reforestation planned cutting, opening of roads, etc. such holdings should be reduced and excess land revert to the province.

5. That the Government be advised further recommendations and brief will be prepared jointly by the cities of Port William and Port Arthur and forwarded for their consideration, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Hon. George Drew, Premier, Mr. Garfield Anderson, MLA, Mr. F.O. Robinson, MLA, the Hon. Mitchell F. Hepburn, Hon. W. G. Thompson, Mr. E. B. Jolliffe MLA, Hon. H.C. Nixon, Hon. C. D. Howe, MP, and Rev. Dan McIvor MP."

Now, during the depression, as I said, there was a delegation came down and asked the Government to permit the exportation of wood.

-Page 722 follows-

DDD-1

I am not blaming the present Minister; I am not blaming the present Government. I do believe, and I think we can all agree, that the timber of this country is not unlimited. We used to think that was the case, but that is not really the case. There is a limit to it. I think it would interest everyone in this province to see this properly handled.

As far as the export of wood is concerned, there is another angle to it, which this telegram does not mention, and, in all fairness to the hon. minister, I will mention it. That is that the Dominion Government has entered into certain commitments with the United States of America in connection with our war effort, and as the Dominion Government supersedes the province, I think it is only in fairness to the hon. minister that I make that explanation. The people do not want anything impossible, but they do want to warn the Government, and bring it to their attention, that with the present rate of cutting, with export, forest fires, and with the bug worm, there is a possibility — indeed, a very grave danger — that in that part of the country there will not be sufficient material to carry on and enable the communities we now have to exist, or even make it possible for the people to live.

I will bring my remarks to a close. I know I have not done justice to the question of timber, because it is a big question, but there is another speaker to follow, and I have to catch a train and go back home to see about these school taxes.

MR STANLEY J. HUNT (Renfrew, North): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to congratulate you on your elevation to your high office. I suppose I should, too, congratulate the previous speakers, especially the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I was

particularly impressed with the address of the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald), who, being a farmer like myself, and whose tenure of office has been brief as a member of this House, I know it must have been a great ordeal for him, on his first day as a member, to get up and make the speech that he did.

Since we have been in here as members for about three weeks, may I take it we have surely had an example of the privilege of free speech in this House. The members of the Opposition have spoken for something over eight hours, while the members of this side of the House have spoken for three hours, or a little better, and, as a new member, I think I might have been well advised to listen and learn, rather than attempt to make a speech.

I think I feel somewhat like the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) felt some years ago, as he said the other night, when making his first speech here in the House, and I hope if he happens to be in the House at the time that he will do as did the hon. gentlemen at that time, if I should lose the thread of my remarks, that he shall give me the proper cue.

As a farmer, I think I owe it to the farmers to say something in their behalf. I am just an ordinary dirt farmer from the back of the county of Renfrew. I think the members who have sat here for some years will agree that for the past ten or twelve years not very much has been heard from the county of Renfrew. I think I owe it to the riding to make some attempt to draw the attention of the House to some of the problems we have in Renfrew County, and while it may be applicable to all other counties of Ontario, I think it is more keenly felt in the county of Renfrew.

I resent the leaders of Labour getting up in this House and trying to dictate to the farmers just what they

should do and how they should carry on their affairs. I also resent the armchair farmers trying to tell us what we should do. I did resent on -- I think it was the opening day, or the second day of the Session -- the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) making the implication that not until the C.C.F. Party had drawn it to the attention of the people of this province had either of the old parties taken it upon themselves to show any interest in farm organizations.

At the conclusion of the last war I settled down in Renfrew County, and I know whereof I speak. I started from scratch. I just had the little accumulation I had accumulated from three or four years of service in the Army, and I settled there with the will to work, and when I hear some of the hon. members talking about thirty hours a week, I would like to remind them that I have worked sometimes pretty nearly thirty hours a day, and while I have not a great deal to show for it to-day, I would like to remind the hon. member for Windsor (Mr. Bennett) that during all those depression years I have managed to carryon; I have not lost my farm; I have not cancelled my insurance, and I have not sought relief or assistance from any Government, and I intend to carry on. And during all that time I have been able to give of my time, as a member of my own township Council, a member of my own county Council, and a good part of my time has been thus taken up during the past twelve or fifteen years.

Like the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Goodfellow), I have been a member of the Federal Commission on Agriculture, and I enjoyed that work, because I was trying to help the farmers, and help myself at the same time, to stand on my own feet and not look to the Government to solve all our difficulties.

Now, as I said at the start, we have problems in Renfrew County that are, I think, possibly a little more keenly felt there. I have been reminded on several occasions since coming down here that I come from one of the backwoods counties of Ontario. It is true, as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Murray) has drawn to your attention, that we have many townships back there which are not developed. We have townships in which no roads or highways have been built; we have whole townships that know nothing of Hydro; we have villages of eight thousand or ten thousand people who are still dependent on the old kerosene lamps to light their homes, but, at the same time, we are well aware that there is a war on, and I was much pleased to hear the hon. minister the other day say that this Government was prepared, when the opportune time came and man power and material were available, to go ahead and provide Hydro to every rural municipality in the province as far as it was possible to do so.

I think every rural municipality should have the advantages of Hydro. We have vast stretches of land which have not been developed. I think that the tourist industry can be one of the most lucrative industries in this province when these stretches of Renfrew County and other counties throughout the province have been made accessible to the tourists after the war.

At the present time there is very little that the Government can do to relieve this situation. I feel that the farmers should be given a great deal of consideration, and I know there are other sections in this province which are just as much entitled to consideration as the farmers. The flower of our manhood to-day, in this Dominion and province, is in

Europe fighting our battles. Many of them have paid the supreme sacrifice, and many more will, but for those who come back -- or, at least, those who will come back, -- I think they have the right to expect a condition of affairs in this province such as was referred to by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. Mr. Downer), and that they should have a place "fit for heroes to live in".

I think a great responsibility faces this Government, (in fact, all Governments in this Dominion at this present time,) and as I have listened to the speech from the Throne, I have felt that the Government of this province had accepted the challenge and assumed the responsibility of bringing about that condition of affairs, insofar as it pertains to this good old province of Ontario.

Now, right in our own county -- and I think I will speak about Renfrew County, because I know a little bit more about it -- I am sure that what applies to Renfrew County will apply to all the other counties in Ontario, in some measure, at least. I have pointed out before that a great deal can be done in making these out-of-the-way places in our province accessible to the tourist traffic which we may expect at the conclusion of this war. It was very gratifying to me to know that the Department of Highways, through our able Minister, had a plan prepared, all ready to launch at a moment's notice when the proper time comes. This, I am sure, will be of great advantage, not only to the farmers, but to the men who will take part in constructing these highways and supplying the materials needed in their construction.

And the same applies to the thousands of miles of Hydro lines which may be built in the province of Ontario. A great deal of material will have to be manufactured and processed in the factories, which will provide employment for thousands of men throughout this province, and will, at the

same time, give the people living in these backwoods municipalities some of the privileges which they should have, some of the privileges which the boys who are away from these farms at the present time will expect when they come back, and which they will have the right to expect. I think we can accomplish two great objectives by this gigantic programme which has been planned, ready to be launched when the opportune time comes.

I was also very pleased at the remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister with regard to the development of our natural resources, especially in regard to reforestation. As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Murray) has pointed out quite clearly, lumber has been one of the main industries in the Ottawa Valley, in the County of Renfrew, and vast stretches of that county have been either cut over or burned over, and very little has been done to replenish our forests. I think our natural resources are being properly developed, but they should, at the same time - and this applies particularly to our forest resources - they should be conserved and augmented, and I think that the vast programme of reforestation should be carried on, so that we may pass on to posterity the heritage which has been handed down to us.

Now, I am not going to take up very much of the time of the House. We have listened to some very able addresses. The hon. members have spoken about anything and everything here. There is not very much left to be said, but I think there is one grave danger, or tendency, at the present time, and that is to bring in too much paternal legislation. As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Murray) has pointed out, when our fore-bears came to this

county they hewed their homes out of the forests; they went in and made homes. The tendency in recent years has been to get away from that idea, and to make of the farm a place of business. In the county of Renfrew -- and I am sure it applies to all the other counties -- we have a great number of farms of which very little use is being made at the present time. They are vacant farms, farms which were once prosperous and produced and supported large families.

In order to get away from depopulation of these farms, I think the Government should launch these gigantic programmes. But, as I started out to say, our fore-bears, our ancestors who landed here, were building homes, not just farms, not just places of business. They developed this province, which I believe is the banner province of this Dominion, and if we are to continue to propagate the right type of citizens, (which has made the province of Ontario what it is to-day,) we will have to leave them to solve their own problems, to some extent, and, as the hon. minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Kennedy) has said, we should assist the farmers, assist the labour classes, assist all classes to solve their own problems, but refrain from doing everything for them. After all, I think the Government, like Providence, can and should only help those who are prepared to help themselves.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD (York,West): Mr. Speaker, in rising as a new member to participate in this debate, I must confess to a certain sense of disability. There has been very much said, and I recognize my inexperience in Parliamentary debate. I noticed by the calendar that I am the thirtieth to speak on this debate, and there would not seem to be much left to be said by anyone. I must also confess that my inexperience will probably make me live up to the reputation I have enjoyed with some people, at least, of being rather un-

orthodox in my approach.

I want to preface my remarks to-night with a word of tribute to two Canadian citizens, two citizens born in Ontario, two citizens who have meant much to me, personally, and to the people whom I represent.

The first citizen is a man who lived to a ripe old age, comparatively speaking, a man who, in spite of persecution and ridicule, lived up to very high ideals, a man who spent his life in the service of his fellowmen, a man who, in spite of being badly, sometimes almost criminally misunderstood, stuck to his ideals and lived to see those ideals, at least in part, materialize, a man who founded the co-operative commonwealth of federation. I refer to Mr. J. S. Woodsworth.

I not only have the honour of representing a very important riding in this province, the riding of York, West, but I think it is only fair to point out that I feel it is a double honour to represent the riding in which Mr. Woodsworth was born in this country. And I think I can pay no greater tribute to this great Canadian, whose sterling character, whose contributions to Canadian society will probably be recognized more in the future than they have in the past, than to use the words of Mr. M. J. Coldwell in speaking to a convention of the co-operative commonwealth of federation in Winnipeg, in nineteen forty-one, I believe, when he said, in referring to Mr. Woodsworth, "He has lighted a beacon, and put it on a hill, and it is up to you and I to keep it burning".

I feel, sir, that I am in a considerable debt to Mr. Woodsworth, personally I listened to Mr. Woodsworth, and the hon. member for York, East, (Miss Macphail) speak from a Forum meeting at Hygea Hall, Toronto, in the fall of nineteen thirty-two, and I decided that the ideals and

principles that they proclaimed on that occasion were worth dedicating one's life to.

And so I say that I want to pay this word of public tribute to Mr. Woodsworth and to the contributions that he has made to Canadian society and to Ontario.

The other Canadian citizen of whom I speak is relatively unknown. He is a man who was born in a log cabin, of pioneer stock, a man who lived almost obscurely, relatively speaking, and yet a man whom I believe had some vision, particularly faith in the future, and he was very close to me, individually. He pointed my feet in a certain direction, in the direction of the church, and a tolerant attitude toward other religious groups. He gave me a conservative name, named after Sir Charles Hibbard Tupper, the son of one of the Fathers of Confederation, and I believe that he directed my path, and is, in a large measure, responsible for any little contribution that I have been able to make to Labour and to my country.

I want, at the outset of my remarks to-night, to direct my attention to two or three of the members. Some of them are here, and I see others are absent from their places, and I hope that what I say will not be misunderstood in their absence. I would like to say it to them, personally, here in the Legislature.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the ideas which have been expressed by some of my farmer friends, that they will not be able to say, when this Legislature is concluded, however soon that might be, that the Labour representatives, the Trade Unionists, sitting on this side of the House, were in anywise partial to Trade Unionism to the exclusion of this other great group in our contemporary society.

I have been somewhat concerned, as I sat here since

the opening of the Legislature, to sense a feeling of mistrust, a sense of the fact that because there were so many Trade Unionists sitting on this side of the House at this time we were going to be partial to Labour, and indifferent to the problems of the farmers. But I want to say, at the outset, that I hope it will be said, also, -- and I will be able to say on my behalf -- when I have completed my term of office in this Legislature, that I left many of those who might continue in the same way in which the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) mentioned in his remarks, as friends. In other words, I want to suggest that what I have to say on this occasion, or any future occasion, will in no sense be said in a personal manner.

Now, of course, I do not want that to be misunderstood. I think, inevitably, we will have differences of opinion, and sometimes those differences of opinion might be fairly strongly expressed, and I hope they will not be misunderstood and will not stand between the friendship that still exists between people sitting on this side of the House, representing their respective constituencies, and the people of Ontario, as a whole.

I have noted from those who have taken part in this debate a desire for cooperation, a desire for a meeting of the minds, a desire to serve the people who have sent us to this Legislature.

I think there are some things about this particular House that are probably going to prove of great assistance to the people of Ontario. I have heard speaker after speaker stand in their places and say that they represent the farmers; other speakers have been able to stand in their places and say they represent the trade unions, and there are a great number of others who are not particularly representing the farmers, or not particularly representing the trade unions.

and so I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this house at the present time a very good cross section of the people of Ontario, all groups are represented, and we ought to be able to make great headway in legislation which will be helpful to the people of this great province of ours.

In opening the debate, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) aptly described the legislation's forecast as contained in the speech from the Throne as "another installment of social legislation", and correctly stated on behalf of the hon. members comprising this group that the legislation submitted to this House would be judged strictly on its merits. In closing the debate for the opposition, I want to re-affirm that position, and point out to the hon. members opposite that a grave responsibility rests upon each one of them to see that the legislation put forward to this house is such as to warrant the support of the people on this side of the house.

On the fourth of August last the Progressive Conservative candidates were elected in thirty-eight of the ninety Ontario ridings. There was some doubt as to the election of one of that number, but a judgment subsequently given on a technicality gave the Seat to the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. T. A. Murphy). These hon. members were elected on a pre-election manifesto of twenty-two points, as has been pointed out here on a number of occasions, a manifesto which promised fulfillment if a sufficient number of candidates of that party were elected and formed a government. That government has been formed, and has been functioning now for more than seven months, and I suggest to the Government, and to the hon. members of this House, that the people of Ontario are looking for action on a number of important issues at this time.

I think it should again be pointed out that almost an equal number of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation candidates were elected on August fourth. They, too, were elected on a manifesto which had fifteen points, to which several of the latterly-conceived Progressive Conservative points had a striking similarity. The people, then, of this province, more than four hundred and twenty thousand who voted for thirty-four C.C.F. members of this House, voted for a programme, and they, also, are looking for action. And I want to suggest that in spite of all that is being said to the contrary, some in highly-paid advertisements, that we believe that more than eight hundred and seventy thousand people — Ontario people — voters in this province — knew on August fourth, and they know to-day, what they voted for. And they, the people of Ontario, I say to the hon. members of this Assembly, will insist on the fulfillment of those promises. It will be necessary for the Government, therefore, not only to measure up to the high hopes raised in their election manifesto, and largely reiterated in the speech from the Throne, but to give serious consideration, if not effect, to the other important, and in some cases, we feel, fundamental measures composed in the manifesto of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

And I have noted, Mr. Speaker, that it is somewhat the custom, in participating in this, what I believe is termed the "maiden speech", and in this debate on the speech from the Throne, to mention one's own riding. I briefly referred to it,—the fact that Mr. Woodsworth was born there,—and I am proud to represent that riding, and I want to suggest that in the campaign that preceded the August fourth election, and which resulted in the situation which I have

described, the people of the riding of York, West, were warned that I would consider it a very great honour to be elected their member to this Legislative Assembly, but that they must realize this, that the days of thinking in terms of constituencies, or even of progress, has passed; in other words, they, as Canadians, both new and old, as residents of Ontario living in the several important municipalities in that riding, whether farmers, market gardeners, industrial workers, professional workers, or small business people, must realize that their present welfare and their future security can be obtained and maintained only by a genuine regard for the welfare of all groups in this province and in this country.

The people of York, West, supported that proposal, and sent to this Legislature the C.C.F. candidate in the last election.

I want to suggest — and I think other members have been very fair in putting forth the claims of greatness of their own particular ridings — I want to suggest that York, West, is a very important riding. It has a total population of something over eighty thousand people. There are approximately fifty thousand voters, with several thousand voters now in the Armed Services. There are a number of important basic industries, with a corresponding industrial, residential population. In York, West, you find a large-scale transportation industry, with a corresponding number of railway workers. The stockyards, about which we have talked so much in this debate, and the packing plants, are almost within the boundaries of York, West, and many of the workers, as well as most of the management, live in the Yorks, East, North, South and West, all of which are represented by hon. members of this side of the House.

And I would just like to paint this picture for you. In the riding of York, West, we have an urban population, which, if consolidated into one municipality, would compare very favourably with such cities as London, Ontario. It has not the industry necessary to support such a population, but it does have the peculiar problem of servicing an urban population largely employed outside the boundaries of York, West.

York, West, also has an important market gardening industry, and a substantial number of working farmers, as well as a few of the "armchair" variety, previously referred to in this debate, and I would like to tell the members of this Legislature an experience which I had in the campaign which preceded the election.

My campaign manager asked if I would go and see a certain farmer. I met the farmer in the barnyard. His wife was helping with the chores, in the early evening, and I had been told before I went into that barnyard that this man was a dangerous character, that he was "fed up" on the manner of voting. He had voted Liberal, and he had voted Conservative, and felt he had "got it in the neck" from all parties, and he was sick and tired of it, and he said that all politicians were the same, and told the campaign manager that he and his wife were just not going to vote in this election.

I went in and had a chat with this fellow. I found him a very reasonable man, and I found he had some justification for the grievances he had expressed. He had tried the old parties; he had voted Liberal, and had voted Conservative, and apparently the results were about the same, whichever administration happened to be in power.

I tried to tell him something about our programme. He had not seen, at that time, the programme of the Progress-

ive Conservatives; he had some literature from the Liberal head office in York, West. After, however, I explained the situation to him, he said, "Well, at least, you seem to be different, and I am going to vote C.C.F.", but, he said, "I am just going to warn you now, if you fellows go down there, and you do not do something more than was done in the past, don't you ever step foot into this barnyard again, because, as sure as you do, I will take the old shot gun and shoot you dead."

Now, I just tell that story because I think it is indicative of the feeling of a great number of people. I feel that it expresses to us the need for getting on with the job, of actually doing something, not just talking about it, and get down to the fundamentals, and try and do something for the people of this province, try to give them a standard of living which we are capable of giving, and which we have neglected in the past.

And I want to suggest another thing that entered into the last campaign and into the election, which has resulted in the situation of finding us here in the House in such a variety as we are to-day, and that is that in the three Yorks, particularly York, South, York, East, and York, West, the people suffered probably as much, if not more, than any other section or municipality in the province of Ontario during what we now call the "depression years", and they have a very vivid recollection of what that has meant. And I suggest that the people of West York, and all the other Yorks, which I have mentioned, particularly those who hold public office, shudder, I should think, at the very thought that there might be a recurrence of the situation which they went through prior to the war. These people, I humbly submit to this Legislature, want action; they want something done; they want some safeguard. They do not want, as the last speaker

has suggested (Mr. Hunt) any paternal legislation, but they do want the opportunity of freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom to work and to make a contribution; to those people who are unable to work they want given some sense of security, much better than that which we have had in the past. I am going to return, Mr. Speaker, to my question of work and wages in a few minutes.

But, for the moment, we must turn our attention to Point No. 9 of the Progressive Conservative twenty-two-point pre-election manifesto. It is my information that the hon. Prime Minister, on a very warm day last summer, perspired and laboured, and brought forth a twenty-two-point programme. However true that may be, I do not know, and I am not suggesting it is true, but that is my information. And it is safe to assert, and it has been well said by the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) that Point No. 9 of the twenty-two-point manifesto succeeded in winning the popular support of more people than any other single point of the programme, with the possible exception of Point No. 12, on the question of employment.

From municipal councils in York, West, and from citizens generally, over the length and breadth of this province, I have learned that whatever disposition there might be to allow the Government time to implement its programme and policies, that whatever reaction there might be to the failure of the Government to fully implement all of its advertised election promises, there will be a dangerous disappointment and disgust if the Government breaks faith by failing to fully implement - and at once - the intention to relieve home-owners of fifty per cent. of the cost of education.

And yet we find, Mr. Speaker, that this point was, in my opinion, (and I say this kindly,) glossed over, was neglected in the speech from the Throne, this one cardinal point, this one concrete, definite promise that the people look forward to having fulfilled, and which should never have been made if it was not intended to keep,and to keep it soon.

This point, I say, did not receive, in my opinion, sufficient attention in the speech from the Throne, and I want to say, in all fairness, that I rather resented the fact that we were in Session here, and yet we had to pick up a daily paper in Toronto to find an announcement made with respect to this matter, and then only a very indefinite promise that the thing was being studied, and there would be some discussion on the point, at least, before this Session of the Legislature is concluded.

Through the courtesy of one of the Municipal Councils in York, West, I have been given access to a number of photographs and statistics which graphically describe the tangled or totally unequipped state of taxation now in operation to support our public school system. And I am going to cite for the record one or two examples.

I have the pictures of these houses, with an attached memorandum as to the assessment and taxes, and I would be very happy to hand them out, and let the members of the Legislature get a picture of what the situation is.

And I want to say to the hon. members of the Government that when they took this obligation upon themselves of under-writing one half the cost of education, or relieving home-owners of one half the cost of education, I hope they understood the magnitude of the problem which they were getting into. They certainly had plenty of time. They have

been in the Legislature, and in the position of opposition, for years; undoubtedly they could have received information through the previous Minister of Education, or from the Departmental officials, and I say that they ought to have known the tangle that exists, and the problem of improving that tangle, before they went out and made a definite promise to the people of this province.

I have here four pictures of similar types of homes in four municipalities in three of the four Yorks, two in York, West, one in Mimico, and one in Long Branch, and one in Scarborough, which is York, East, and one in Forest Hill Village, York, South.

I want if the members will to try and retain in their memories some of the figures which I am going to give you. I will do it slowly and I hope clearly and distinctly. A working man's home in Mimico, a bungalow type of home, one floor, cottage type--apparently they are all about the same size--and I have pictures here which demonstrate that fact--is assessed at $1,850.00. The home in Long Branch is assessed at $1,045.00. The home in Scarboro is assessed at $1,650 and the home in Forest Hill Village in York, South, which I suggest is a better home, in a nicer locality, with better surroundings, well-kept up, would be a more desirable place to live, that home is assessed at $525.00. The total tax on the Mimico home is $135.00 on this workingmnn's home. The school tax is $34.93 and the county tax $16.39. I would just like you to take down these figures if you would just to have on your pads.

MR. WILLIAM DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): That $155.00 is the total taxes?

MR. MILLARD: Yes, total tax, school tax $135.00 and county tax $16.39. Now, I want to say in fairness, Mr. Speaker, that those figures may not be correct to a cent because they are now three or five years old. There may be some slight changes, but I think the principle will remain. Long Branch home the total tax is $94.00, school tax $31.35 and the county tax $9.50. Scarboro homes the total tax is $104.46, school tax $39.72, and the county tax $16.68.

I want to have you compare those better homes in Forest Hill Village and particularly I want you to pay attention to the school tax, which is the point that I want to bring out. The Forest Hill Village homes, the total taxes is $40.16. Less than one-third of the Mimico homes. The school tax is $2.09 and the county tax $5.20. Now, in spite of this widespread between the amount of school tax, $2.09 the Forest Hill Village area--all in the county of York--against $39.72 in East York and Scarboro.--In spite of that spread I want to give you the picture of what they were able to spend upon education per pupil, and when we talk about underwriting half the cost of education, what do we mean? What type of education? What is the extent of the education that we mean?

I find in spite of these figures I have given you a brief

which has been presented to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) that in 1935 the Board of Education for Forest Hill Village spent $117.00 per pupil for education for that school year. Well, the Board of Education in Scarboro could only spend $65.00 or approximately half what they could spend. This is the tax on a workingman's home of $39.50 and they could only spend for the education of that man's child $65.00 for the entire year. On the Forest Hill Home the tax was $2.89 and yet they were able to spend on each pupil $117.00 for the year.

Now, that creates, in my opinion, a very great problem and indicates a condition which must be corrected if we are going to have any kind of equity in our municipalities in this part of the province or any other part of the province--these questions must be gone into.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): Might I ask the hon. member (Mr. Millard) are the assessments the same in all those cases?

MR. MILLARD: No, I think I gave you those: the total assessment on the Mimico home $1,650., Long Branch home $1,045., Scarboro home $1,650., and the Forest Hill Village home $525.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick's): Might I ask the hon. member (Mr. Millard) if he could give us the mill rate in each municipality.

MR. MILLARD: I am sorry, I could not do that, but I think it would be comparatively easy to get it probably from the Department of Municipal Affairs or from the municipality involved.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick's): It looks to me as if the mill rate is tremendous.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot argue about this. Asking of a question is all right.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick's): Do the figures he gives for schools include primary and secondary?

MR. MILLARD: As I understand this is for Public School education.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick's): A number of schools are separate.

MR. MILLARD: I cannot say. They are total school taxes.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Ottawa, South): You cannot tell if any of those municipalities have paid for school buildings. Perhaps it would make a difference if no debentures.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think if the member would conclude his address, it would be better. If you would inquire in the Department of Municipal Affairs, I think you will get it there.

MR. MILLARD: I thank you. I do not think it is any interruption. There is one case here, and I think it is very general. I have here another type of home--two storey building, and I imagine that possibly is a six or seven room house. The one I have here first is 516 Eglinton Avenue, Toronto, and the total assessment is $6,750. The school taxes on that home--as a six or seven room house, I imagine on the shape of the house, being a builder myself, that it is probably a six room house and the school taxes are $67.50. The total taxes--on that home on Eglinton Avenue, Toronto. Here is one not far distant, 315 Chaplin Crescent, Forest Hill, and the total assessment on this home, and I would consider it as a builder to be a superior home, probably a little bit larger, and it is in a very good locality--the local assessment is $2,300. Compare that with $6,750. The school tax is $12.65 compared with $67.50 and the total tax is $196. compared with $292.13. In other words the total taxes are almost three times as great in the case of one home, which I believe is smaller in size than the Forest Hill home.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): What year was that?

MR. MILLARD: That was 1935.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): I think my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) might remember this: there was a difference in certain taxes which had been allowed to municipalities but were removed and replaced by the one mill subsidy, you remember and I think that made a very great difference in the matter of Forest Hill Village. Now, I may be wrong.

MR. MILLARD: I just want to point out that this was a condition which existed then, whether it has been corrected to any appreciable extent I am rather doubtful.

I have another set of pictures. One 36 Queen's Avenue,-- a very small cottage at 138 Queen's Avenue, Weston. Total assessment on this small working man's home is $1,800. School taxes $26.26 and the total taxes $90.95, and this is a very small home. Now, I have one at 33 Rosemary Lane, Forest Hill Village and it is a double storey building, apparently a six-roomed home and the school tax is $4.67 and the total tax $38.17 on a home which would be relatively twice as large as the other home.

MR. WM. DUCKWORTH (Dovercourt): Is that all in 1935?

MR. MILLARD: These are all in 1935. I would like to say I have a number of pictures here but these pictures have all been shown on the screen to the York County Council and they are all vouched for by a responsible member of the municipal council of Mimico.

MR. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Ottawa, South): You are making a good speech for my department, because that is what we are endeavouring to do, to have equalized assessment.

MR. MILLARD: I do not consider it myself--

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): It is a good speech.

MR. MILLARD: I hope it will put us on the track of finding a solution of this problem and the fulfilment of those promises that the government has made.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Ottawa, South): It is constructive.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to point out that equal opportunities for education are quite impossible under such conditions and I am taking it for granted that the government is sincerely desirous of carrying out this pledge to the Ontario people--irrespective of where the pupil lives in the province of Ontario --whether in the far north or in the far east; whether in our urban centres or in the outlying northern districts, that they are going to be given as Canadian citizens this great national asset of a liberal education, and if the government is going to find ways and means of making equal opportunities for education for every child according to its ability.

In this debate the hon. member from Huron (Dr. Taylor) said, "We are all concerned about the possibility of unemployment and never again should unemployment be allowed to recur." He

also said, "We should know from the great depression of the thirties, that mismanagement and fear and lack of courageous handling of the nation's affairs contributed largely to the depression."

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is all too true, and I am not going back to condemn the past or to blame those who were in the seats of the administration at that time. I think that life is too short to engage ourselves in that kind of thing, but I must warn that we should profit by the past and I think that was in the mind of the hon. member for Huron (Dr. Taylor) and make sure that this does not recur and that we do without fear and with courage and with vision proceed to bring about a new state of affairs. I think it is demanded of us as members of this legislature, whether we are on this side of the house or on the other side of the house, I think we are called upon not to wrangle over political differences but to get on with the job of fulfilling our contract, you might say, with the Ontario people.

Mr. Speaker, I have not concluded and I will want to carry on. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Millard that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): I move the adjournment of the house.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the minister leading (Mr. Frost) will be able to tell us something about to-morrow afternoon.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I am unable to tell the leader of the opposition definitely, but I assume that we will be proceeding with some bills and possibly with the balance of the speech of the hon. member from West York (Mr. Millard) but in order that there may be no misunderstanding I will advise you as soon as the house rises. I will find out and let you know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure that the house adjourn to three o'clock to-morrow afternoon?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This house do now stand adjourned until to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, March 10th, 1944.

The House met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Drew, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the County Agricultural Committees", and that now be read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Mr. Drew that leave be granted to introduce an Act intituled "An Act respecting the County Agricultural Committees", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the County Agricultural Committees"; the first reading of the Bill.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER (Grey South): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) give us an outline of that.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, it is a committee set up in each county where a district representative office may be, and a committee of farmers themselves, outside of two members, to transact the farmers' business. It rather fits in with the local government.

When moving for the second reading of the Bill, I venture

that I might introduce the biggest effort for cooperation, ever attempted by any government in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House, the preliminary first report of the provincial auditor, 1942-1943.

Secondly; the twenty-fourth report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1943.

Thirdly; report of the Department of Municipal affairs.

Fourthly: report by the Liquor Control Board for the fiscal period ended March 31st, 1943.

Fifthly; the twenty-third annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Board, for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1943.

Sixthly; report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for the year ended June 30th, 1943.

Seventhly; the annual report of the Ontario Historical Society, for the years 1942-1943.

Eighth; Statement of Legislative Grants apportioned to Rural Public Schools and all Separate Schools for the year 1943.

Ninth; Orders-in-council pertaining to the Department of Education.

Tenth; Orders-in-council pursuant to the Insurance Act.

Eleventh; Orders-in-council under the Guarantee Companies' Security Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the day I will table answer to question number 11.

Also, before the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. members to what may be one of the most important statements that has appeared for a very considerable time with regard to our own prospects in this province, which appeared in to-day's Globe and Mail. In the second section, there is a report of a statement by Senator George Aiken, in which he makes public the

contents of a letter to him from President Roosevelt in regard to the St. Lawrence waterway, and in the event that anyone may not have read that, I think I should read the brief opening paragraph of the letter, which are of very considerable concern and interest to us.

These are the words of President Roosevelt, in the letter:

"I am convinced that the time has come for a non-partisan effort to secure Congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early postwar construction," Mr. Roosevelt wrote Aiken.

"The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows, but will ultimately increase their business.

I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill, modified to provide for construction as a postwar project, has my approval, I have appreciated your consistent support of this great undertaking."

Mr. Speaker, that is an announcement of very great importance to us. This government and the Hydro Electric Commission of the province, since we have been dealing with this matter now for something over six months, have been doing everything possible we can to forward interest in the development of this great enterprise, and of necessity the announcement by the President of the United States that he is to proceed with it as a postwar measure, is a vital key to the forward movement for which we are already prepared with our own draft plan, and I may assure all hon. members of this House that we will immediately take steps consistent with this announcement to open up the negotiations to we were already carrying on/forward this tremendous project which will

offer opportunities for increased employment on a basis which is only possible by bringing in the enormous electric power which will be provided from this source.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, also, I wish to refer to another announcement in which I regret I cannot express such hearty concurrence.

In last night's Daily Star there was a news announcement on the front page which opened with this statement:

> "Physicians will be supplied to as many rural areas of the Dominion as soon as possible, under the plan worked out by the Medical Procurement and Assignment Board approved by Federal authority"

And it then went on to state what would be done and the fees to be paid, and makes a very interesting statement that:

> "The amount paid to these doctors are to be paid by the provincial government from fees collected up to the amount of these fees by the provincial treasurer".

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the very first remarks I made in this Legislature I emphasized our desire, and our determination to cooperate in every way we could with the Dominion Government, and I pointed out at that time that cooperation means cooperation, and that it is essential that there be an effective joint discussion between the Dominion and the Provincial governments, — not only this one — with regard to matters effecting the provincial authorities.

I think it is rather a surprising thing for the government of this province to read of a decision of that kind through the newspapers, and to learn that we are to collect money and to pay money, for a plan, no matter how desirable it may be.

Actually, there has been no communication of any kind between the Dominion government and this Provincial government in regard to this proposed plan. It may be an excellent plan and it may not. We do not know. All we know about it is that a few days ago a letter came in

not from the Dominion government, or any member of the Dominion government, or any official of the Dominion government, but a letter came addressed jointly to myself and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Vivian) signed by an army officer, informing us of what the Dominion government proposed to do, and telling us only a few of the details, but telling us what it is proposed. It says:

> "It is now proposed that physicians serving as medical officers in the armed forces be allocated to the locality or situation in urgent need of physicians".

And another statement:

> "The fees chargeable for the services performed by these medical officers will be collected under provincial arrangement, and the province will reimburse the Dominion government in an amount equal to army pay and allowances which the latter would continue to pay to the medical officers".

As I have already informed the Legislature, I have sought in letters which, as one of the speakers for the opposition pointed out, were couched in terms of the utmost cordiality -- I thought to point out that if we are to have cooperation, it is essential that things affecting the provincial and dominion governments jointly, there be discussions with the government concerned, and I have no hesitation in saying that I think that this government of Ontario must look upon the course followed in this case as arrogance of the worst type, to leave the thing in such a situation that an army officer, who is merely engaged in the routine details of carrying something into effect, is the first to communicate to us a decision which has been made by the Dominion government, calling for the collection of fees and the payment of money by the Government of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate most emphatically that we are anxious to cooperate, but this system of reaching decisions as to what the provincials governments are going to do, and then announcing it without through the press, ~~when~~ the provincial government even knowing about it,

must stop, and must stop right away.

We had the case of a very clear and explicit undertaking by the Dominion Government being ignored when they stepped into the control of the distribution of alcoholic beverages. After all, this government, and the government of every other province, is directly concerned with the distribution, and distribution and quantity cannot be separated, and yet, without even attempting to find what the experience ~~was~~ and opinions of the provincial authorities are, the Dominion government reached an arbitrary decision in regard to the quantity which has necessarily seriously affected the whole problem of administration.

(Page 751 follows)

Then we found that the Dominion government was proceeding with a labor code without giving the information, or accepting the consultation which we desired. And that course has proceeded right through, in spite of the conference at which we were presumed to have the code, and I am simply emphasizing that in view of the comment made -- although I think under a misapprehension -- that the code was here when the conference was held. It was not. The code was drafted by the Dominion government, and simply presented to us as a decision by the Dominion government.

These things are things which make it extremely difficult for us to administer our own affairs in these increasingly difficult times, and I may make this announcement to the Legislature, so that they will know what the situation is, in view of the announcements which affect the field of legislation which in ordinary years is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province, and I can only repeat if there is to be any cooperation which is not only desirable but vital to the successful working out of the problems that lie ahead, then this and other provincial governments must be consulted before decisions are made affecting their own administrative affairs.

MR. L.G. ROBINSON, (Waterloo, South): Is it is order to make suggestion at this point, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to take advantage of the short period you have been in the house. I think the government should be willing at all times to take a suggestion, and I would suggest, subject to the approval of the house, that you make your suggestion.

MR. L.G. ROBINSON, (Waterloo, South): It just occurred to me -- and we are heartily in accord with the government's position on this matter -- that occasions of this nature in the future might not occur if the Dominion House

would set up a Department of Planning and Development, as we are setting up here, and if the government has any resolution suggesting to the Dominion that they now do that, I know that as far as the opposition is concerned, we would be heartily in accord with that.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Without encroaching upon the rules may I answer, Mr. Speaker, just to this extent, and say that I do not feel we can take it upon ourselves to suggest to the Dominion government what they do within their own affairs, and all we can do is to make it quite clear that we feel that the course to be followed, would proceed more effectively along the lines of cooperation.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask you sir if it was permissible or in order to ask a question of the hon. prime minister growing out of the statement he just made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any person rising to a question of privilege would be heard, but in order to interrupt the proceedings, there should be a motion for the adjournment of the house for the purpose of referring to a matter of public interest. That custom we have waived, and now any person who desires to rise before the orders of the day, comes to my office before fifteen minutes to three o'clock, and advises me of the subject matter upon which he wishes to speak, and I then let him know whether I will give him consent or not.

If any question rises as a question of public interest, it is not debatable after ten minutes to three.

I want to be fair, but we must have regard for the business of the house being completed in time, but with the consent of the house I will extend the same privilege as I did to the other group , but I would ask the house to support me by

letting it go no further.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD: It would have been very difficult for me to give you notice, Mr. Speaker, because we did not know what the prime minister was going to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not debateable.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD: Then, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to ask the hon. prime minister this; I noticed a report in the press last night that the Dominion Parliament is to rise on the 31st of March, and have its holiday extended until sometime in April. Would the prime minister tell the house today whether there is any likelihood of the conference which he has been seeking taking place between the Dominion and the Provincial governments during that period.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): I can only answer that by saying that I have been informed that a time for the conference cannot be named. I have been pressing for a conference just as soon as possible, and I have not discontinued my efforts, but they advise that they would not know the date.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the house for its cooperation in extending the privileges to the hon. members and also for getting back on the track.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): First Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order; third reading of Bill No. 44, "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act", Mr. Kennedy.

HON. T.L. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Kennedy moves the third reading of Bill No. 44 "The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944". Shall the motion carry,

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime minister): Second Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The second order, third reading reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of the Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act".

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Challies moves third reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act", shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

(Page 755 follows)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order; third reading of the Bill number 47, "An Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation" Mr. Drew.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do now move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Drew moves the third reading of Bill number 47, "An Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation". Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I do now move, Mr. Speaker, that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that I do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain Bills. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House now in committee.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order number 8.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth order; House in committee on Bill number 48.

(Page 756 follows)

"An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act", Mr. Blackwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number 48, "An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act". Shall section 1 form part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just a question to the hon. attorney general. I see that section 2 does not as it sometimes does, provide for the date on which the Act shall come into force. I understand this is a matter of some urgency, and I suppose in the absence of any date being mentioned in the Bill, there will be some delay before it comes into force.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the usual practice on Bills now is to bring them in, and they become in force sixty days after the Legislature rises. The reason for no date in this particular Bill is so that it can be effective upon assent any time after third reading.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Will that not hold it up for a while?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): It might actually advance it, if we could get some bills dealt with during the session; we might have it advanced before the date we could fix.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be amended by providing that it be brought into effect on the day that it receives the royal assent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blackwell moves that section 3 be added, reading:

> "This Bill shall come into effect on the day that it receives royal assent".

Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move that the committee do now rise and report a certain bill.

The House now resuming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House report a certain bill as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, chairman of the committee of the whole House, reports a certain Bill as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House that the report be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order number 9.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth order; second reading of Bill number 46, "An Act to prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter Referring to Race or Creed", Mr. Blackwell.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since this Bill has become a matter of considerable discussion I would like to make certain remarks in regard to it and as to its proposed effect.

Without in any way attempting to give instruction ~~as to what~~ — as to the course or proceedings, might I point out that on the second reading it is accepted that the debate is merely upon the principle involved and that the time for discussion as to the effect of wording, and any possible changes that might be suggested, comes on the debate in the committee of the whole, because actually on the second reading, we cannot amend the Bill in detail.

So that there may be an understanding of what we propose when it reaches the committee stage, we propose to move one amendment which is the addition of a section, and which reads as follows:

> "That this Act shall not be deemed to interfere with the free expression of opinion upon any subject in speech or in writing, and shall not confer any protection to, or benefit upon alien enemies."

If you like I will read that again, so that you may take it down:

> "That this Act shall not be deemed to interfere with the free expression of opinions upon any subject by speech or in writing, and shall not confer any

1414

protection to, or benefit upon alien enemies."

Now, again having regard to the recognized fact that this is a Bill which touches upon the feelings and sentiment of many people, I would only urge, by way of suggestion, that we recognize that in this debate we are discussing the principle, and the principle only, and that the time for discussing all the details comes best in committee, when suggestions as to amendments might be effectively made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill, which is before the Legislature, is simple in form, and very clear in its purpose. In spite of what has been said to the contrary it limits in no way complete freedom of speech or the right to discuss any subject which could now be discussed under the existing laws of libel and slander, the provisions of the Criminal Code and other similar laws.

It is intended to stop the use of offensive signs, notices and symbols which by announcing the denial of equal rights to any particular group in our community, offend equally those of that group itself, and all who accept the principles of democracy which this Legislature is pledged to serve.

As those who have been in this Legislature before will recall, this is not the first time there has been a discussion of this subject. This is not the first time such a Bill been introduced. It is, however, the first time that a government has taken the responsibility for introducing it.

We have done so because it is ih our opinion time to end the unsatisfactory discussion of this subject and to deal with it upon a positive basis. The introduction of this Bill is consistent with opinions already expressed by some of us during earlier Sessions. --

And when I say "we" I mean the members who were present, of either party -- We did not, however, support the earlier Bills

which were presented because they attempted to enact provisions which could not have been enforced effectively by any government of this province.

I do hope that this Bill and the simple issue which it raises will be discussed with the moderation, and cool judgment, which the subject deserves. This is a time, above all others, when our discussion of questions of this kind should have due regard for the very principles which have become fundamental issues in this war. This is also a time for Governments to be just as clear about what they will not do as about what they will do. No one can question the temptation that there is for any government to take what appears to be the easy course and to comply with requests for legislation without equal regard for the disadvantages as well as the advantages to the very people who may ask for such legislation.

Many proposals have been made as to things which should be included in a Bill such as that which we have before us today. I need not go into all of them in detail. Requests have been made that such an act should cover terms of employment, that it should deal with the obligation of hotel keepers in regard to the use of their rooms, that it should deal with libellous or slanderous statements, and with a number of similar subjects. All these are covered by existing laws. It would not only prove ineffective, but it would actually cause confusion and dissatisfaction to the very people who claim protection if any attempt were made to pass laws which could not be enforced. That we will not do in this or in any other case.

I wish to be equally emphatic in stating that existing laws do not cover the points dealt with by this Act. The

offensive signs, notices or representations with which it deals are not now covered by the Criminal Code or any other law in this province. May I also say that the Act as drafted cannot possibly effect any of the legitimate activities of any racial group, which in their preservation of ancient traditions are in fact highly desirable.

I think I should at this point emphasize one consideration which this or any other government must bear in mind. The passing of legislation is one thing. Enforcement is another. The government, however, is responsible for both, and each is equally important. A government which recognizes its obligation to the people will not pass laws which appear to give some rights or protection which, in fact, are not there and cannot be enforced.

That thought has been before us in drafting this Act. We have given it the most careful consideration .

I do not suggest for a moment that the legal draftsmen of this government -- of the hon. Attorney General's department -- excellent civil servants though they be, are infallible, and naturally any suggestions as to the more effective wording of the Bill will be more than welcome, but care has been taken, and it is the opinion of those competent legal draftsmen, that this Act, as drawn, will be effective in stopping the practices which should be most objectionable to every citizen of this province, who believe in the basic principles of the British Democracy. We are not prepared to go further in principle than the provisions contained in the Bill now before you, because of the fact, as I pointed out, we did not believe that anything further would be effective. I have, I hope, given sufficient evidence in the past of my own belief in the right of free speech, and I hardly need assure the members of this

Legislature that I would be the last to support any Bill which limited the right of free speech the slightest extent.

Now may I deal with the question as to whether the principle underlying the Bill should be supported. That is the issue really before us today. The meaning of the words "discriminate against" leaves no doubt about the purpose of the Bill. If we had used the expression "discriminate between", doubt might possibly have existed, although I believe the purpose would still have been clear. But if you discriminate against any person because of race or creed in respect of their ordinary rights as a citizen, you deny that equality which is part and parcel of the very freedom we are fighting to preserve. It seems to me that we have a very simple choice to make. When we say that Canada is a land of freedom and of equality, we either mean what we say or we do not. If we permit signs and notices to be put up in conspicuous places indicating that any particular group of people are denied the ordinary rights available to all other people, then those who should be most indignant are not the people against whom the signs and notices are directed, but those whose basic principles of freedom, justice, and equality have been insulted.

Equality is the very foundation of our social structure. This issue is not new. It has at all times been the issue between democracy and dictatorship. Twenty-two centuries ago, we find that Aristotle stated the principle in describing the proper government of free men. These were his words that long ago: "The only stable state is the one in which all men are equal before the law".

We find the same principle more fully stated in the Declaration of Independence of the United States. These are the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that

all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In quoting these words may I recall that they did not constitute a statement of principle applicable only to the United States, but were merely an assertion by Thomas Jefferson of basic rights which had come down through the centuries to all who trace their institutions from the Magna Carta.

We deny the very principles we support in this Legislature if we permit signs and notices to be displayed which deny equality in the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I know that we will not end prejudices and animosities by passing bills in this Legislature. That is one reason I am not prepared to support any vague or uncertain provisions. Prejudice is as old as mankind and since there have been laws it has been made abundantly clear that toleration cannot be enforced by Statutory enactment. That simple truth we will seek to observe. Prejudice and animosity are limited to no one group or groups. They can only be cured by education. I hope that our education will produce better results in that direction than it has in the past. We will do our best.

Let me give you just one personal experience of the sort of thing which illustrates the extent to which prejudice can go without full knowledge of the facts. I knew a man who came here to Canada when I was a boy. The country from which he came fought with us as an ally in the last war, but in this war fought for a time against us. He became a good citizen of Canada in every way. During this war, however, he has been made to suffer deep humiliation and personal loss

because of prejudices which were based simply upon the lack of knowledge of the facts, and a lack of appreciation that he was a citizen of Canada, the country to which he had been invited, and to which he had come of his own free will, and which he had chosen as his home.

When I was in England recently, the Commanding Officer of a unit I was visiting told me that his Sergeant Major was anxious to see me as he had known me here in Canada. I met him. His Commanding Officer told me that this young man was one of the smartest non-commissioned officers in the Canadian Forces overseas. I found to my surprise that he was the son of the man to whom I have referred.

Now then, I am afraid, all too often, it is suggested that this deals only with a group in our own community. It is also suggested that no lasting harm comes from permitting such signs and notices as are under consideration, that the effect of this passes, and that they cure themselves in the end.

May I offer an example of the lasting harm which can come from such signs, and which are not limited to any one race. It may be forgotten by some that at a time, when immigration suddenly very assumed large proportions, at the beginning of this century, some of our own people, in a spirit of isolationism which had developed, had very narrow views of the subject, and there are undoubtedly those in this chamber today who may recall that there was a time when signs bearing the words "No Englishmen need apply" actually appeared on buildings in this province. And this is not confined to any one race. It may be forgotten today, but it has not been forgotten by some of the people who were affected.

When I was in Britain only a few weeks ago, this was brought to my attention, and I was asked whether it was possible

that the same sentiments that had been reflected in those signs at that time still existed here. I was able to assure them most positively that it did not. I mention that merely to emphasize how, over the years, the effects of signs of this nature directed to any race, leave lasting injury.

I recognize how difficult it will be to stop it, but it should be our purpose to attempt in every way we can to remove the causes of such prejudices, and to make "community", "equality", and "freedom" real, live words.

I believe if this Bill went further than it does and attempted to go into fields of legislation already covered elsehwere, we might only increase the very evil we are seeking to remove. But I do believe that along with education, which will take time, we should enact this law which will have the effect of removing from our sight signs and notices which deeply offend those to whom we have promised equality, and should offend just as deeply those who assert there belief in personal, equality of rights, and the honour and dignity of every citizen of Canada.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I am bound to agree with a great deal of what the hon. prime minister has said today, and I agree particularly with him that this is a matter which ought to be approached without heat, and in a spirit of moderation and fair play.

I am not going to speak at any length on the subject of this Bill, but I address myself for a moment only to the principle of the Bill, and not to any of the other questions which might have been dealt with in this Bill, or in some similar Bill.

With the general principle, which the hon. prime minister has enunciated, namely, that outward manifestation of

discrimination against a group, or against groups should not be permitted as being offensive both to the group discriminated against, and to all those who believe in equality -- with that general principle, the members of the opposition are inagreement. We believe also that some of the comments which have been made elsewhere on the text of this Bill -- in fact, all of the comments we have seen -- are founded perhaps on misunderstanding, but a closer examination of the Bill itself will demonstrate that the object is precisely what has been stated by the hon. prime minister, and that object is to prevent the outward manifestation of inequality and discrimination, which outward manifestation may produce results which none of us would welcome in a democratic country such as ours, results that would be in no way compatible with British Democracy and with the principles for which the United Nations struggle in this great war.

We are aware, as I am sure every hon. member of this house is aware, that not all the thoughts which pass through the mind of an individual, certainly not the beliefs and the prejudices of any individual, can be dealt with by legislation, but a serious problem has arisen in connection with what I have described as "outward manifestations" or "discriminations", and it is with that problem we understand this Bill is designed to deal, and we are satisfied that it is necessary not only in the interests of the groups who are particularly and directly affected, but in the interests of Ontario as a whole.

(Page 766 follows)

MR. THOMAS A. MURPHY: (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the second reading of the Bill, I was unaware that there would be an amendment to it at this time, but I wish now to record my objections to it. I think it is inopportune, and it is too far-reaching. I have no objection to the Bill, designed as it is, against signs and notices in the press, but we must take into consideration that we have no jurisdiction over the radio, and this Bill states that no radio broadcasts shall take place referring to creed or religion. That is true that there has been strong objection taken in the press to the Bill, and surely they have good advice - the advice I have received from the legal profession states that this Bill goes much further than a great many members of this House believe. It states here:

> "Permit to be published or displayed on lands, or premises, or in a newspaper, through a radio broadcast station, or by means of any other media, which he owns or controls."

Now, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it prevents the candidates or members of this House making statements at public meetings - making statements against their opponents.

(Page 767 follows).

It also prevents ~~advertising~~ advertising on bill boards and during the last election there was a great many bill boards exhibited throughout this province - I am sorry that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) is missing, but his picture was on a great many bill boards - some of them by his own party and others by his opponents. I maintain that this Bill will prevent any of that. It will prevent publications of sermons by some ministers. They will not be able to print their sermons. It will prevent the publication of such papers as the Orange Sentinal, the Protestant Action and the Catholic Register.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: NO, no, no.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that is my opinion, anyway. It also will prevent the churches referring to their creeds. I will refer the members of the house to section 22 of the Church of England Prayer Book. Those of you who are members of the Church of England will know that that refers to another creed. I do not believe the people of the province of Ontario are ready for a Bill of this kind. While I wish to be tolerant in every way - all those who are new Canadians in this country, I believe that the minority must at all times bow to the majority. I suggest to the Government at this time that they withdraw this Bill. I have not got the amendment here, but I do not believe that the amendment takes away the objectionable features which I have stated.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLeod: (Bellwoods) The statement by the prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) and by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was so excellent that it really is unnecessary to say very much more in respect of the general principle of this Bill. I agree a hundred percent with what the prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) has said, and I am trying to say that as a Canadian citizen who , I suppose, also belongs to a minority group - the Scotch, you know, have had a very great lot of very hard things said about them from time to time and I rather imagine this Bill will not cause anybody to cease from attacking the Scotch. I am told some years ago

an Englishman or a Welshman - I am not sure which - went to Scotland to look over the Scotchmen and came back and wrote a book in which he said that he only found two decent people in Scotland and one was half Irish and the other was half drunk. Now, of course, that was all said in fun, perhaps, and as long as men live I suppose there will always be the temptation for one racial group to take a crack at the other. The hon. member at the rear here was saying some rather harsh things about the English last night, and even wondered if they were worth fighting for. But, Mr. Speaker, frankly, when I pass by a picnic ground or a beach or some area and see a sign linking a great race with a certain creature of the animal world, every feeling of decency and justice in my being is outraged.

I think that the Bill perhaps if it does nothing else it declares to the world that we stand in differentiation from the German nation, which has become depraved as a result of permitting this sort of thing to develop. There are a great many manifestations of discriminations, racial and otherwise, that cannot be covered by any law. It is regretable that they cannot . For instance, there is one form of anti-semitism that is to be found in stories that are current from time to time. One of those stories is in circulation in the United States during this war when an American magazine of the strong Nazi tenet carried the following: "The first American to kill a Jap was Michael Murphy. The first American bombardier to sink a Jap was Colin Kelly, and the first American to get four new tires was Abie Cohen." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that a lot of people have laughed about that, and thought it was an innocent joke, but this is just an example of the insidious form of anti-semitism, because the man who cooked up this little joke overlooked one thing, namely, - and a very important thing - that the bombardier in the plane of Captain Kelly was Myer Leven of Brooklyn, New York, and that, of course, was left out. This suggestion that some

particular race can be singled out as objectionable or unpatriotic, and that sort of thing has gone so far in this country and has been encouraged by people with axes to grind that unless some steps are taken to check it in a relatively short space of time this country and this nation can become depraved as some of the European nations have become and we have got to start somewhere, and I agree with the leader of the opposition that perhaps the most we can do now is to deal with the outward manifestation of it. But we should not be content to let it stand there, and here I agree with the prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) that it is very important for Governments and other public bodies to undertake a campaign of enlightenment in this country that will help to counteract this insidious propaganda directed against not just one creed but many creeds.

I was interested, in standing out in the rotunda the other day, to see a bronze tablet there in memory of the Negroes who went to fight for this country in the last war. Now, that was a very fine thing to do. I am very glad to see it there, and I am sure the Negroe citizens of Toronto who placed it there are honoured to feel that Negroe heroes of the last war have that tablet placed there in their memory. But there is not much use honouring them in bronze if you are going to deny them their privileges and rights as citizens of this country, and I think it would be an excellent thing now if the Department of Education in this province would undertake to cope with this problem by paying a little more attention in the text books to the contributions that these various groups have made to the national life of Canada. We are not just a nation - we are a nation of many nations, so to speak.

I noticed that the Toronto Evening Telegram last night in commenting on this legislation complains if this thing is passed, if this Billis passed, we will have to change some of the hymns in the hymn books. Well, frankly, I do

not think that would be a bad idea, because I suggest to you that those lines that they quoted, "The heathen in his blindness bows down to wood and stone" is even out of line with the Atlantic Charter. It does not conform to the modern up-to-date approach. I think a great many of the leading hymnologists like Dr. Alexander MacMillan, the father of Sir Ernest MacMillan, has been advocating for a very long time that we go through the hymn books to bring those hymns up-to-date and in line with the modern conception of civilization and relationships between people.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that Bill with its amendments will pass through this Legislature without dissent. The mere passing of the Bill, of course, is not going to dispose of the problem. We still have a long way to go, but at least it is one way in which we can let the world know that Canada is reaching forward to a higher plane of civilization and differentiating itself from those people who have dragged the world into the awful holocaust in which we are engaged today and I support to the very limit everything that the prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) have said.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD: (York West) Insofar as this group is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think we are anxious to see this Bill proceed through its legislative way, pass second reading and go into the Committee of the Whole House.

The premier (Hon. Mr. Drew) has been very wise in saying, very tolerant, in that if we do not find ourselves in agreement with some of the provisions set out in the Bill, that when the Committee of the Whole is sitting we can make amendments or propose amendments and have them judged by the members of the house. I recall, as the prime minister set out, the difficulties that we have had in the past in approaching this problem. Formyself, I agree entirely with the principle of the Bill. The trouble, as we have gone along the road to meet this problem, seems to me that we could not find a common ground on which to proceed. Now, I hope the proposal of the Government is that common ground we have been seeking. I know, and the prime minister admitted it that it does not meet in full the problem that presents itself, and I

for one think the prime minister is wise in proposing that we should not try to meet in full the problem that presents itself. As far as I am concerned, I think to try to cover the whole field would defeat the purpose which we seek today and I would rather take this one step, even if it be a false one and let the progress of time and the usage of the Act itself demonstrate to all of us if we can go safely forward in further removing the objectionable features that this Bill does not touch.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves the second reading of Bill number 46, "An Act to prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter referring to Race or Creed".

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime minister) The tenth Order.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The tenth Order. Second reading of Bill "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales".

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR: (Ottawa South) I would like to move the second reading of Bill number 50, Tax Sale Confirmation Act. This is just moving the date for one year. It is the same Bill that is now on the statutes but just moving the date forward one year to apply to all properties, land taken over by municipalities and being confirmed as being sold.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunbar moves Bill number 50. Is the motion carried?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of the Bill.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime minister) Order number 7.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order - resuming the adjourned Debate on the motion for the consideration of the Speech from the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD: (York West) Mr. Speaker,

in resuming this debate I would like to just for a moment touch upon a matter which I was going to deal with in any event, but I think it ought to come in at this time.

I listened to the prime minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) today with a great deal of interest in respect to his announcement in regard to cooperation between the Federal and the province of Ontario Legislation. I would like to have the Government carry that degree of cooperation which they expect and which they should expect into this house. I am not complaining and I hope it is not harping criticism or I do not want it labelled as such, but I brought it to the attention of the house last night that on a number of occasions we have had to get the press to find out what was in the Government's mind by way of announcements, and this has occurred again, and as I am going to deal with the question of welfare now I just want to bring it to your attention that last week we had an announcement in the press in respect to the Bill that the Minister of Health proposed to bring to this house and this morning we find another announcement of a grant which has been made to the Ottawa Hospital. Now, I think when the house is in session, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this house and members of the Government particularly, that it would be courteous at least if the Government would make this announcement or Minister make this announcement in the house so that we did not have to go to the press to get our information from there before it is received here.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime minister) I do not want to interrupt: I do not want to interrupt, but I will just explain the procedure. Notice had been given formally to the Clerk and in view of that explanation was given of the notice when the information was requested.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD: (York West) That does, Mr. Speaker, explain the announcement regarding the Bill and I think that the announcement regarding these grants, etc., that we should hear about them here. I am not finding fault but I think it would aid in the relationship which we want to

establish and maintain.

I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the question of welfare, and I want to point out that the hon. member from Stormont (John L. McDonald) who seconded the Address in Reply said that he believed and I quote: "The state owes the aged, the blind, the feeble -minded, the cripple, widows and orphans, a living - a full and happy living," and I believe that I would be correct in stating that there is no hon. member of this house who does not share the belief of the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. McDonald). But I say, Mr. Speaker, that you will find no provision in the Speech from the Throne for a full and happy living for the several groups which he mentions. Surely this house does not believe that a blind person can have a full and happy living this day and age on $20.00 or $25.00 a month starting when they reach 40 years of age. So far as the state is concerned his life would be anything but full and happy for the first forty years. I believe the hon. member included the crippled in the group to which the state owes a full and happy living and I suggest that there are many crippled persons who receive but a mere pittance in the form of relief. There are many others crippled in industry, but as was stated by the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) receive only two-thirds of what was in many cases a low and inadequate income. And those engaged in industries not covered by the Compensation Act get nothing. With their disability these crippled people get scant consideration from the state. The general attitude that I have encountered in my experience has been one of keeping compensation and pension payments, and other payments of this kind at the lowest possible level that will keep body and soul together. It has been anything but the generous treatment to provide a full and happy living.

The Throne Speech deals, I think, somewhat superficially with point number eighteen of the Progressive-Conservative 22 point manifesto, and I want to just refresh the memories of a couple of members present that the pre-election

manifesto to which I have referred says in the preamble and I quote: "Old age pensioners will no longer be subjected to harsh treatment at the hands of Government." Then I read: "The party's firm belief .." and I think this is rather fundamental and important - "that the natural wealth and productive capacity of the province are such as will provide steady employment at good wages for all industrial citizens together with economic and social security from the cradle to the grave. All that is required to make that vision come true is strong, forthright government in Queen's Park. The party therefore pledges itself.." - and that is the Progressive-Conservative party - "pledges itself to increase Mothers' Allowance and Old Age Pensions and to relieve old people from the obligation of parting with their homes before they can become eligible for their small pensions."

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members with whom I have had the honour to be associated in this C.C.F. group share the belief of the Progressive-Conservative Party that the natural wealth and productive capacity of Ontario does and will provide steady employment at good wages for all those able to work, and economic and social security for all from the cradle to the grave. We share also the belief that a strong forthright government in Queen's Park can make that vision come true. It is because we share that belief that attention must be directed to the fact that the Speech from the Throne fails to mention that any steps are to be taken to raise old age pensions, even up to the Alberta level of $30.00 per month, or to lower the age qualifications and the residence' qualifications or to provide for a private income which would augment the pensioners' income and bring it up to the amount of a single person's exemption in their Federal taxation. There is no mention of removing the obligation of parting with their homes before they become eligible for their small pension, and I believe that the Government will rightly say that those things of

which I speak are Federal matters. They are Federal regulations dealing with the Act on which the basis of payment is arranged as between Federal and Provincial governments and I humbly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government knew these things when the election manifesto was published and it seems to me that we ought to take steps in this legislature that we do what we can at least to have these Federal regulations amended in order that we can carry out the program suggested in the pre-election manifesto of the present Government, and I think in the light of the promises and pledges made on July 3rd last, - for that is the date on which that was said that the Progressive-Conservative Party platform was approved at general meeting in this province - and surely the aged people of this province have a right to believe that a change would be made in the regulation which causes the Government and its agents to continue what is recognized by all as "harsh treatment", and I want to suggest in order that it would be on the record that in this connection for the information of the members of this house that I put on the record social security services respecting the aged now in effect in New Zealand and for reference my source of information is MacLean's Magazine, November 1st, 1942, in an article by the Hon. Walter Nash, Minister to Washington:

> "To every person over sixty, thirty shillings a week. In addition they may own their own home, have £500 in the bank and private income up to £1 per week."

This means that Old Age Pensions start at 60 years. A pensioner can own his own home, have free medical care, have about $2500 in the bank for emergencies, travel, or burial expenses, and can have $260 yearly income in addition to the $360 pension payment; or in other words an old couple in New Zealand can own their own home and have a combined income of approximately $1200 with which to enjoy the sunset of years in the country which they have helped to build. This is what

New Zealand is doing and this is what hon. members of this group want to see done in Canada as soon as possible. And I say further that the treatment being meted out to our old people, to our widows, and to the orphans is anything but "economic and social security from the cradle to the grave". I suggest humbly that it is more apt to mean fewer cradles as was said by the hon. member from Prescott (Mr. Belanger) and we will rather find our security in the grave rather than before we get to the grave. It falls far, far short of a "full and happy life" in which the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. McDonald) believes, and with whom we fully agree. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is another group mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and referred to by the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. McDonald) namely, the feeble minded. From the Speech from the Throne we learn that the Ontario Hospital service is providing accommodation for fourteen thousand one hundred and seventy-two patients, and they are confined in quarters intended for eleven thousand, which means there is over-crowding to the extent of almost 29% in the present quarters. It is also estimated that actual accommodation required for the mentally ill is nineteen thousand beds in this province. This means, Mr. Speaker, that four thousand eight hundred and twenty-eight more beds are required than we now have, but the Government plans to provide only three hundred this year - only three hundred. Now, that means that there are great numbers of mental defectives, people requiring attention, scattered throughout the homes of the people in Ontario at this time. The amount of accommodation proposed by the Government in the Speech from the Throne is four thousand five hundred and twenty-eight beds less than that which is required. It seems to me that that is a matter which should receive further attention. It is not adequate as a program. I grant that the Government has a very good

argument that priority to provide the accommodation necessary for further beds is certainly a handicap but I do not believe it is an insurmountable handicap. I believe that if the importance attached to this problem was emphasized, that we have now reached the state in productivity materials necessary for armaments that many of those things could be released for the provision of these necessary replacements and supplies to provide this kind of accommodation. I want to say I do not want the Government to feel that I am unduly criticizing them. I am only trying to point out where I feel greater emphasis should be laid. As far as the Government is concerned, I think it is to be commended for its proposal to establish mental clinics under expert direction. Surely it is time to stop thinking in terms of past administration which seems to be put at least in terms of "bigger and better" insane asylums and to start to think in terms of "prevention"by removing some of the causes which subscribe to the mounting percentage of mentally defective. We are well aware of the physical difficulties faced by the Government, but consider that planning to provide three hundred beds in the coming year is a very feeble attempt to minister to the needs of the feeble minded.

While speaking on this subject I want to tell the hon. members of this house that if the conditions of labour in the Ontario Hospitals are as they have been described to me, there is certainly room for making an immediate and thorough investigation with the necessary changes. Otherwise we are endangering the lives and health of those who minister to these sick people as well as lessening the chances of recovery of many who might, with adequate attention be reclaimed as good self-supporting citizens.

Now, I want to deal for a few minutes with the question of the stock yard. It has been referred to too often that it seems almost like repetition, and I hope what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, will add a little sidelight on

to this particular question.

I want to commend at the outset the action of the Government in the practical steps which have been taken to fulfil the first part of pledge number four in their program and I shall look forward to seeing the results of the recommendations of the Agricultural Commission of farmers when it is put forward. I want to take this opportunity - the Minister with who I want to deal for a moment is not in his place but some of the members of the treasury benches will convey to him - that I take this personal opportunity of commending the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) on the forthright manner in which he has dealt with this sugar beet matter, I am sure that I speak for the Trade Union members of this group, that I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) will find we are desirous of giving full co-operation in order to see that the farmers get what they should have.

I have heard some say in regard to the stock market that it is a step in the right direction, that it may prove of some value. Well, I suggest to the members of this house as to it being a step in the right direction it matters in what direction the Government is travelling. If, I suggest, the Government is headed in the direction of extending public enterprise and is prepared to take whatever steps are necessary in order to rescue food processing and distribution from monopoly control and have it operated in the public interest, then I heartily subscribe to the view that taking over the stock-yards is a step in the right direction, for I, along with other members of this group, believe in public ownership, and I believe that this war has fully justified that belief. If we want any supporting evidence I think it was contained in the remark that the Hon. C. D. Howe, when he said in reply to the hon. member from East York, Mr. R. H. McGregor, "Let me tell him that the lowest cost shipyard we have in Canada

today is government owned and operated - the United Shipyards at Montreal". However, the hon. members of this Ontario Legislature need, I should think, no other proof of value of public ownership than we have in the Ontario Hydro and the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, for these two great public enterprises have paved the way for great industrial development in Ontario and Canada. Some time it would be interesting, I am sure, for the hon. members of this house to find on a map just where industrial development has taken place, and I will guarantee that you will find that the greatest development has taken place where publicly owned hydro power has been available or where the resources of the north country have been tapped and communication has been made through the Temiskaming Railway. I thought that ought to start our thinking along the line of further public enterprise development so that we can extend the area of development in this country of ours.

The prime minister (Hon. George Drew), I believe, in his remarks in this debate referred to the area of the clay belt and the development of that great area in Northern Ontario. I suggest that there are certain other developments that will add greatly to the shift of industry and the development of that country and I want to put ourselves on record here in this group as being entirely inaccord and in favour with the extension of public enterprise, and all I am afraid is that the stock yard example you used in the Speech from the Throne and the twenty-two points of the Progressive-Conservative is a very feeble step in the direction of public enterprise in this province. It has been indicated here that more than 50% of the cattle being consumed or processed in the abatoirs and in the packing plants now in Toronto are not going through the stock yards at all. It has been stated by the hon. member from Grey Bruce (Mr. Oliver), I think it is, that it is a vanishing or diminishing factor.

It does not make much different now whether the stock yards are taken over or left to rot with their present ownership. However, I am not going to find fault with the Government for doing it but we certainly feel that it is only a step in the right direction if the Government is prepared to go much further in that direction.

I want to suggest while I am talking about public enterprise and the packing plants rescuing the processing of food, the distribution of food from the clutches of monopoly control, that I was a little sorry to see the toning down which was made in the Speech from the Throne from the twenty-two points in regard to agricultural Committees. In the promises made before the election we find that the Agricultural Committees are to have authority to promote the question of processing and distribution of food. In other words, I suppose that that was meant to infer at least that these Agricultural Committees would arrange these matters, but I find in the Speech from the Throne that when it is proposed to establish these county committees of farmers that they are now going to be used simply in an advisory capacity. They are not going to have, according to the Speech from the Throne, any authority. And dealing with this question of public enterprise and public development, I want to go on record here as supporting the Government fully in their measures to institute the Planning and Development Department of the Government, but I suggest we have got to look afield, Mr. Speaker, we have got to raise our sights a little bit. At the present time we recognize we are in a war - certain restrictions are necessary - but I suggest that the restriction of gas and oil in Ontario are not necessary today except for our blindness in not preparing for such an eventuality. The resources are available. We know there are great unexplored resources of tar sands. We read in this morning's paper that they are being developed at this particular time. I see in The Globe and Mail, Friday, March 10th, "It is not expected that

gasoline in quantity will be produced this year in the Athabaska tar sands development undertaken in agreement with the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company of Canada, Limited, the Mines Minister Crerar said. "The plant is being constructed to handle six hundred tons of tar sands in twenty-four hours."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those tar sands were there. Their presence was known long before this war started. If you will take the Magazine of the Imperial Oil Company you will find that they have a map of Canada; they have great areas converging down into Ontario, if you please, where there is possibilities of oil deposits and they say very frankly that some day we may find we will have to produce our own oil rather than import it from outside, which is largely done at the present time. I know that hon. members of this house will suggest to me that the oil resources lie largely outside the boundaries of Ontario, although there is a great deal of exploration work that may prove there are plenty of resources inside the boundaries of this great province, but even if they lie outside, it seems to me that it is a matter that can be placed immediately in the hands of Planning and Development Board that they can proceed to procure those resources for the use of Ontario and Canadian people, and I want to make that suggestion to the Government. Some may say it is a long way to the Athabaska tar sands. Yes. I suggest it is a long way from Oklahoma and that is where our oil is coming through pipelines owned by private corporations, and if private corporations can do these things for the people of Ontario at a profit, surely we can construct our own publicly-owned pipelines and provide these resources in whatever quantity required for the use of our public, and I sincerely hope we are never going to be caught napping again and be so dependent upon private enterprise with this heritage of natural resources available to us. I hope the Government will take

under advisement the suggestion that they immediately institute a research committee and put this in the hands of the Planning and Development Department.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker - and I see the Minister of Highways in his place - that the Government and the Minister of Highways are to be congratulated on their announcement of substantial highway program. I believe that I express fully the feeling of my colleagues when I say we hope this program is but the forerunner of much greater preparation to implement the promise of full employment.

I was very pleased to hear an announcement of the prime minister (Hon. George Drew) today in respect to the letter written by the President of the United States. Here is another great project which certainly has prospects of providing a great measure of employment.

I say that provision in the Speech from the Throne regarding highway development program is very good, but it is a very feeble step when you consider the size of the problem involved. The Speech from the Throne refers to the figure 27,840,000 man days of work provided in the Highway Program covering four years, and this fact has been underlined by several of the Government speakers in this debate as being something really worth while and I do not want to depreciate the value of such a program, but I want to put it in its proper light for the members of this house, and when you break it down into a four year period, and when you divide it up and find out exactly how many men are going to be employed in relation to the number of jobs that we are going to require when this war is over, I am going to say it does not look so good when you start to analyze the situation.

I am taking the Government's own figure of forty-eight hours per week, which they have suggested and which I am going to have something to say again in a moment, this program provides employment for 32,091 persons, if they take forty-eight hours and fifty-one weeks a year. It is estimated by

one of the two central labour organizations, and I have the documents here, that in the immediate post-war period that we will require two million new jobs. I have the figures of the War Pension Board here, and especially a draft on this particular problem and I find that we are going to require, according to their figures 2,968,000 jobs, because that is the number of people now engaged in essential war industry, and the number of men and women in the armed services. So that means that we have got to find in our peacetime economy for these people now engaged solely in war production and in war activities, we have got to find 2,968,000 jobs. Well now, I want to be conservative in this particular case - not Progressive-Conservative - and I am going to take the lower figure of two million jobs and I am going to divide that into Ontario's share and with our extra industrial development I think I am perfectly safe in suggesting that we will require a minimum of 700,000 jobs in Ontario in the immediate post-war period, and when you take and stack up against that this provision, which is the only provision to construe them in the Speech from the Throne, of 22,091 jobs, I suggest that it is not going very far. In fact it only amounts to about a 3% fulfilment of the necessary jobs that will be required. Three per cent in the case of jobs, six per cent in the case of hospital beds, and four per cent of the feeble-minded. I do suggest, in passing, Mr. Speaker, to the Minist r of Labour (Mr. Daley) because I want to deal with the question in a moment of a 48 hour week -- I do suggest if you will just divide the number of man days that the roads program calls for at 48 hours a week, fifty weeks in a year, that you will find that you will provide jobs for another eight thousand people by that simple reduction of hours and another week's holidays with pay, Mr. Speaker.

The pre-election manifesto, to which I previously referred says this: "The Progressive-Conservative party has

definite plans for reconstruction and full employment after the war". Definite plans! I do not doubt the word of the Progressive-Conservative party, but I believe it would be in the public interest to open up the definite plans and let the hon. members of this House know what assurance they can give to their respective constituents that they are going to have full employment, and I suggest that any other course on the part of the government is wrong and cowardly. I want to use this in no personal sense; I want to use it in its proper sense, so far as policy making is concerned, that any other course is cowardly in my opinion.

I believe the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. Mr. Downer) in his very appealing remarks to this House the other day, told us that we should let the boys at the front know what is going on at home and I want to subscribe fully to that. As a returned veteran of the last war I know, particularly when we came to the days immediately following the armistice, the men did worry over there and wanted to know what was being done, and I imagine the question is being asked today, as suggested by the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. McDonald), as to what we are fighting for, what is being accomplished towards this great new day for which these men are willing to sacrifice their lives and in regard to the appeal made by the hon. member (Rev. Mr. Downer) who I always feel like calling the padre, and that is what he is and that is what we called them in the last war. I want to deal in a moment with this question of writing letters and suggest to you and to the House we ought to be very careful about the kind of letters we are writing and the reason I have suggested to the government that they ought to make these plans known to us as hon. members of this House, is that when we write letters we can write positive letters, reassuring letters, letters with hope instead of the kind of letters that I am afraid the families of some kind in Ontario are sending to their boys overseas today.

I have here in my hand excerpts from an illustrated newspaper put out by the Dominion Foundry and Steel Corporation in Hamilton,

and this was almost two years ago and I just want to read to this House and put on record some of the things that I found in that paper, some of the things that are going into the homes of the people who have sons and daughters across the seas and in the armed services and it starts out by saying "That the evil day of reckoning and readjustment that must overtake us; and then "we have been surprised at the complacency of their mind rather than in fear of uncertainty." Then I found these words, which to me are bad: "The victorious ending of this war will not bring this security, for history will undoubtedly repeat itself and we shall find the same problems with us as we did during the months immediately following the armistice of 1918."

I know that is in disagreement with the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) who thinks everything is going to be love and honey when the war is over.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): That is really in agreement with what you said.

MR. MILLARD: But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here is the voice of prominent industrialists in this country and it does not look good to me to have these kind of things being placed into the hands of our people and it must create a sense of dispair and futility and certainly the letters that these people will be sending to their people overseas would not bear much encouragement or much hope.

I am not going to read the rest of this except in one or two I think pertinent passages and I read this as a piece of philosophy which we are going to meet in the post-war years: "It has always been and always will be the survival of the fittest. It is something beyond our control." I want to say to the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, if I believed that I would not bother being a member of this Legislature.

(Page 786 follows)

But, I do not know but what we would be wasting our time coming here. I believe that it is something within our control, and that we must grapple with the problems that we created in connection with these conditions after the last war.

Here is a statement that I think the government ought to regard very carefully, a statement being put out to the employees of a great industrial plant. This is speaking of after the war period, immediately the war is over, and it says:

> "Nevertheless, instead of employing upward of twenty-five hundred men, our staff might be nearer five hundred".

In other words, they are saying that only one in five are going to be employed in this plant when the war is over. That is not a very bright prospect for these people to convey in letters to their friends and relatives and neighbours who are overseas. I want to give you this particular passage, hon. members of this House, because I think it is all important:

> "After many months of urging every employee to be unselfish in war production, we now urge them to adopt purely selfish attitudes towards the need that is creeping up on him. A man's own well being is the biggest thing in his life."

I am sure the hon. member from Dufferin-Simcoe (Rev. A. W. Downer) if he was in the House at the moment would be the first to stand on his feet and say that is not the right kind of assurance to give to our men who are in the armed services. If these men are willing to sacrifice their lives, their everything, their all, for the preservation of democracy, and they expect, Mr. Speaker, I think to come back to a land, as somebody said the other day, "fit for heroes to live in".

I think that is the wrong complexion to put on the attitude of the workers in this country; it is a wrong thought to put in their minds, that a man's own well being is the biggest thing in his life.

I do not believe that is true at all.

I want to deal just for a few moments in this question which has been raised here in the debate already, with regard to labour legislation forecast in the speech from the Throne, and I have got to admit, as a representative of labour, that it is most disappointing, and falls far short of the pre-election manifesto, and I want to remind the government, who were the candidates elected under this manifesto, that their program calls for "the best industrial legislation in the world". It is a very sweeping statement. They are not satisfied with "the best in Canada", or "the best in America", but they just take in the globe, and say "the best in the world".

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Why not?

MR. MILLARD: Well, we are promised a forty-eight hour week. A forty-eight hour week is a little late in the day.

In 1892 the United States Congress established a wage-hour standard covering the workers employed in public works, whether employed by the United States government, or by private contractors, and fixed the maximum number of hours to be worked any one day at eight hours — in 1892 they set an eight hour day, six days a week in the United States.

In the United States to-day we have the fair labour standard Act, of 1938 — a year before the war started, so far as Canada is concerned, and in section seven we find:

> "Maximum hours of a week shall be reduced from forty-four hours to forty hours within a space of three years of the date of the passing of the Act",

and provision is made for the payment of over-time and a rate of not less than one and one-half time the regular rate as stated.

I would like to suggest that the hon. Minister of Labour was represented in the Washington conference of the international labour convention in 1919, and at that conference they voted for an eight hour day. I suggest to the ministry of the government, and particularly to the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Daley) that if we are going

to have a full utilization of man power, if we are going to have full employment, it is not realistic to be thinking in terms of forty-eight hours. I am in agreement that forty-eight hours will touch a small fringe of out-lying industries, where there are sweat shop conditions, low pay and long hours, to try and pad the pay envelopes, but forty-eight hours to-day is not a realistic approach, and it does not coincide with the government promise of full employment after the war.

I think the government would have demonstrated a much more realistic approach to the problem of employment if they had started with a forty hour week, with an escalator clause reducing it by one hour each year for the next five years.

The reason a farmer works long hours is because of the low prices and low incomes, and the same is true of the industrial worker because the fact to bear in mind is that when hours are reduced for the industrial workers, and the farmers, they both require more money, and not less money, because they have more time in which to spend it and they should be entitled themselves to secure their cultural education and recreation, and we should not think of maintaining the present wage level with the reduction of hours, but actually increase the wage levels, as we reduce the hours.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that labour will be expected to be grateful and I do not know why. For the suggested forty-eight hours, and one week's holiday with pay? The workers in the industries where they already have a normal forty hour week, are not likely to be greatly cheered with the suggestion that the government is going to accept and put on the statute book a standard forty-eight hours. I do not think that is a step in the right direction. I think that is a step backwards.

I would like to say just a word, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this one week's holiday with pay. I presume the government is aware that it is general practice in Canada, in Canadian heavy

industry to-day, to have two weeks holidays with pay. The government itself is a large employer, and has regularly adopted two weeks vacation with pay. Employers for many years have provided staff and management with two weeks holidays with pay.

When I was overseas in the last war, I learned that in England the two weeks vacation was a British institution, and it had been in practice for many, many years, even up to that time, and I know that the hon. minister of labour (Mr. Daley), himself a war veteran, probably encountered the same thing. He is aware that one week's holidays is a very incomplete step in this matter of progressive legislation.

And I would like to bring out this fact as well, Mr. Speaker, that we have some of the finest playgrounds in America, and we have advertised widely to attract tourists from across the border. We have built roads and super highways to make these playgrounds accessible to the visitors to this country, and yet the working people of Ontario will in large part be denied use of these playgrounds unless two weeks holidays with pay is the rule, rather than the exception as at the present time.

Legislation to provide one week's holidays is practically useless to-day, and it will be positively inadequate when war production becomes unnecessary.

The forty-eight hour week, one week's vacation with pay, is, as the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) referred to it as a "fading issue". I do not think it is important to pass such legislation if the government is not prepared to go much further than one week's vacation and forty-eight hours. And, as suggested by the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) I do not think consideration should be given in this House to a reduction by legislation of hours, unless we are going to couple with that a provision that there is not going to be any corresponding reduction in wages.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to see you just very briefly with

this matter of applying the proposed labour code of Ottawa to all industry in Ontario. Time does not permit me to deal with this matter but very superficially, and I do not propose to go into it at any great length, because there are two or three things which I feel are rather of a fundamental nature which I want to speak upon, and I know the House wants to adjourn as early as possible, particularly to-day.

But I do say that the legislation or proposal to adopt the legislation, seems to me to be almost fantastic, in view of the considered judgment of labour since they have had this code placed in their hands.

I was greatly surprised to find a speaker representing the Progressive-Conservative party, none other than the hon. member for the federal constituency which I represent provincially, York West, speaking in Kitchener on February 14th, said, as reported in the Globe and Mail of February 15th "Mr. Rodney Adams assails the government labour code".

I will not take the time of the House to read that through but I want to say that I agreed with it whole heartedly, and it is available in the press, for anybody who wants to see what these resolutions were. I will not take the time to read them now. But here we have a federal member of the Progressive-Conservative party, the day before the Order-in-Council is tabled in Ottawa, going out and whole heartedly condemning this labour code as put out by the Federal Department of Labour in Order-in-Council, now known as "No. 1003", and we have the rather peculiar situation of the Progressive-Conservative government in Ontario proposing to establish the legislation which has been condemned, and applying it to all ~~its~~ industry in this province.

It is a suggestion which I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, and I think we had better go very carefully in adopting something which the government itself, through their speakers, have condemned.

I want to commend the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and

the

the government, for the position they take in saying that the Ottawa government should have got legislation on the books which covered all industry, and not have this confusion in any way, shape or form, because one of the weaknesses of adopting the present labour code, and applying it to the balance of industry, is not only that it is bad legislation -- and I want to say something stronger than that -- it is a deceitful and defective document when you start analyzing it, and it is trying to lead labour up a blind alley in this legislation. And one of the bad features is that it does not do what federal legislation should do; it does not achieve uniformity across this country, and the result will be, when you move from Ontario into Quebec -- why we talk about there being confusion in Ontario -- if we apply the labour code to war industry -- and that is something this government of Ontario cannot help -- but you can see there will be confusion if we apply it to war industry and not to the other industries, there will be two sets of codes, and a great resultant confusion. Knowing this, imagine the confusion when you have a peace-time industry or other industry under the code in Ontario, and you have a war industry under a code in Ontario, and other industries not under a code, and not under the same regulations applying in the province of Quebec and the other industrial provinces in this country. It is certainly a confused situation we are getting into.

And I must urge respectfully and with all the power at my command, that the government reconsider their decision in this matter. There seems to me there ought to be some better way out.

If the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) -- and I am not casting a doubt, when he said the Bill which has been drafted with the advice of his experts -- although I do not know who the experts were, and I know a good many experts connected with labour, but none of them seemed to have been --

HON. CHARLES DALEY: Do you know all the experts?

MR MILLARD: I am not doubting the word of the Minister, but if they have a bill,-- which has been approved by labour, why

in heaven's name is it not put before the labour committee of this House, and bring down a Bill that is worth while legislation? and in keeping with the promise that the government has made to labour in their pre-election manifesto.

When I suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. Minister in this regard that to follow any other course can only be construed by labour as some kind of political manoeuvring on the part of the government that, "Ottawa has passed a Bill which is bad, but the government is prepared to say, 'well, now, for the sake of uniformity in both sets of industry in Ontario we will adopt it, but the onus for passing this bad legislation will be on the MacKenzie King Government at Ottawa'".

I do not think that is a solution to our problem; I do not think labour will be very easy in the acceptance of that decision.

I will not deal with the matter further, but I am going to earnestly suggest that the government take under advisement the suggestion that they reconsider their position with regard to this idea of adopting what is considered by everybody, the government included, to be bad legislation, emanating from Ottawa.

I just want to point out in passing — and I hope the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will not consider it personal, or not consider it bad manners on my part, Mr. Speaker, but I want to point out that there was quite a wide divergency between the promises made that a committee was to be established, a representative committee of fifteen people was to be established, and they were to sit down and draft a plan, and draft a code, and the report which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) gave us the other day when he said that he had laboured on this thing, but it was in secret, nobody knows what is in the Bill; — I presume it is a good Bill or the Minister of Labour would not be quite so sure about it, but it is a long way now removed from this representative committee.

I am not one, Mr. Speaker, to subscribe to the idea of the representative committee. I think the facts were before the government

they were before a Select committee of this House last year; I do not think that this committee so long drawn out is necessary, but I do believe that the government was aware that there are labour people in this House, and labour representations have been made and as it is a Bill of the government, I do believe that it should be placed now before the labour committee of this House in order that we can get down to some finality, and some decent legislation for labour in this province.

I want to refer, in passing, to the question of meeting post-war problems now, and I want to say that in his very worthy and common-sense remarks in this debate, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) said that men in the fighting services are saying to-day, "What are we fighting for?".

Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of the last war, and a member of this House, I say with emphasis this question must be satisfactorily answered. Every day, according to the Press, numbers of our service men are returning to Canada. They are veterans of World War 2; they are not asking the question, "What are we fighting for?", but they are asking the question, "Is this what we fought for?". And it must be understood, Mr. Chairman, that that question cannot be satisfactorily answered with promises of plans for training to be given after the war is over. I say, in passing, that I note in the pre-election manifesto that the words "after the war" are used in at least four places. We must realize now, as far as these people are concerned, that it is now "after the war"; they have done their bit; they are here, invalided home; they are being discharged from the services, so that the problem of "post-war" is now immediately upon us, in a lesser degree, it is true, that we should be now ready to grapple with the problem, and get on with this work.

The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) has said, in effect, that we were fooled last time as veterans, and we must not let that condition exist to-day. In my opinion, and I believe the opinion is shared by the hon. members of this group, if we are to have full employment after the war we must start our programme of expansion and public enterprise, housing and rehabilitation, now. It will be necessary, it is true, to have the cooperation of the Dominion Government,

but this is not likely to provs any great obstacle to action along the line I suggest, and with all due respect, particularly in an election year, possibly, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) has said, in moving the address in reply, "No place on this earth can give a better standard of living than this province of ours." And I want to humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, — although it was covered by other speakers in this debate, — that the people of this province, who suffered through the demoralizing depression, who could not even find work, but who have given their sons -- Why, one of the constituents in my riding has placed before me one of the most pitiful cases I ever encountered, of a man who could not find work in Canada, who was utterly unable to get employment, but who was accepted in the Air Force, trained as a pilot, provided with equipment, and has given his life in South Africa, in the interests of a country which could not provide him even with a job. I say these people who can find no work, who have suffered from malnutrition, who never could have a home or a car or a vacation, and who have been given two hundred and forty dollars per year old-page pension -- The words of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Taylor) will sound very bitter, indeed, and if these words are true, then I suggest, most respectfully, that past administration stand condemned by its own speakers in this regard.

Even if our country is able to provide that kind of a standard of living, we can go no farther along the road until we make this standard of living available to our people.

Now, I want to address myself, for a moment, to a statement made by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) when he said, "So you have one of the greatest markets for our manufactured products right here in Canada". He said, in effect, "Do not cater to the export trade and neglect the rural market." Surely this is good common-sense, and should be a

lesson to the politicians who think and talk in terms of "blasting our way into the markets of the world", while the farmers and industrial workers of Canada suffer depression conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not delay this House further, but there are a number of things I do want to say very briefly, and I want to wind up as quickly as I can. I recognize the courtesy that the House has shown to me, but there are just two or three things which I think are rather fundamental, and I would like to deal with them as briefly as I can, and get some of these things onthe record, so that our position will be clear.

I want to say, with regard to the statement of the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald), whom I see is absent from his place, that I was happy, as a representative of Labour, to hear this statement from a veteran of the last war and an experienced farmer, because it indicates, I believe, a new awareness that there is no economic excuse for poverty in this province and in this country. But I must warn my hon. friend that if the rural markets, of which he speaks, are going to be fully supported, we will have to do more than simply tinker and temporize with the present economic machinery and controllership.

cc 10

In this regard I want to remind the hon. members of this House of a statement recently made by Vice President Wallace of the United States. According to the press statement Mr. Wallace had this to say, and I want to read this article because it is important, and I think it is important that it be put on the record correctly:

> "The issue is very simple. The question is whether the people keeping themselves fully informed, can operate through democratic government to keep the national interests above the interest of Wall St. or will the old-line politicians, financed from Wall St., again succeed in making Washington the servant of Wall St? What we need in this country is a new partnership in which Main St. and Wall St. as well as Washington, will put nothing ahead of all-out production in our America of tomorrow.
>
> The people can come out on top provided they remain continually awake and really believe they can have a higher standard of security and a higher standard of living and if they will not let up in their fight until they get what they want and must have. They must hold their congressman responsible for getting that higher standard of living. They must make him feel responsible at all times to the general welfare and above everything to the principle of complete utilization of all resources, all manpower, all skills, in the service of the common man in his search for jobs for all. In this fight of the people it is quite possible for those who control the big corporations to gum up our system so that it cannot work.
>
> It is possible for an incipient American fascism to precipitate a depression which will defeat all the desires of labor and government and most of business."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these are very timely words, and I am sorry that the hon. Attorney General is not in his place at the

moment, because I do not want anybody to feel that I am taking advantage of this situation, but there has appeared in the press a statement made by the hon. Attorney General when he was speaking to the Lion's Club recently in the City of Toronto. This is a Globe and Mail report of January 14th, 1944, and I read these words — and I say that these words give me personally a great deal of apprehension as to the ability of the government of the present day to fulfill their pledges, or even fulfill the anticipated labour legislation, the legislation provided in the speech from the Throne.

Here are the words of the hon. the Attorney General according to this report, and I quote: "I pin my faith on free enterprise, with a proper tax structure". I repeat that: "I pin my hope on free enterprise".

I believe, as the hon. member for Windsor (Mr. Bennett) said yesterday that we are not condemning free enterprise by simply using the old standard that "By their fruits ye shall know them", and if the hon. Attorney General, an important member of this government, says that he "pins his faith on free enterprise with a proper tax structure" — and what that "proper tax structure" is, of course, we have no idea, but I believe that "free enterprise" is comparatively not affected at all by the tax structure, as far as the province is concerned. So that the safeguard placed there by the hon. Attorney General seems to me to be unnecessary, and the fact that I want to bring out here is that here is a spokesman for the government who says, "I pin my faith on free enterprise".

Speaking about "free enterprise" I can only quote the words of a previous prime minister of Canada, the former leader of the Conservative — now the Progressive-Conservative party, when he said in a letter signed by himself in the Toronto Star, on December 12th, 1940: "In the economics of every people profits always have been an must be the main objective of business and industrial operation. It is definitely in the public interest that this objective remains".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I point out that that letter was written in reply to a statement made by this leader of the Conservative party in the

Senate at Ottawa when he said that business men by the dozen, even in this war period — not a postwar period; not a peace time period; but even in this war period business men by the dozen were saying they would rest on their oars rather than do their business if the government is going to remove — not their profits — but their excess profits to the treasury of Canada.

Now, as I said before I will not take time to deal with a number of matters I had in mind. I did want to put before this House some of the loose thoughts which the hon. Prime Minister referred to in an address that he made in Peterborough in 1937. I will have to skip that, Mr. Prime Minister, because of the time element, but I do want to just pass one or two remarks which I think ought to be brought to the attention of this House before I conclude my remarks on this debate.

I have here in my hand a press clipping which says:

> "Mr. Bracken spoke at a banquet under the auspices of the three Essex County Progressive-Conservative associations at the Prince Edward Hotel. Many prominent labour leaders were among those who heard him outline the program which he pledged would be put into effect. Ontario Labour Minister, Charles Daley, was a head table guest and introduced the chief speaker".

This was dated at Windsor, February 11th of this year. I have read the words uttered by Mr. Bracken, now the leader of the Progressive-Conservative party, and a man whose words should be listened to with respect for whatever worth they have but I think men ought to be more careful when they speak or write these words.

Mr. Bracken said:

> "The trade unions of Italy and Germany entrusted themselves to what they thought was a benevolent dictator, only to discover they lost what they were striving for".

I have no doubt Mr. Bracken believed he was making a very important statement and a very correct statement and I am surprised that

if the hon. minister of Labour knew it was not, he did not correct it at that time but I think it should not go unnoticed in this province of ours, being the banner industrial province of the Dominion of Canada because that was a press report, and is carried abroad, and I am just a little bit apprehensive of the repercussions that this statement might have.

But I want to say this — and I quote from a book by Mr. S. H. Robert, a professor of modern history in the University of Sydney, Australia. He spent the greater part of two years, — 1937 — 1938 — in Germany studying the whole Nazi set-up and had already an intimate knowledge of German history and internal affairs.

I want to quote briefly from his book "Trade unions and National Socialism":

> "The Labour Front was one of the first institutions set up in Hitlerite Germany, because the trade unions were the centres of organized opposition to the new regime. At ten o'clock on the morning of May 2nd, 1933, trade unions were completely abolished throughout Germany, and their funds were expropriated, together with the whole of their buildings and records. Within four days, Dr. Ley had taken over the last of the 169 workers' organizations, and he said naively: "It was just as if the leaders of the trade unions had waited for them to be taken over, and breathed a sigh of relief when they were finally relieved of their burden." .... Dr. Ley was more honest in admitting that "the taking over was done to secure our political power, because the unions were so many anti-fascist nests."

And I want to stress that point particularly, Mr. Speaker, because I am somewhat personally involved.

(Page 800 follows).

I expect to proceed to England this summer representing one of the labour organizations of this country as a delegate to a World Conference of Labour. I expect to meet at that conference representatives of the underground labour movement in Germany and I would hate to have it coming from Canada in these news despatches that we had accused them of being dupes and in any way aiding or abetting because I want to say with the hon. member of this House that it is this underground movement of labour in Germany that we are depending upon today to support the United Nations — doing their job at great risk of being liquidated and they will be represented, I have no doubt, at this World Conference and I wanted to be on record and I hope that the leader of the Progressive-Conservative party will change his mind and retract that statement because I do not think it is in accordance with the facts.

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker I am not going to detain the House any longer. I have spoken too long already.

I did want to tell a story to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Daley) but time does not permit. I will tell it some other time — he has a bedroom story of two boys at Hal'o'ween — but I will tell him it some other time.

I do want to say this that the leaders of private enterprise in this country and abroad have made it abundantly clear that they want all the privileges. They want the conditions that they enjoyed prior to the war established after the war and I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, and members of this House, I do not believe that the speech from the Throne has dealt with this matter satisfactorily. I do not believe that it has gone nearly far enough and I do not believe it is moving fast enough to meet the present situation or the situation which we are bound to encounter. I think it is a little feeble in its approach because when I read, for instance, that the Bankers' Magazine in August of last year printed these words in their magazine in London: "The progress of the future will require forces of unemployment and poverty in order to ensure that necessary drive in this world's internal and international competition." I say that is the fundamental

thing we have got to be thinking of, just as the Vice President of the United states has pointed out. We are going to be the top-dog. Are the common people represented by their representatives in this Legislature and the House of Commons, is their voice to be the dominating voice, is their interest going to be the dominating interest or are we just going to fall back and say — let us take the line of least resistance and let private enterprise, who provided money to fight the social-democrats in Germany, are these the kind of people we are going to put in control of the situation in Ontario?

I do not want to be accused of painting a picture of blue ruin; I do not want to be accused of saying: Well, we have not got anything constructive to offer and I do not want to be challenged by the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Drew) as we were in the early sessions of this debate to a division on this question. I do not think that challenge was really intended. I think that the Prime Minister, if I might observe, the Prime Minister was a little bit jumpy that particular day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): No, not at all.

MR. MILLARD: I thought you were — from here, anyway — I thought you were a little bit personal in your remarks and I am glad the situation has improved greatly in that regard. I do not want to be personal in my remarks, at least.

I want to point out two or three definite proposals that I think we can do. I said last night, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this municipal affair that we ought to do something about it because it seems to me that is one of the cardinal points of your pre-election program and I think there are three elements that I might touch on very briefly before I close. I found out that this issue of taxation for school purposes is eighteen years old according to the proceedings of the York County Council and I say this problem has been a live issue up to this time and has not been dealt with and I propose to say this

in closing that the total assessment in the whole province of Ontario is slightly less than three billion dollars and the total assessment for Toronto and the suburban districts surrounding is a little over one billion dollars, so that you have today in this concentrated metropolitan area one third of the total assessment of the province of Ontario and it seems to me that it is reasonable to suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. C. H. Dunbar) that we should undertake a sweep, if you want to call it that word that the government has used, a sweep, a clean-up of this particular situation in this particular area to show that it is possible and feasible and then give a lead for the rest of the province in this regard. It is a very important problem and should be undertaken and I want to suggest that we have here a resolution which is now before the government from the Ontario Municipal Association and I want to refer them and have them take under advisement resolution number 67 which says that they want the Department of Municipal Affairs put under a full time minister. I do not think that there is any way in which the present government can get closer to the people, provide them with better services, than to take this Department — which is overcrowded with work, which has got to give special attention to burning issues and burning problems at the moment — to have them under the direction of a minister who can devote his full time to this very important department.

AN HON. MEMBER: A new ministry.

MR. MILLARD: I do not care whether it is a new ministry or what it is but I believe the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. C. H. Dunbar) is overburdened when I note that he has three portfolios to take care of I understand — Minister of State and Game and Fisheries.

In conclusion I just want to say this on behalf of the hon. members that I represent, that we are very appreciative of the fact that we are here in this House for the first time. We are very appreciative of the fact that the government has just got nicely started although we think they have had seven months and might have

gone further than they have but I want to say, I reiterate what I said at the beginning, we will support every measure of legislation that the government will bring that is in line with their program that is in line with our beliefs. We will co-operate in that regard but we do not feel that the speech from the Throne goes nearly far enough. We do not feel that it touches many of the fundamentals and I believe, Mr. Speaker, in this debate that some of the people who have spoken for the government have been guilty, to some extent at least, of pulling a red herring across the track.

I want to refer particularly to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Daley) -- and I do not say that he did this intentionally or maliciously -- but he read a letter from some person from some organization -- anonymous so far as we are concerned -- where he read the letter and placed on the record that some man through his union had to donate, I think it was five cents per week for membership in the party represented by the hon. members of the opposition. Now, I know that that lie is baseless. It may be ignorance on the part of the person who wrote it but I think it was a trivial matter without any foundation and the minister should not have brought it in and placed it on the record unless he was prepared to put it on the table so that the matter could be investigated and properly replied to. The man was wrong who wrote that letter and I think the Minister was equally wrong for reading such a letter and not being prepared to give the name of the man and name of the organization in order that the letter might be properly investigated. I happen to know through my association with the C. I. O. and the Commonwealth Federation that no such condition could possibly exist in Ontario anywhere or anywhere in Canada.

I thank the House for their very courteous attention to the remarks I have made. All I am sorry for is I have taken so long and that I could not say some of the things that I would

have liked to have said.

MR. DANA H. PORTER (St. George): I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George (Mr. Dana Porter) moves the adjournment of the debate. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the House now adjourn.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: May I ask the Prime Minister (Hon. George A. Drew) if it is proposed to complete this debate on Tuesday?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): No, Tuesday. Bills Monday.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: What line of Bills?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (prime Minister): We have Bills that will keep us very busy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure that the House adjourn to 3:00 o'clock on Monday afternoon?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House do now stand adjourned until Monday afternoon at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

T H E L E G I S L A T I V E A S S E M B L Y .

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario, Monday, March 13, 1944.

- - - - - -

The House met at Three o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting of reports by committees.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

MR. DANA PORTER (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Murdoch, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act Respecting Victoria University", and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Porter moves, seconded by Mr. Murdoch, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting Victoria University", and that the Bill be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting Victoria University". First reading of the Bill.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON (Kent, East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon.minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Kennedy),

I move, seconded by Mr. Charles Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Cheese and Hog Subsidy Act, 1944", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Cheese and Hog Subsidy Act, 1944", and that the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "Cheese and Hog Subsidy Act, 1944"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Well, with respect to that Bill, is the hon. minister (Mr. Thompson) prepared to give the House any information upon it? Is the Hog Subsidy to be continued, may I ask?

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Yes. The original Cheese and Hog Subsidy Act was passed in 1941, was again passed in 1942, and in 1943, and the suggested Act being introduced is just an extension of that Act up to March, 1945.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): On exactly the same terms.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Charles Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Credit Unions Act", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Credit Unions Act", and that same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An

Act to Amend the Credit Unions Act"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. minister (Mr. Thompson) explain the purpose of the Bill?

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the Credit Unions are organizations of people at the present time largely working in factories or in other large groups who, by and large, do not have sufficient income, or are not sufficiently interested, to use the ordinary banks. There are several amendments here -- six, in all; shall I read them?

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: No. What are they about?

HON. WESLEY G. THOMPSON: In Section 1, sub-section 15 of the Act has been re-enacted to provide that a two-thirds majority at a general meeting, in place of "two-thirds of the members", may pass a resolution to change the name of a Credit Union.

Section 2, Clause "A" of Section 25 of the Act has been re-enacted in order to conform with the present practices of the Credit Unions.

Section 4; according to the proposed amendment, the Credit Unions may authorize the Treasurer or Manager to make loans to members up to twenty-five dollars, without obtaining the approval of such committee.

Section 5: Section 25 has been re-enacted in order to clarify the same.

Section 6; the present Sections 34 and 40 were together serving no useful purpose, and, accordingly, they are repealed, and in their place is enacted two sections similar to sections 77, 78 and 79 of the Loan Trust Corporations Act.

Section 7, Clauses "G", "I" and "J" of Sub-section 3 to Section 41, are serving no useful purpose, and according-

ly are repealed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to table answers to questions Nos. 8 and 9.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to refer to a Press report appearing in the "Toronto Daily Star" of last Friday, which I did not see until after I had left the Legislature on that day. Consequently, this is the first opportunity I have had to refer to it.

I quote from this report from the "Toronto Daily Star":

> "H. C. Nixon, Liberal Leader, to-day condemned the announced procedure as an almost unbelievable action of the Government --"

This is referring to the announcement that no machinery had been set up to take votes by proxies in the by-election of Haldimand ~~North~~ Norfolk --

> "It shows the inconsistency of the Drew Government, now they are in power, says Mr. Nixon; they certainly could have made provision for taking the votes of the Armed Forced in Ontario, but they do not even try to do that."

Mr. Speaker, I think this subject should be clarified. It could have been well dealt with any time during the last three weeks, and the Leader of the Liberal Group in the Legislature (Mr. Nixon) has been fully aware of the situation.

May I point out certain facts in connection with this, which I think should be recognized by the hon. members. Quite frankly, I would have thought that the last man in this Legislature who would have raised any question about the

present electoral system, as far as it affected soldiers' votes, was the hon. member quoted on this occasion.

I have carefully refrained from dealing with this subject during the time we have been sitting here, because it seems to me it would serve no useful purpose to amplify the criticisms I made last summer, not merely in regard to the mechanics of the Act itself, but in regard to the way in which it was carried out.

And may I assure the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Jolliffe), in relation to the comments that he has made, that the criticsm I directed toward this Act has in no way varied, and I condemn this Act as it now stands as much as I ever did.

But may I also point out that no matter what arrangements are in force for a general election, neither the Canadian Government nor the Government of Britain, nor any Provincial Government, at any time, felt that it was possible to carry out a system whereby they took the votes of the members of the Armed Forces in by-elections. That may be unfortunate, but there are certain practical angles to this.

This decision was made by the Chief Electoral Officer, and I should think, once the facts are known, his decision would be supported as the only reasonable decision he could have made.

In the first place, any soldiers living in that riding can be put on the list, and can vote, but when it comes to those outside of that riding, I, for one, do not believe that those in uniform outside of that riding, and elsewhere in Canada, have any higher right to have their vote taken than those members of the Armed Forces who are on Active Service Overseas. So, unless a practical measure can be adopted

for doing that, then I think that those votes which can be taken within the riding, and which can be cared for properly, under the existing system, should be recorded the moment it can be done.

Now, the simple proposition is this, that to take the votes in any single by-election would call for exactly the same machinery as would be called for in the case of a general election, with exactly the cost. I asked why the decision had been made, and I received this reply from the Chief Electoral Officer, which I will table as a matter of record, but may I read the opening part of that report. It says:

> "In reply to your question as to my reason for suspending the operation of the Active Service Election Act in connection with the by-election at present underway in the Electoral District of Haldimand ~~North~~ Norfolk, this is to advise you I suspended the operation of the Act because it was not practicable to apply it to a by-election. The machinery is too involved, and the cost of operation too great, to justify its use for the small number of votes involved.
>
> "In the general election of August fourth, nineteen forty-three, there were three hundred and eight active-service votes cast for candidates in Haldimand ~~North~~ Norfolk, including both camp votes and proxy votes. I estimate it would cost approximately fifty-five thousand six hundred dollars to carry on an election in the Active Service Forces, as provided for by the Active Service Election Act, for this one by-election."

And the reason for that is apparent. There are, in Ontario alone, twelve naval camps, forty-six army camps, and

thirty-six air force camps. In each case it would be necessary to set up the complete electoral machinery in those camps. The fact is that there are fewer numbers of the Armed Forces in those camps to-day, as is generally known, than at the time of the election in August, and one should bear in mind that part of the votes that were cast — the military votes — last August were right in the riding of Haldimand ~~Norfolk~~ Norfolk. So that no one may be under any misapprehension that this is a device to favour the party that happens to have been called upon to form a Government, may I remind you of what the military votes were in the last by-election in that riding.

The late Mr. Walsh --

MR. H. C. NIXON: The hon. Prime Minister I think means the general election.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Yes, the last general election. As I say, the late Mr. Walsh, whose death has caused the by-election, received one hundred and thirty-five votes.

The Liberal candidate, Mr. Cross, received one hundred and seven.

The C.C.F. candidate, Mr. Grove, received sixty-six. These are the official returns.

Now, there is no reason to assume that this number has varied very greatly, and, in any event, it is a known fact that the numbers now in the camps in this province are smaller than at that time, so that even if the machinery had been set up for this province alone, it would have affected a much smaller vote than that, and I believe that, consistent with the practice in the cases both of the Dominion Governmens and each of the other provincial Governments, and the House of Commons, the Chief Electoral Officer had followed the

only practical course.

Now, may I refer to this question of the taking of the soldiers' votes, which does present very considerable difficulties. It has been the subject to enquiry here; it has been the subject of enquiry, already, on another occasion before the House of Commons in Ottawa; it has been the subject of enquiry by the Government in Britain, and in each case they have found that it would be impracticable to set up the machinery for single by-elections, no matter how desirable in principle that might be.

Now, we have a very practical problem in connection with this, and since it has been raised by the statement I referred to, I believe I should explain what it is.

Members of the Armed Forces are under the control of the Dominion Government, and no Act which we pass can be effective unless it meets with the approval of those who have control over the members of the Armed Forces.

Consequently, what we do must be based upon what they are willing to arrange in connection with the members of the Armed Forces, whether of the navy, the army or the air force.

I may say I have already taken up with the hon. minister of National Defence (Hon. Mr. Ralston) a possible arrangement which may be made.

As you will have seen, the Dominion Government is, at the present time, considering the question, and may possibly evolve a scheme that, with reasonable modifications, might be applicable here. That we do not yet know. But, if they can come to an early decision, it will be of great advantage to us in making our own decision, because what we then do would be with knowledge of the system which they are going to carry into effect, and so long as that system is satis-

factory, it would obviously present very considerable advantages toward providing something of a similar nature in the event the necessity should arise to take their vote.

Now, may I say most emphatically, in response to this statement, and in response to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), that this has stood far too long. I agree with him. Also, recognizing the practical problem, we will deal with it, and obviously that cannot be done without full disclosure to the members of this Legislature as to what the situation is, and I think, for the reason I explained, and which will be seen, we could not very well, from a practicall point of view, have insisted upon the Chief Electoral Officers' carrying out this Act as proposed, which has not been adopted by any similar Act, either in the Dominion or any other province or the Government of Britain, and, also, it would be most unwise for us to proceed to set up the election machinery for the purpose of the Armed Forces until we know that this provision will be carried out by the Dominion Government.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: Of course, my comment, Mr. Speaker, when being informed of this release from the Chief Election Officer, was with regard to the local camps, the training stations within these two counties. Surely, at least, polls could have been established there for the convenience of the residents who have a vote in this particular by-election.

I appreciate the difficulties involved, of course, in carrying out the proxy system, but I do not know that I just appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's personal preference to that. It was my responsibility last August to see that the Act, as it was upon the Statute Books, which did provide

for proxies, was carried out to the utmost of our ability, and the ability of the election machinery of the province, which was done, and certainly these training camps were all provided with a separate poll, established right there on the ground.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I do not want to enter into any debate, but the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) may have been misquoted, but the quotation refers especially to the system of elections used in Ontario, and I was referring to that.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: There were no proxies within Ontario, of course?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): No, that is so, but I was referring to the number of camps which would have had to be dealt with in Ontario, and the practical difficulty involved. You are not dealing with the riding alone.

But I do want to say this — and I do not want to raise it now, because nothing will be gained by extending the sometimes very strenuous comments which were exchanged at that time — but I am quite prepared to accept the remarks of the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Nixon) with regard to what may have been done by putting the machinery into operation for the province. I did express the opinion that the time allowed was not sufficient, and I still say that observation was correct. It may be the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) thought it would operate more effectively than it did, but I can tell him, and tell the Legislature, that as a result of a visit to a very large number of camps in Britain, I know that an extremely high percentage of the units never even saw a proxy; it was not a case of whether they used them; they never even saw them, and did not know what they were. Somewhere along the line the system broke down. I am not question-

ing the hon. member's statement as to the machinery, but I can say most emphatically, wherever the break-down came, the units, in an extraordinarily large percentage of cases, never saw a proxy, at all.

(Page No. 816 follows.)

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have only one observation to add to what has been said about this matter, and that is that we will appreicate the desirability of establishing some machinery which will fit into the machinery that may be acceptable to the Dominion Government.

I am somewhat disturbed, and I should think all members of this House would be somewhat disturbed, by the possibility that it may prove too late, or it may prove that we have not sufficient time, to establish that machinery so that it will be effective.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter which all members in the House would like to see satisfactorily adjusted on a non- contentious basis, and I can only express the hope at this time that the arrangements made by the Dominion will not be postponed so long that we will find ourselves in the position that we were in a year ago.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I give my assurance that we will communicate with the Dominion Government, and that, if it is not well advanced I will consult the leader of the opposition and the leader of the other groups before this House is adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): A message has just come in which, I think, would make it possible to deal with a matter. It has just come in this minute, and because of the notice I have just received I have sent for a copy of a letter, which I will have in a few seconds. Mr. Speaker, it is a subject of some importance and I do not want to delay it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the whole House, as it is a matter of public interest, will wait.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that the Prime Minister of Canada has announced that the restrictions on the sale of beer have been removed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does that amuse you?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): No, it does not amuse me, but I will read you a letter which I addressed to the Prime Minister of Canada last Friday.

But I will say this, before I comment on this letter, that I have before me certain extracts from the report, and I can only take the words of this report, — I hope they are not correct, they are press reports. I do not mean that the press would wilfully/misrepresent it, but the statement before me says that the restrictions have been removed because of the failure of Ontario to cooperate. That may be a very satisfactory reason, but it does not happen to be the correct reason.

I have a further statement that Mr. King added that Ottawa had called for only a ten per cent reduction but Ontario went ahead and called for a twenty-five per cent reduction. I may say that if that statement is correct I will have further comments to make, because that is a glaring inaccuracy.

So that the members of the Legislature may have an accurate understanding of the facts, I am reading recent correspondence on the subject, because it is so accurately set out the circumstances with which we were confronted and the impossibility of getting any statement from the Dominion Government at the time. I made a statement that the whole problem should be investigated. You could not separate quantity from distribution, and this had been done without consulting us. All we wanted to know was what facts lay behind it which had not been disclosed, and we wanted the whole subject discussed, because we believed that the reasons given were not the whole of the reasons.

Having regard to the press reports, which I feel sure are

reasonably accurate, and I am quite sure from the fact it comes over the press wires, that the report about the restriction to the quantity of beer is accurate.

I heard someone on my left ask if the election in Quebec was coming on right away. I do not know. But I think the Legislature might well have these facts before them. In response to my letter of February 19th I received this letter from the Prime Minister dated March 25th but received several days later in my office:

"My Dear Premier:

I duly received your letter of the 19th instant, regarding the effect upon the Provincial government of the operations of the wartime alcoholic beverages order.

I have carefully reviewed the correspondence between the then Premier of Ontario and the Minister of Finance, culminating in Mr. Ilsley's letter of January 31, 1942, from which you quote an extract in your letter. This correspondence related soley to the financial arrangements between the Dominion and the Province of Ontario, and in that contaext, it was clear that your predecessor was concerned to safeguard the revenues of the Province.

At the time the wartime alcoholic beverages order was being drafted, this correspondence was very carefully considered by the government. It was felt that the enactment of the order could not regarded as a breach of any undertaking" .....

I pointed out to Mr. King that the restrictions had been a clear breach of an explicit undertaking by Mr. Ilsley, which was upon an agreement between the Dominion and this province, and it was presented to this Legislature by the Premier, Mr. Hepburn.

"..... since the assurance given by the Minister of Finance had relation only to the safeguarding of the revenues of the provinces, and since the Federal government

"proposed to indicate its readiness, on certain terms, to compensate the provinces for any financial loss occasioned to their treasuries by the incidence of the order."

I want you to listen to this:

"In reaching that conclusion, the government was influenced to some degree by a statement made in a speech at Oshawa on October 30, 1942, by your predecessor, honourable Gordon D. Conant. At that time, there were already widespread rumours that the Federal government proposed to enter the field of control over the supply of alcoholic beverages. Mr. Conant is reported to have said on that occasion:

'The question of curtailment in the quantity of liquor or the hours of sale is a matter over which the Dominion Government may exercise jurisdiction in a war emergency. If, as a war measure, they find it necessary to curtail quantities or period of sale, all jurisdictions involved will have to accept it as part of our war program.'

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. Conant's speech.

"In the light of Mr. Conant's statement and the Federal government's decision to safeguard the revenues of the province against loss resulting from the policy of curtailment, it was felt that no question of a lack of good faith could arise and no such question did, in fact, arise.

"It might be added that the Minister of Finance in the letter you have quoted, was careful merely to give a statement of intention and not a definite undertaking. At the same time, my colleagues and I were aware that the financial policies of some of the provinces were influenced by that statement

"of intention and that the provinces might, therefore, feel reasonably entitled for some compensation from any losses which might result from the change in the policy of the Federal Government.

For obvious reasons it would have been difficult to consult the provinces in advance of a decision of policy without occasioning rumours throughout the country" .....

Having regard to the above statement, rumours were already rife in October. I would remind you of that when I read the next words.

"..... which would probably have caused serious embarrassment to the provincial liquor administrations. The Liquor Commissioners of the all the provinces were, however, advised the Government's policy just prior to the public announcement in order to enable them to take such administrative measures as they might deem appropriate.

As you are no doubt aware, the Federal government merely curtailed the supply of alcoholic beverages released to the several provinces and made no attempt to interfere in any way with their retail sale and distribution beyond making an appeal for a limitation in the hours of sale. Each province has made its own arrangements for distribution, and it would be hardly appropriate for the Federal government to attempt to explain why one province has acted in one way and another province in a different way. All the provinces are entitled to obtain 90 percent of the beer, 80% wine and 70% spirits released for sale in the province in the base period. I can assure you that this particular method of curtailment imposes no greater restriction upon Ontario than upon any other province.

"As to the reasons why the curtailment was undertaken, the Wartime Alcoholic Beverages Order is, of course, enacted under th authority of the War Measures Act. The preamble to the order cites these reasons in the following words:

'Whereas it is deemed expedient to curtail non-essential civilian activities so that man-power and material resources may be released and made available to satisfy the growing requirements of the armed forces, war industry and essential civilian activity;

And whereas it is deemed desirable to control and restrict the use of alcoholic beverages in time of war; and whereas;

And whereas as a means toward accomplishing the aforesaid purposes, it is desirable to prohibit the advertising of spirits, wine and beer and to limit the production and im-portation thereof for consumption in Canada.'"

That is given as the reason, being taken from preamble. And the last paragraph of the letter reads:

"In the opinion of the government, there has been no fundamental change in the circumstances which impelled the government to enact the order in December of 1942."

Now, in view of the statement which has been made to-day, I would like to read you a letter which I wrote in reply on March 10th, 1944:

"Dear Mr. King:

I deferred replying to your letter of February 24th because I wanted to make sure that I had the complete file in my possession before replying."

I may say, in passing that I could not believe it was possible, in view of some of the statements in the letter, that I had the complete file.

"Having regard to the increasing importance of agreements between the Dominion and Provincial Governments and between the Ministers of those Governments, I was disturbed by the statement that Mr. Ilsley's letter of January 31st, 1942, had merely constituted: 'a statement of intention.' My concern on this point has been increased by further examination of the correspondence. My Ilsley's letter of January 31st was in reply to a letter from the then Premier of Ontario dated January 15th, 1942, which said that the agreement under consideration would not be 'formally consummated and put into effect until I have received from you assurances that the Dominion Government will not in any way attempt to enter this field.' But the letter went still farther and left no doubt that Mr. Hepburn was not referring only to the financial aspect of the arrangement, because he followed his request for a positive assurance of this nature with these words:

'In return I can assure you that should an emergency arise which would make it advisable to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors I will act promptly in the matter.'

"I referred to Mr. Ilsley's undertaking because it seemed to me that there must have been some very strong reasons not disclosed to this government for departing from the assurance which he gave, and I was anxious to have such reasons before me in the

consideration of this problem. I was, of course, aware of the preamble to the Wartime Alcoholic Beverages Order, and in my opinion nothing in that preamble offered such reasons for disregarding the undertaking which had been given. I will go farther and say I do not believe they disclosed any constitutional ground for passing this order under the Wartime Measures Act, having regard to all the facts.

"I cannot refrain from expressing some surprise that it should have been unwise to consult the provincial governments in advance because of the anticipated danger of the rumours which this might cause. You point out earlier in your letter that by October, 1942, there were already wide spread rumours that the Federal Government proposed to enter the field of control over the supply of alcoholic beverages. Under these circumstances I find it difficult to understand the concern expressed about the possibility that rumours, which already existed, might have been occasioned by consulting the provinces. Having regard to the future arrelationship between the Dominion and Provincial governments, I must ask that no such consideration be regarded as a reason for avoiding discussion between the Dominion and Provincial governments in regard to any anticipated change in arrangements which may, from time to time, exist between them.

"You state that the Dominion Government was influenced to some degree by a statement made in a speech at Oshawa on October 30th, 1942, and you quote a part of Mr. Conant's speech which conveys the impression that he accepted the authority of the Dominion government to exercise their jurisdiction in a war

"emergency. I would not, of course, question that proposition provided that any steps are taken with due regard to existing undertakings and also with due regard to the actual necessity for the course followed. But since the Dominion government was apparently influenced by Mr. Conant's statement in this respect, it was unfortunate they were not also influenced by the statement which immediately followed the words which you have quoted. The very next words in his speech were these: 'such curtailment, however, even as a war measure would certainly result in bootlegging with all the troubles that arise therefrom involving the problem of law enforcement'. At another point in his speech he said that if such steps were taken by the Dominion government as were then rumoured, 'bootlegging will thrive just as surely as the day follows the night.'

"If the Dominion government found one part of Mr. Conant's statement so convincing it is unfortunate it was not equally impressed by a prediction which has proved all too accurate.

"I have made these observations because I would not wish the impression to be left that the reasons given in your letter and can be accepted by this government as justifying the course which has been followed. Where two governments must deal with the same problems I believe it is essential in the future that a different course be followed than that which was taken in this case."

Now, in reading the closing paragraph, may I suggest this as my desire:

"As your letter did not give me the information which I had hoped to obtain, I would ask for an early meeting

in Ottawa to which I will bring the Attorney General and the Chief Commissioner of the Liquor Control Board to discuss the possibility of finding some satisfactory solution for a situation which is becoming increasingly serious.

Yours sincerely,"

Mr. Speaker, I have given you this because, in the first place it makes it abundantly clear that, far from refusing to cooperate, all we had asked to do was to have an opportunity to meet to discuss what the situation actually was, and what possible solution might be found for the situation which would arise.

May I say, without any undue unkindness, that apparently it is about as difficult to arrange a conference between this government and the members of the Canadian government as it is to arrange a conference between the heads of the Canadian government and the heads of the governments of the other Commonwealths.

This is something which certainly did involve consideration, and so far as the removal of these restrictions is concerned, we will immediately expect the Liquor Control Board of Ontario to deal with this under the new arrangement. But may I point out that during my whole correspondence, as has been pointed out, to the leaders of the opposition, It has been wholly with a view to arriving at an understanding so that we can get together to discuss what is the best way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third readings.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Third readings.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Commissioners' for Taking Affidavits Act.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: (Eglinton)(Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that the Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, be now taken up and read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have heard the motion that the Bill, an Act to amend The Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act be taken up and read a third time.

MOTION agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Sixth order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move that the House do now go into committee of the whole House to consider certain Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved that the House go into committee of the whole House to consider certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

—— The House then resolved itself into committee of the whole House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Bill No. 46, an Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter Referring to Race or Creed.

THE CHAIRMAN: An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter Referring to Race or Creed.

MR. THOMAS A. MURPHY (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where the amendment is going to be placed in the Bill?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (Victoria): (Provincial Treasurer): That is what I rose to do.

I now move that a new Section 2 be inserted in the Bill as follows:

2. "That this Act shall not be deemed to interfere with the free expression of opinions upon any subject, by speech or in writing, and shall not confer any protection to or benefit upon alien enemies."

LESLIE E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak at any great length upon this Act, but there are a few remarks I want to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking on any particular section of the Bill? Perhaps your remarks will be covered by Section 2 when we

reach it?

MR. LESLIE R. WISEMAN: Then when we come to Section 2, I will make the few remarks which I have in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does Section No. 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

MR. T. A MURPHY: I would like to say the following:

"Or any broadcasting station or any station which it controls."

I do not believe the amendment will take care of the objectionable features which I stated on Friday last in relation to this Bill.

I note that there is an editorial in the Evening Telegram to-day stating the facts that I stated, that the amendment does not cover fully the interpretation of the Act as it now stands.

I would therefore move that the part of (b) of Section 1 be struck out, after the word "newspaper".

(Page 828 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion prepared and seconded, amendment to the motion?

Mr. Murphy moves, seconded by Mr. Acre that all the words after "newspaper" in section 1 (b) be struck out of the Bill. Discussion?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: (Attorney General) In discussion on the proposed amendment for the purpose of clarity I propose not to go into at this moment the question of the dictionary meaning of discrimination in the alternative. I propose to limit myself purely to the effect on the principle of the Bill of carrying the proposed amendment. You will observe in section 1 that what (a) is directed at is what a person by his own act may do in posting signs or any other indication of discrimination. By reason of the person himself doing the act the prohibition against that act would include any medium of any kind whatsoever that that person might select.

Section (b) comes down to another person permitting the first person to do any of those acts and for that reason it becomes necessary in (b) to designate the nature of the different mediums of the persons permitting someone else to publish or display.

With that explanation I come down to this: if the Bill is sound in principle then we should not leave it open to a person to do indirectly through the permitting by someone else of that which the first person is prohibited from doing.

Now, the nature of the medium through which publication or display might bemde as prohibited by this Bill are as follows: "On lands or premises". Now, that is most obvious application. Through a newspaper - that is by way of notice or advertisement.

When we come to radio broadcasting or by means of any other medium that does not, as some of the members might have in mind, relate to broadcasting opinion on radio. It means using a radio for a spot announcement or advertisement in the same sense that you might post up on a wall or building.

or put it by way of advertisement or notice in a newspaper, and under this Bill, as far as the radio is concerned, that is all that it can or will relate to.

When we use the expression "other medium" which a person may own or control, there is a rule of law which I must refer to - it is technical - it is called ejusdem generis rule. It means any other meaning of which something in the way of notice or advertisement might apply, and I say to the members of this Legislature that if it is sound in principle in the first instance to prohibit the act, if it is sound in principle to prevent the indirect doing of that act by prohibiting its commission by somebody else, then I say to the members of this Legislature that it is sound and sensible to carry it to the logical conclusion and prevent the doing of that act by any means of the nature I mentioned.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition on those narrow grounds I mentioned, I speak in opposition to the proposed amendment.

MR. THOMAS. A. MURPHY: (Beaches) Mr. Chairman, the explanation given by the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) while it might be clear to a great many of us is not quite clear to me. I may be dense being a layman, but I do not see how there can be legislation here stopping a spot advertisement on the radio. The radio in itself is controlled by the Federal Government, by the Federal Broadcasting Commission, and has sole authority in broadcasting. Then, again, if we had control of it here there is nothing to stop anyone from hiring or going over to Buffalo and hring a spot on WGR or any other Buffalo or foreign stations and broadcast here in Toronto. It was brought to our attention in the last municipal elections that the C.C.F could not secure a station in Toronto and they had to go to Hamilton to secure a broadcasting station so that they could indicate their intentions to the electors of the City of Toronto, and I say that this legislation will not cover the act to broadcast.

Now, regarding the mediums I think we should specifically state in our Bill what the mediums are. This will involve in my opinion a great deal of law and court cases after the Act is passed, because we are not defining what "mediums" are, and there might be a thousand mediums; that we should define what mediums are objectionable, in my opinion, to the public and to the citizens of this province.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose so that the members may have as clear a perception as possible of reasons advanced before the Legislature, that I should make some answer to those doubts. It is well known to many of the members of the Legislature that people will not go to Buffalo or most American jurisdictions for the purpose of making some such announcement as we seek to stop here, for the reason that the laws of those states already go far beyond the law that we propose here, and I can assure the member that such an announcement would not be tolerated in the State of New York or Michigan.

Federal jurisdiction over radio has to do with the regulations of the operation of radio, and I assure the members of the Legislature that it is quite within the jurisdiction of this Legislature to prohibit the owner of a radio station within the province of Ontario, where we have jurisdiction, to permit any such notice or advertisement.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: (York South) Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for the Beaches (Mr. Thomas A. Murphy) is under a misapprehension about the position of a radio station. It is perfectly true, as the Attorney General has said, they are for some purposes regulated by Federal authority. They are for many purposes, and certainly for that purpose, subject to the law of this province. They are subject to the laws of this province, subject to the law of defamation, law of libel and slander.

If the hon. member for the Beaches (Mr. Thomas A.

Murphy) were negligently struck by a car or truck owned and operated by a radio broadcasting station of this province he would have a right of action against that station under the laws of this province.

I concur entirely with the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) that this is a matter which does fall within the provincial jurisdiction and it would be illogical to draw the line at a newspaper or some similar medium and to give any particular exception to a radio station.

THE CHAIRMAN: SHall the amendment carry?

Motion not agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favour signify aye. Opposed, nay.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

ONE HON. MEMBER: Nay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 2is amended to read as follows - it is a new section entirely - section number 2 reading as follows: "That this Act shall not be deemed to interfere with free expression of opinion on any subject, by speech or in writing, and shall not confer any protection to or benefit upon alien enemies."

Shall the new section 2 carry?

MR. CHARLES A. STRANGE: (Brantford) I would like to ask the Minister is there any particular reason for wording the last words "alien enemies"? The usual expression is enemy aliens. I don't know if there is any particular purpose.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: (Attorney General) I can assure the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Charles A. Strange) there is no ulterior motive in that regard. I am inclined to accept it and reverse the words.

I want to rise to a point of order about the motion of section 1, just some question how that was put and I might ask that it be reviewed because I do not want to leave the slightest question on the record as to what the house was

cc 5

voting on. I apologize for bringing it up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Amendment was moved by Mr. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Acres, and I asked those in favour of the amendment and those opposed to the amendment and then I declared the amendment lost.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: (Attorney General) Would you mind putting it again?

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment proposed by Mr. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Acres. Opposed. Amendment lost again.

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew) Mr. Chairman, on the amendment moved by the hon. the Attorney General, (Mr. Blackwell) I have no quarrel. As a matter of fact, all those who favour such legislation as being brought before the house now have at all times recognized and emphasized that such legislation should not in any interfere with the right of free speech and free expression, nor with the rights of the individual or corporations or any organization to maintain certain standards which they desire to maintain so long as the standards apply to all people alike, but there is no intention, I am sure, on the part of anyone to prevent an individual or an organization from establishing such standards.

However, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) whether in his opinion - I know the answer will be in the affirmative, but just for further assurance - whether in the opinion of the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Blackwell) the amendment may not be construed in court as making negative some of the positive proposals of this Bill, and there could not under interpretation of freedom of speech someone engage himself in advocating that which this Bill, quite properly in my opinion, seeks to prevent?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, in view

cc 6

of the request of the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I probably have to go back of the section slightly and to express this opinion, that is, that the Act without the amending section means precisely the same as the Act does with the amending section. The reason for moving that amending section is merely to interpret what, in my opinion, the Act already meant. The government brought forward that amendment because I do say this: that opinion is after all opinion and although this Act was drafted with the greatest care, by reason of the opinions that were expressed about it, it was felt desirable to put a section in that, in my opinion, added nothing or subtracted nothing from the Act as already drafted for the purpose of clarity and for the purpose of allaying fears. Now, under that I think I have answered the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in expressing the opinion that it adds or subtracts precisely nothing from the Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 as amended form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3, formerly section 2, form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4, formerly section 3, form part of the Bill?

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: (Brant) In respect to that, in advertising under this Act, many fines will come to the Treasury of Ontario and they cannot be recovered without the consent of the Attorney General. Does that prevent any action being initiated without the consent of the Attorney General? If not, why have an action and penalties imposed if the penalties will not be collected without your consent, and why should the action start without your consent?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the procedure contemplated by this section is that a matter of this

sort should not come into the police courts in the ordinary way and the procedure is as stated in the section "upon application". "Upon application" is a well understood word under the Rules of Practice by which proceedings are originated in the same way as a summons or by a writ, and therefore considered in that light the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will appreciate that it is the application itself that must have the consent of the Attorney General before it is proceeded with. That, I might say, in an Act of this sort is another precaution to prevent vexatious actions being launched under this Act which would have a very unhappy result. Another precaution by the Act is that any penalties imposed should not be penalties to the complainant, but should go to the Treasury of the province. Another factor it prevents a person launching vexatious proceedings in the hope of collecting penalties.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported as amended?

Motion agreed to.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods) Is this the proper place to ask when this Bill will become effective?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Sixty days after the close of the Legislature.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, - "An Act to confirm Tax Sales".

THE CHAIRMAN: Bill number fifty, "An Act to confirm Tax Sales".

Shall section 1 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 3 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 5 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 6 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall section 7 form part of the Bill?

Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall the Bill be reported?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I move the Committee now rise and report certain Bills.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved that the Committee rise and report certain Bills. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

-- The House resumes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole house reports one Bill with amendments and one Bill without.

Shall the reports be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: (Prime Minister) I might explain before I move the adjournment of the house that we will proceed tomorrow with the Debate from the Throne and will have certain Bills before us. There will be no reason to expect a night session tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the house be now adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the house be adjourned Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

I declare this house adjourned until Tuesday afternoon at 3.00 of the clock.

The house rose at 4.25 p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

SPEAKER: Honourable William J. Stewart.

Toronto, Ontario, Tuesday, March 14, 1944.

- - - - - -

The House met at Three o'clock.

Prayers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

Nil.

Mr. SPEAKER: Receiving reports by committees.

MR. H. A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to submit the second report of the committee on standing orders, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Stewart (Kingston), from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presents the following report:

"Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient.

"Of the Corporation of the County of York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the payment of remuneration to members of the Toronto and York Roads Commission.

"Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the establishment of a retirement fund for employees of the Ottawa Civic Hospital.

"Of the Ministerial Superannuation Board of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and of the

Baptist Convention of Ontario, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Petitioners to establish a contributory retiring annuity plan for Ministers, Missionaries and employees of the said Convention.

"Of the Corporation of the Town of Fort Erie, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the said Corporation to fix the manner of electing the Town Council.

"Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass to validate tax sales, to authorize the Corporation to provide for the payment of contributions to any superannuation or benefit fund for employees on Active Service and for other purposes.

"Of the Corporation of the Township of North Monaghan, praying that an Act may pass validating an Order of the Ontario Municipal Board annexing a portion of the said Township to the City of Peterborough.

"Your Committee recommends that Rule No. 63 be suspended in this that the time for introducing Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Tuesday, the 21st day of March next.

"All of which is respectfully submitted,

(Signed) H. A. Stewart

Chairman."

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart (Kingston) moves the adoption of the report. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion.

MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and to move its adoption.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Reynolds, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, begs leave to present the following as their first report:

"Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:

"Bill No. 5 -- an Act respecting L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada.

"Bill No. 6 -- an Act respecting the townships of Anson, Hindon and Minden.

"Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with a certain amendment:

"Bill No. 4 -- an Act respecting the township of Scarborough.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Walter B. Reynolds."

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Reynolds moves the adoption of the report. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion.

MR. GEORGE LOCKHART (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Brown, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Milk Control Act", and that the same be now read for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Lockhart moves, seconded by Mr. Brown, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Milk Control Act", and that the same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Milk Control Act". First reading of the Bill.

MR. T. A. MURPHY: (Beaches) Will the hon. member

explain?

MR. LOCKHART: This amendment to the Milk Control Act is to restore to cooperative organizations, engaged in milk distribution, the right to pay profits to their patrons in the form of patronage dividends.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Guardianship of the Dionne Quintuplets", and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Guardianship of the Dionne Quintuplets", and that the same be read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Guardianship of the Dionne Quintuplets"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. CASSELMAN (Nipissing): Would the hon. Attorney General please explain the purpose of the Bill?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members of the House are no doubt aware, the existing guardianship as provided by a former Statute contemplates a judge, Mr. Dionne himself, and also the official guardian. It so happens that the judge who acted, His Honour, Judge Valin, who has reached a very advanced age, has resigned, and that seemed to create the proper time to review whether the nature of the present guardianship is or is not suitable. It should be born in mind that after a long and protracted struggle to accomplish that result, Mr. Dionne now has the

children — not only the quintuplets, but also the members of the family — all under one roof, where the whole family is being brought up and educated as an integrated family, rather than two separate units of the same family, a result, I would suggest, which is highly desirable.

Now, under those circumstances, it appeared to the Government that the intervention of the Government in the affairs of this family should not persist beyond the point of necessary interference, and then should only continue to the extent that is demonstrably necessary.

Under these circumstances, this Bill proposes that Mr. Dionne himself will be the sole physical guardian of the quintuplets.

The Bill also proposes that this family, insofar as it can safely be done, be restored to being a normal family, and that the Government and the Courts intervene in its affairs to only the minimum extent necessary. So the Bill contemplates that Mr. Dionne will be the physical guardian, and, as far as any contracts respecting the quintuplets may be concerned, and as far as their financial affairs are concerned, their resources will be deposited with the Court, and their use will be supervised by the Court under the terms of the Bill, and, as to any further contracts that may be entered into, they will be entered into under the supervision of the Court.

Might I add this, that this proposed set-up will also very substantially reduce the overhead/which the to Dionne family is now subjected.

I feel that I should report, if I may, to the Legislature on how this conception arose. It really resulted from a personal meeting — in fact, more than one meeting — between Mr. Dionne and myself, to see how far the Govern-

ment could go in this matter. Mr. Dionne and his advisors have seen the draft Bill which the Government felt was a desirable step. They have had the Bill, and have had an opportunity of examining its provisions to determine whether or not it meets with the complete satisfaction of the family. I feel, for that reason, I should now read to the Legislature a letter I received from Mr. Dionne. The letter is as follows:

"Dear Mr. Attorney General:

"I have had an opportunity of giving consideration to the proposed Act of the Legislature of the province of Ontario with respect to winding up the present guardianship of the quintuplets, and am indeed quite satisfied with its provisions.

"May I take this opportunity on behalf of Mrs. Dionne and all our children of expressing to you, and through you to the Government of the province of Ontario, our sincere appreciation for what you have done and are endeavouring to do for us.

"I assure you, on behalf of Mrs. Dionne and myself, that we are aware of the heavy responsibility which it places on our shoulders. We will do our utmost to live up to those responsibilities. Our aim is to bring up our children as Canadians in such a manner that they will be a credit to our country, both from the English and the French points of view."

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

MR. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township

of North Monaghan", and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Goodfellow moves, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of North Monaghan", and that the same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of North Monaghan"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. CYRIL OVERALL (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Riggs, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Town of Fort Erie", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Overall moves, seconded by Mr. Riggs, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Town of Fort Erie", and that the same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Fort Erie"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. ROBERT LAURIER (Ottawa, East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Ottawa Civic Hospital", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Laurier moves, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Ottawa Civic Hospital", and that same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Ottawa Civic Hospital"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. DANA PORTER (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Duckworth, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Porter moves, seconded by Mr. Duckworth, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto", and that the same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Toronto"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): Will the hon. member (Mr. Porter) give us a word of explanation about the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerk of the House that as this is a private Bill it will go in due course before the Private Bills Committee.

MR. GEORGE H. MITCHELL (York, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. F. W. Warren, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the County of York", and that same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Mitchell moves, seconded by Mr. Warren, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the County of York", and the same be now read the first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the County of York"; first reading of the

Bill.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec", and the same be now read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec", and that the same be now read a first time. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: This is a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Boards of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec"; first reading of the Bill.

MR. T. A. MURPHY (Beaches): Will the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) please explain?

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: This is a private Bill, and it will no doubt have the same treatment as other private Bills. It has something to do with ex-Ministers.

MR. T. A. MURPHY (Beaches): I thought it might have something to do with Dr. Shields.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON: No, I don't think so -- and, also, not ex-Ministers of the Government.

MR. EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister, of which I gave you notice yesterday.

By way of explanation, may I say that during the discussion yesterday on the arrangement for voting in the

Haldimand-Norfolk by-election, it was said — and I believe correctly said — that neither the Dominion nor the provinces in by-elections provide votes for members of the Armed Forces. Now, that statement, I think, will be qualified by this fact, that, according to my information, in a recent by-election in Red Deer, Alberta — a provincial by-election — the Alberta Government was able to arrange with the Dominion Government to set up polling booths within the Army and Air Force Camps within the riding for the purpose of taking the votes of Active Service personnel living in the camps, who had been there for more than two months, and were, therefore, deemed to be qualified to vote under the Alberta Legislation.

Now, the information reaching me within the last day or two indicates that the Active Service Election Act, having been suspended, the situation in Haldimand-Norfolk is that soldiers and airmen and their families, who are living in the ordinary way in the towns and villages in the riding, and who have been added to the voters' list, or who can later be sworn in, will be able to vote in the ordinary way, but my understanding of the situation is that no provision has been made for Active Service personnel who are living within the camps, and, I suppose, would require special arrangements with the Services' authorities.

I believe the situation is that there are three, or possibly four, Royal Canadian Air Force Camps in the riding, and in them there are a number of Active Service men who have lived in the riding for more than two months, but for whom there is no provision to vote at the present time.

I am aware, if they are living outside the camps, there is the usual provision for voting, but I am suggesting

to the Government, in raising this question, that it is not too late to arrange for those who are in camps to vote at polling booths in their camps, which is now their place of residence.

And may I say, in concluding, also, that I agree entirely with what the hon. Prime Minister has said, that the Active Service men in the riding have no better right to vote than those who are overseas. That is true in principle, but it is also true that the men in camps in the riding have no less right to vote than those who happen to be living out, or than their wives who are not living in the camps, but are living at some places of residence in the riding.

I am, therefore, asking the hon. Prime Minister and the Government if they will not consider the feasibility of arranging with the Dominion authorities, as was done in the case of Red Deer, to take the vote in the camps of the men who are there, and who have been there for more than two months.

(Page No. 847 follows.)

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with respect, a clear distinction must be drawn between any of these men who might be in those camps, drawn from the riding itself, -- if they were gone from that riding, they would ordinarily be entitled to vote. The fact that they were in the camps would not deny them that right to vote. If, on the other hand, they had come in and had lived there long enough to fulfill the ordinary requirements, which would be the requirements referred to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Edward B. Jolliffe) in regard to the wives of soldiers, they, in that case, would come under the same general category, if they qualified within the riding, as I understand it.

But there is no reason why, in this particular riding, a man, whose normal place of voting might be a hundred miles away or a thousand miles away, should have some special mechanism set up to take care of that vote.

While it is difficult to be exact, I am informed that it probably would not affect a dozen people in that whole riding who would be qualified under the requirements in such an election in that riding.

I want to make that distinctly clear. If we are setting up a mechanism for the taking of votes for soldiers generally, then those men would come in on a system, having the right to vote in some other riding than the one they are in, unless they are already entitled there. In other words if this were a general election throughout the province and the mechanism were set up to take the votes of soldiers in the camps, then those soldiers would vote in the riding from which they came into the camps in Haldiman-Norfolk, not in Haldiman-Norfolk, and therefore, even if the provisions made it possible, -- it does not seem to me that they do, -- even if they did, I cannot see the weight of the argument that these men who come in from another riding, who would have a right to vote in that other riding, if the broad provisions were set up, should have special provisions set up

by which they could vote in a riding which is not their riding at all.

As this present law is set up, any man in the active service forces who is qualified to vote can vote by being sworn. One of these camps is either in Simcoe or Dunnville. In any event, those who are entitled to vote and may, for any reason, not find it convenient to be sworn, can vote at the advanced pole, which will be held this week.

It is not for me, Mr. Speaker, to open it beyond the ordinary course, but I do not want any misunderstanding about this, and I would ask your indulgence, sir, to open the thing to the point of allowing any question, if this is not clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter of great public concern, and it is open, if it is not clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I am not clear as to the meaning of the phrase "ordinarily resident". I would like to know what the election officer or the government will accept as ordinarily resident.

In the case of an active service man stationed in camp, he may have been there for a year or more, and who appears and swears that he has been resident in the riding, and claims the right to vote, will his residence in camp be accepted as ordinary residence?

I see the clerk is nodding his head in the negative and I take it that it will not be accepted.

The point on which I would like the Prime Minister to throw some more light, if possible, is just what is the distinction between an air force man who happens to be living out and the one who happens to be living in, with regard to the question of ordinary residents. The only difference I can see is that probably the one is married and the other is not.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I may explain it in this way, every man, whether he is in camp or out of camp, has a right to vote somewhere; and either the man who has been in camp or out of camp for a year, has a right to vote or not. Now, the

question as to what is ordinarily resident is judicially determined, but I will be very pleased, after we rise, to send a reference to the leader of the opposition to the case which determines it. But here is the point: A person who is living outside of the camp and has taken up residence there, not matter what the special circumstances might be which impelled it, has to some extent become a resident of that particular riding; and not matter what provisions are set up for voting, he would have the right to vote there. But the man who is in the camp still has his residence and still has the right to vote some-place else; and if there were a general election, that right would be established.

The practice is perhaps difficult to determine, but so far as I can ascertain it, it does not involve more than perhaps a hand-full of men who would be in the position that they already have a residence. There probably is not a single man who has not a residence some place else and who would not be included in the provisions respecting a general election.

So far as the by-election is concerned, — you are only limiting the provision to a by-election, — and I am quite satisfied that this does not limit the right of any man in any way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the day there is a matter I wish to refer to, which is a matter of some importance. When I informed you yesterday that the Prime Minister of Canada had just announced the withdrawal of the restrictions on the sale of beer, I did not have the text before me. Having read it since that, I consider it my duty to deal with it to-day, because this is a matter that does affect not merely the government but the members of this legislature and the people of the province.

Mr. King's main argument was devoted to the alleged failure

of the government of Ontario to cooperate with the Dominion government in this matter.

That is an indication too often and too readily made by the Prime Minister of Canada. Every member of this Legislature will recall the vigorous criticism of these restrictions from other provinces than Ontario and Alberta. Why the Prime Minister of Canada saw fit to single out these two provinces alone is something entirely beyond my comprehension, because anyone who reads the press should remember the very strong comments by premiers and others in other provinces not so very far away from Ontario, expressing concern about the effects on those provinces regarding the restrictions.

But the most offensive feature of Mr. King's statement is the imputation that this government is not actuated by the same patriotic motives which inspire the Dominion government in questions of this kind. Since that merely is reflecting the criticism which has been wide spread throughout the whole of Ontario the statement goes further and imputes a lack of patriotism to the people of this province. That is an imputation which neither I nor any other member of this Legislature should allow to pass unchallenged.

No one knows better than does the Prime Minister of Canada that the patriotism of the people of this province has been proved since the opening of this war; and I most heartily resent the statement [illegible] statement.

His statement that Ontario has failed to cooperate is contradicted by the facts, which speak for themselves. We have on every occasion since we took office offered cooperation and sought closer relationships between the Dominion and Provincial governments. Over and over again I have requested a Dominion-Provincial conference to lay the foundation for an effective solution of the vital problems which confront us. The absence of cooperation has all been on the other side. In the most high-handed manner the Dominion government

has proceeded to make announcements regarding matters ordinarily within the sole jurisdiction of the province, without indicating to us that the matter was under consideration. The Dominion government flatly refused to cooperate effectively with us in the preparation of the Labour Code. Recently a Health Plan was announced, containing many details of activity which the Provincial government would be called upon to carry out, without letting the Provincial government know what they had in mind.

Yesterday the Minister of National Defence announced a plan for medical services, for which the provinces again would be called upon to arrange for payment; and again it was done without consulting the province, -- I mean the other provinces as well as Ontario, -- at any time as to the effect their proposals would have upon existing or contemplated legislation. We have heard of these proposals indirectly through the press or otherwise, without even the courtesy of a letter to tell us what was being done, so that we might be ready to express our approval or otherwise when the announcement was made.

And this is the point I would wish to emphasize in regard to these remarks. This is not a question of the distribution of beer alone, nor is it a question of what one thinks about the way in which it should be distributed. This is a question which is primarily one of cooperation between governments, that our system must work together, if the Federal system is to work at all.

In a system such as ours conduct of this kind makes effective joint action utterly impossible, to say nothing of the decent amenities which should be expected in public life.

The Prime Minister has taken great exception to the signs which the Board has put up regarding sales in this province.

I do not know whether it will follow that a Bill which passed the Committee yesterday might be applied to the Dominion Government, in the opinion of the Prime Minister of Canada. I can assure him as well as the others that neither the opinions which I have

expressed publicly or otherwise, are not contemplated by that Act; so that he need not be troubled.

The fact is that the signs were properly put up and in words to which no reasonable exception can be taken. The fact is that the Prime Minister of Canada has grossly represented the facts, and I do not intend to describe it in any other term. It was true that there was a reduction in the percentage of beer to be sold in the beverage rooms, but the total percentage sold in the province of Ontario generally was the exact amount allowed by the Dominion Regulations. Ontario sold its total quota permitted by the Dominion government.

These notices did not appear only in the beverage rooms. Mr. King may not have been visiting other places but the fact is that they appeared elsewhere as well. They appeared in all sales outlets, and they correctly stated the facts in every case. The notices mentioned no percentage. They referred only to restrictions and the effect of the restrictions.

The Dominion government fixed no definite percentages which were to be allocated to any particular sales outlet. We were not told that we could sell such and such a percentage in beverage rooms, such and such a percentage in wine shops, and such and such a percentage in the ordinary distributing centres.

There was an overall percentage, and it was that overall total which it was the duty of the province to observe, and it was also the duty of the provincial authorities to allocate that total as they deemed advisable. And in the wisdom of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario the allocation was made in such a way that it did, for the time being reduce the amount available in beverage rooms, with the hope of making available a higher percentage to meet the demands at the places where the beer was being taken in package form.

These notices, to which complaint has been made and which appeared in every sales outlet, were worded most accurately.

They represented the fact, and they represent the facts today, and I may tell the Prime Minister of Canada that they will remain in every sales outlet affected by the Dominion restrictions.

May I also in passing comment upon the publication which we are informed is not looked upon with too unpleasant by some of those associated with Mr. King, the Toronto Daily Star. There is an editorial in the Toronto Daily Star to-day that the Drew notices were misleading. And it was a peculiar fact that it was in the Toronto Daily Star that this funny idea about the twenty-five per cent reduction, instead of the ten per cent reduction, first appeared. They say these misrepresented what the facts were. I read from the editorial:

> "The fact was that the Dominion order called for an all-round reduction of beer released to the province by ten per cent. Whereas in applying this order, the Drew Control board reduced the sales in beverage rooms by twenty-five per cent."

Now, that was a mistatement of the fact, and I am inclined to think a deliberate mistatement of the fact. The Dominion reduction did not call for a reduction of twenty-five per cent but it called for an over-all reduction. If in their judgment the Liquor control board took steps to sell all this beverage in any one of our outlets, it was something with which the Dominion government was not concerned at all.

If the notice had been "this outlet is subject to the restrictions imposed by the Dominion government order", that statement would have been accurate and correct in every way. And so were these statements; and I merely repeat, if possible, we urge those gentlemen who attempt to misrepresent the facts in this way to reconsider the position and become more accurate in their statements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to say no more on this subject at the moment, but I want to close my remarks in regard to this subject

by emphasizing the fact that at the very time that we are told, as a provincial government, that it was necessary for the Dominion government to act in this way because of our failure to cooperate, the Prime Minister of Canada had an unanswered request from me for a conference to which I asked to take the Attorney General and the Chief Commissioner of the liquor control board. And that was the way in which we could have best discussed that, and would have had an opportunity to find out what the facts were, and upon the information we received then, to have made up our minds.

The fact was that so far did we go in our desire to cooperate in every way possible on restrictions, the wisdom of which we did question, that in making this switch of supply from beverage rooms to brewery warehouses to avoid, if possible the difficulties which were causing a great deal of opposition, that very act in itself would have resulted, carried over the years, in a three hundred thousand dollar loss in revenue to this province. By that fact we admitted our willingness to act within the limitations, and to do the best we could to carry this Act into effect.

But again may I say that while the subject of this discussion is the distribution of beer, the real objection I take to the statement of the Prime Minister is that in an attempt to find an excuse for doing what he either should have done or should have not done, on the facts of the case, he implies a lack of patriotism to this government and to this province.

The province of Ontario has accepted its full share in the prosecution of this war; and, as the leader of the government of Ontario I have reason to express my most vigorous condemnation of the shameful imputation by the Prime Minister of Canada that either this government or the people of Ontario are not fully seized of their patriotic duty in the gravest hour in the life of Canada.

MR. M. F. HEPBURN (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, because I was a member of a government which was compelled to impose certain

restrictions as the result of the unwarranted invasion of provincial rights under the extreme powers of the War Measures Act by the Dominion Government, I feel confident also to make a few observations with regard to the statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada in the House of Commons yesterday to the effect that there had been a lack of cooperation between the province of Ontario and the province of Alberta and his own bureaucratic government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why he singles out the Ontario and Alberta provinces because we were two of the three provinces which agreed to stand out against the adoption of the Sirois report, which would have meant the disruption of our economy.

I am not going into the report except to say that Alberta and Ontario did their full duty to the people of their provinces at the time. Later on this report was brought in through the back door by the threat that unless the province submitted it would be because of their failure at collaboration.

I was one of those who went to Ottawa to consult with the Dominion government as to the terms to which we would submit. I returned to Ontario and after a while received from the Minister of War Services information to the effect that the Dominion government was thinking of invading the province's jurisdiction upon the Liquor Act.

I do not purpose trespassing on the time of the House but for a few moments. I acknowledged that letter , and immediately communicated with Mr. Ilsley. I believe this letter has been read to the house already, but I will take up your time y reading the letter to show that there was no thought of violating the agreement which we had arrived at as to the Income Tax and the succession duty. I wrote on January 15th, 1942:

"Dear Mr. Ilsley:

During a recent conference between representatives of the Dominon and this Province, as a result of which it

"was tentatively agreed that Ontario would vacate certain fields of taxation, I was particularly anxious to ascertain the attitude of your Government on the sale of alcoholic beverages, and I therefore made a point of questioning you upon and discussing with you that specific matter. From the replies of yourself and your associates, my colleagues and I believed that not only was the invasion of this field not contemplated by the Dominion Government, but that we had your assurance that it would be left entirely to the Province.

I was,therefore, very much disturbed to receive from your colleague, Mr. Thorson, a letter dated January 12th, 1942, containing a brief presented to a Committee of the Dominion Cabinet by a group of prohibitionists, and advising me that the Dominion Government is considering interfering with the sale of alcoholic beverages, stating that 'it is considered desirable that before any decision is made by the Dominion Government with regard to requests put forward by the delegation and those persons who have since supported these representations, the province should be consulted in the matter with a view to obtaining their opinions with regard to these requests, so far as they effect matters of provincial jurisdiction.' I am of the opinion that the entire field belongs to the provinces, and the whole matter is one of provincial jurisdiction only.

As stated above, what was tentatively arranged between the province and the Dominion was based upon the belief of my colleagues and myself that the Province would retain without interference from the Dominion the entire field of alcoholic beverages, and I must advise you that the arrangement aforesaid between the Dominion and this province cannot be formally consummated and put into effect until I have received from you assurances that the Dominion Government will not in any way attempt

" to enter this field, but will treat it as being one belonging entirely to the province.

In return I can assure you that should an emergency arise which would make it advisable to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors I will act promptly in the matter."

Here is the reply from Mr. Ilsley, as a result of which this province, in good faith, entered into the agreement with the Dominion Government that it should take the entire field. It is dated January 31st, 1942, addressed to myself as prime minister of Ontario:

"Consideration has been given to your letter of January 15th, and I am now in a position to reply thereto.

While I gave no specific assurance in the conference with the representatives of the province of Ontario to which you refer, I fully confirm your view that it was understood that it was not the intention of the Dominion to embark on the regulation of the sale of alcoholic beverages.

After consulting with my colleagues I can advise you that the Government's position has not changed in this regard. It is not the intention of the Dominion to enter the field of regulation of the sale of alcoholic beverages or treat it as other than one belonging entirely to the province."

On that assurance the provincial government turned over to the Dominion the Income Tax.

Notwithstanding that, in the spring of that year the Prime Minister decided to put on the whole armour of God and chase the demon rum. In other words, he violated the agreement made between the two governments and adopted Hitler tactics. What was a result of that? Once there is intimation that there will be a limitation of supply,

the natural result followed, and people lined up outside of the liquor stores, and the sales of liquor went up by leaps and bounds, to the extent that my friend by my side, who was the Liquor Commissioner, and imposed restrictions upon the sale of spirits.

Then in December the Prime Minister of Canada took the next step and not only imposed the restrictions, but made the provisions retroactive, and then the Dominion imposed upon the province the duty of imposing severe restrictions on the sale. And then they turned the orderly marketing into a system of chaos, which alone created the conditions from which we suffer at this moment.

What a spectacle it was to see men and women, women with babies in carriages, lined up.

What a picture it is today to see bootleggers offering at twelve dollars a quart spirituous liquors purchased inside the store at three or four dollars a quart. What a sight it is to the people of Ottawa who have taken such a high moral stand that it was against public morals to allow the sale, and yet that same Government allows the export of $360,000 of spirituous liquors to the United States and millions of dollars' worth of beer. So that while the Prime Minister with his armour of God speaks of our morals he has no compunctions against selling the same poison to our allies. And I say "poison" because when he determined upon that action at the time, he increased the tax on whiskey by four dollars a gallon, but reduced the alcoholic content by 30%. He not only watered the whiskey but taxed the water.

-Page 860 follows-

I want to say unless his appendix is an active organ I don't know how he sleeps at night. Then we found the alleyways cluttered up with lilac perfume bottles and we found some wood alcohol deaths right under his own nose, but the public revolt against these restrictions manifested itself in many ways and so the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. King) got his cunning political ear to the ground. He wanted to find a way out. Just now there is a by-election in Haldimand-Norfolk. The Dominion liberal member, former Whip, for that riding went down, and he too had his political ear to the ground and he was there and he found the going was not so good, and I suppose he had a little conference with his leader and he said, "Mr. King, you had better take off this armour of God, because there is something practical in politics and we are going to run a poor third down there," and so brings the thought it was time to unload this baby over on somebody's doorstep, and he cast around and he thought he would load it on the government of Ontario, and on the Sirois Report, and so he charged the leader of this government and the leader of the province of Alberta on failing to co-operate. I have said privately to the Prime Minister and to the Attorney-General and to other members of this government that they have co-operated to a point where it is even detrimental to themselves. That is how far they have gone. Much further than I would have gone, I might say. I say these charges are absolutely unwarranted. You cannot co-operate with a bureaucracy such as we have at Ottawa, made up of men who are drunk with their own power--probably I should say it is the most incompetent, vacillating, wasteful, hypercritical government we have ever known in the history of this Canada, and so far as these charges are concerned, they are absolutely without foundation. I want to say to the Prime Minister of this issue I am with him whole-heartedly and completely, and I believe 100% of the citizens of Ontario feel the same way.

MR. ARTHUR ST. CLAIR GORDON: (Kent West) Mr. Speaker, having been the Liquor Commissioner who served under four Prime Ministers and still lives and being there at the outbreak of war, I want to say most emphatically that it was the action of the Liquor Control Board of this province to co-operate with the government of Canada, as we realized that the war meant a great deal to this country and that if we could contribute in any way possible we were prepared to cooperate as far as we possibly could. We realized that there would be restrictions - restrictions, some of which would be acceptable to the people of Canada and other restrictions would not, but we were prepared to cooperate as long as those restrictions meant something to Canada's war effort.

During the period from 1939 on we could see a continual increase in the consumption of alcoholic beverages here in the profince of Ontario and we took steps to safeguard the province's position by supplies as far as we could go from anyone that would sell us goods. As time went on the first meeting of the prohibition people in Belleville, which more or less was an advertisement of the people of Ontario - as a matter of fact, all over Canada - that they should rush to the liquor stores and start to buy liquor. The increase was tremendous and we here in this province took the first step to make restrictions in order to conserve and moved to stop this tremendous sale. As time went on it became necessary for further restrictions to go into effect. Great Britain started in 1939 to stop the manufacture of liquor entirely and they also increased their taxes in 1940 or 1941 to over $30. per gallon and steps were taken here to try to regulate and lay before the people of this province of this tremendous increase in sale and further restrictions had to go into effect. At the same time we were cooperating with the govern-ment of Canada and pointing out that the sale of alcoholic beverages was on the increase and restrictions that had to go into effect, not only in this province but in every province of the Dominion, were going to increase the demand for beer, and we went on record that it would be far better for the people of Canada and of this province to have more

beer than to increase the sales of alcoholic beverages, because all of the distillers were involved in making alcohol for war work. As time went on then these restrictions came into force--that is, Order P.C.11374, which restricted the amount of goods to be available for sale in the province of Ontario and at that time that placed the Liquor Control Board simply as distributors of the goods available here in the province of Ontario, and, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying to you that we had very little complaints regarding the supply and quantity of alcohol beverages in the way of spirits from the public of the province. They realized that it was essential and necessary that our distillers convert their manufacturing to war purposes, but there was an up-rising for the supply of beer. The alcoholic beverage order restricted us to 90% of the amount that was sold under the base period. During the base period we sold something in the neighbourhood of 42 million gallons of beer in this province and to give you some idea of the figures, in 1929 the people of this province consumed 11½ million gallons of beer and in 1942 it was over 42 million gallons of beer, and the present condition that developed in this province--something that we never had before--were queues which our Premier has referred to, in front of our warehouses. That developed throughout the entire system of brewery warehouses in the province of Ontario where we were having these continual line-ups, people were going to the warehouses with baby buggies and carts and children. There is something which we never had in this province before and further appeals were made to relax and give us something that the people of this province wanted and that was a larger increase in the gallonage of beer to be sold. As these line-ups were increasing, the Liquor Board took further steps that we must reduce the gallonage being sold in the beverage rooms throughout the province of Ontario, even though it meant a loss of between $300,000 and $400,000 a year in revenue, because, after all, two-thirds of the beer sold in the province of Ontario has always been sold through the beverage rooms and the people throughout the province in our cities, in our towns, were demanding that there be more beer for the consumer. Owing to the war these six bottle cartons had to be done away with and as that made further restrictions and made it more difficult for the people

to get their supply, restrictions were put in limiting and it was necessary to bring in the ration coupon books. Even with the ration coupon book it was impossible to satisfy the demand made by the public for the amount of beer that was made available and that condition has gone on and from time to time has been taken up with the government at Ottawa.

Now, I am happy to say this, that I think that this restriction being raised by the government at Ottawa, which only brings us back to this position that before this Order of December 22nd went into effect, many of the breweries were rationing their beer then, and I think it will be some time, probably two or three months, before more beer can be available, and in my own opinion with the restrictions, and the amount of hard liquors to be sold in Ontario during this coming year there will still be a shortage of beer because, after all, we are the largest consumers of beer in the dominion of Canada here in the province of Ontario, and we are not the largest consumers of spirits. So as we restrict the number of gallons of spirits to be available to the public this year, which is greatly reduced from last year owing to the heavy inventories that were carried by the Liquor Board, the demand in my opinion will run close to probably 50 million gallons or more and I am hoping that there is only one way that this can work out--more beer will satisfy the people of the province and I think with patience, to give our breweries that have the capacity so that they can get up to production, it may ease the situation, but I want to go on record, and one of the reasons I wanted to say a word here, that the Liquor Board has co-operated in every possible way--first, as I stated before, that we recognized this country is at war and the main thing is to win the war and we went out of our way to co-operate but we found an impossible situation. The demand is far greater than the supply made available and the Liquor Control Boards of Canada to-day are simply the distributing agents for the amount made available under Order P.C.11374 at Ottawa.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading bill (No.46),"An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter referring to Race or Creed." Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 46,

"An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter, Referring to Race or Creed" be now read for the third time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lost.

THE SPEAKER: Mr. Blackwell moves the third reading of Bill 46, "An Act to Prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter Referring to Race or Creed".

Shall the motion carry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Lost.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of the bill.

THE SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order, third reading of Bill No.50, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales".

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I beg to move third reading of Bill No.50, "An Act to Confirm Tax Sales".

THE SPEAKER: Mr. Dunbar moves third reading of Bill No.50.

Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

THE SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill be now passed and be intituled as in the Order.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW: Now, I have permission to leave the Chamber and bring the Lieutenant-Governor to you to give assent to the bills that have passed their reading throughout the session.

--The Hon. Prime Minister retired from the Chamber and after some time returned accompanying His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

HON. ALBERT MATTHEWS (Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario): Please be seated.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: The following are intituled the bills to which Your Honour's assent is asked:

An Act to amend the Weed Control Act.

An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act.

An Act respecting Wartime Housing.

An Act to amend the Nurses' Registration Act.

An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act.

An Act to amend the Legitimation Act.
An Act to amend the Crown Timber Act.
An Act to amend the Law Society Act.
An Act to amend the Provincial Land Tax Act.
An Act to amend the Trustee Act.
An Act to amend the Surveys Act.
An Act to amend the Public Lands Act.
The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1944.
The Holland Marsh Roads Act, 1944.
An Act to amend the Rural Power District Service Charge Act.
An Act respecting the Department of Planning and Development.
An Act to amend the Executive Council Act.
An Act to Provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations.
An Act to amend the Power Commission Act.
The Sugar Beet Subsidy Act, 1944.
An Act respecting the Ontario Research Foundation.
An Act to amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.
An Act to prevent the Publication of Discriminatory Matter relating to Race or Creed.
An Act to confirm Tax Sales.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In His Majesty's name, the Hon., the Lieutenant-Governor assents to these bills.

--His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor retires from the Chambers.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order: Resuming the Adjourned Debate on the motion for the consideration ~~for~~ of the Speech of The Hon. The Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. DANA H. PORTER (St. George): Mr. Speaker, may I follow the course that has been laid by the other speakers in this Debate, extend my congratulations to you, sir, for your election to your high office.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder who so ably presented the various topics of the position of this side of the house.

I may say that in the last few weeks, I have listened with very great interest to the suggestions that have been made,

criticisms also that have been made, by the hon. members on the other side of the house, but it seems to me that in listening to the various viewpoints that have been expressed that the issue between us at the present time under present circumstances has been ~~withheld~~ whittled down to pretty narrow limits. Apparently the opposition party opposite have, in my view, very wisely taken the position that so far as this government will give action--and various members have demanded action of this government and more action--that they are prepared to support what they consider to be constructive measures brought down by the government of the province. I must say I have no quarrel with that position and in the present circumstances of our province and in view of the circumstances that we shall have to face within not only the next few months but no doubt the next few years, it seems all the more important that if at all possible we attain a degree of unanimity in attempting to accomplish objectives about which there is really no disagreement at all. There is disagreement as to certain measures that may be employed to accomplish these objectives. There may be some clashes here and there as between one personality and another, but I do believe as a result of listening to this Debate that on the broad objectives that all desire should be accomplished in this province, there is no disagreement at all.

This afternoon we have just witnessed the assent being given to something in the neighbourhood, I believe, of 25 bills. As has been pointed out by the hon. member from Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bennett) that the measures of this government have been merely half-measures, I just wish to remind the hon. member from Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bennett) of the enormous amount of detail that is involved in bringing down the simple matter of 25 bills within three weeks. After all, the government is chiefly a business of administration and in carrying on that administration a tremendous amount of work has to be done. Now, I can quite appreciate that on the opposite side of the house time might hang more heavily than it does in the government benches, and that action perhaps seems a little more slow from that viewpoint than it may seem on this side of the house. And I also listened with very great interest--and I must say pleasure and amusement--to the speech of my neighbour, the hon.

member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). The hon. members of this house may not realize and they may be very surprised to hear it, but the hon. member is a constituent of mine. I may also say that he is one of the only honest constituents I had because nearly ever other constituent I had told me they had voted for me. But the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) apparently is a poet and in view of that rather long-winded but amusing little ditty with which he ended his speech, I am inclined to think that we can regard some of the utterances of the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) as inspired by a certain amount of poetic license.

We have witnessed to-day the assent to a certain bill with reference to Planning and Development. Now, much has been said about that bill in this Debate. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) for instance, suggested that certain legislation should be brought in, in order to give power to the municipalities to the housing boards, or commissions, or whatever they are called, in order to enable them to carry out some of the functions of Planning and Development and housing in the district as well as merely to fulfill an advisory capacity.

I may say that personally I am heartily in accord with that and I think that probably enquiries are already being made as to what sort of legislation will be needed for that purpose, and all I can say is that I hope that as a result of the deliberations of this Assembly, with the result of the legislation that will be passed, that there will be more and better houses in the constituency of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Salsberg).

It seems to me in discussing or considering at all the whole question of planning and development with a view to maintaining and creating maximum employment, no government could succeed in carrying on the projects that would be necessary unless they take into complete confidence leaders of organized labour. It is quite obvious that labour is one vast element in society which suffers most as the result of unemployment conditions. It is also quite obvious that in formulating any plans as visualized by the Act that has been

passed, that labour would be expected to have not only an understanding of the conditions of that group of society, but would be expected to have many constructive suggestions to offer. It is an important fact, for instance, we consider for a moment the building trades. I do not know that there would be any one type of activity which would be more conducive to smoothing out those irregularities of productive activity which, to some extent at least, are at the root of the unemployment problem than to proceed in such a way that the building trades will be constantly and productively employed.

- Page 869 follows-

After all, the building trades are many, consisting of skilled and semi-skilled men, and every dollar that is spent in building, it is said, —and I think rightly — is probably more productive to the general circulation of wealth than a dollar spent in almost every other single line of activities. Therefore, in considering that question alone, a plan that would involve the constant employment of men in all the branches of all building trades would contribute very much, indeed, and to a very great extent, to a solution of some of the problems with which we are involved.

I may also refer, for instance, as another example, to the automobile industry. This industry has its own special problems, from the point of view of unemployment, but where could we look with greater hope of obtaining constructive suggestions as to plans and development with respect to that industry than to organized labour which knows the conditions of work therein.

There are many examples in the many industries which are covered by the Steel Workers' Unions. You can easily and readily imagine the sort of plan that could be developed only if the leaders of organized labour in these various groups were taken fully into the confidence of Governments, and I may say that in making these remarks I happen to have discussed this matter with the hon. Prime Minister, and he has authorized me to make that statement.

We are assembled in this House for the purpose of considering legislation - various kinds of legislation, and I wish to consider just for one moment some of the aspects of the sort of law which is placed before us. And I would suggest that the very simple way of doing this subject would be to regard these various types of laws as divided into four

different classes.

The first class of law that comes to mind is the Criminal Law, with which we, in this House, are not concerned, but at this stage, let me remind you, sir, that Law, in a Democracy, is not a command to be obeyed, but must express the will of the people, and insofar as it fails to express the will not only of a mere majority of the people, but also commands the consent, and the willing consent of much more than a majority, it fails as a Democratic Law, and it becomes a command which must require force to obtain obedience to.

Now, there are many suggestions made as to passing certain laws "with teeth in them" for the purpose, in many cases, of compelling large masses in the community to submit to the will of a mere majority.

Now, a majority -- there is no superior sanctity about it -- the majority is a Democratic device, and it will work as a successful Democratic device as long as the majority is wise, as long as that majority takes into consideration those who are in the minority.

And it is well known that strikes occur in this country on frequent occasions, even though, under the Law, they may be declared to be illegal. I can never see what advantage there was in passing a Law that declared strikes to be illegal, because that is just an example of an attempt to compel large numbers of men in the community to obey the will of the majority, which may not have acted entirely with wisdom and restraint.

The Criminal Law, of course, is the result of many generations of civilization, and it is accepted almost with unaminity in this country and elsewhere.

There is a second classification of Law, and this is

something we have to deal with, and this is the sort of Law which defines commercial transactions and the rights of people in their ordinary day-to-day dealings, one with the other.

That sort of a Law very often is merely a codification of usage, which has grown up. Very seldom, in the definitions that are laid down by Statutes, is it necessary to attempt to enact compulsory measures which will compel reluctant people to do things which they otherwise would not do.

Now, there is a third type of Law, however, into which a certain compulsion enters, and we have had so much talk in the last few days about the beer situation, that I thought I would have nothing to say in my speech, at all, because I find -- and I do not know whether the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) finds his constituency is as thirsty as mine -- but I find there has been a very great interest in this subject in the constituency which I represent. And that is an example. The restriction of the sale of liquor and the restriction of the sale of beer are examples of the legislation which runs the very great danger of running counter to large sections of the community, who are not prepared to consent to the validity of the Law. However, if the public are satisfied that these restrictions are necessary, in view of some great objective with which the public are concerned -- if the public for one moment had it explained to them -- and were convinced -- that the restrictions of the sale of beer was necessary in the interests of the prosecution of the war, I do not for one moment suppose there would be any serious or widespread objection to the maintenance of this restriction.

Nevertheless, I have found in my constituency, and

D-4

elsewhere, -- and I think the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) probably has found it, although I never heard him express himself as much on the subject as I have --

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Maybe we don't believe in signs.

MR. PORTER: Perhaps the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) will write a poem. However, the restriction of the sale of beer was something that not only has proven irksome, but it has become a growing cause for unrest in large industrial sections of the country, and the reason is that the people have not been taken into the confidence of the Government, and they have not been told why restrictions should be maintained and, as a matter of fact, one of the reasons, perhaps, why they have not been told is that there are no reasons which exist for this restriction, at all. When I found that this was becoming not only a frivolous matter for discussion, but a matter of grave concern, in view of the effect that it had upon the enforcement of what was supposed to be Law in this country, I made it a point to investigate this situation as thoroughly as I could, and I discovered that the estimated demand for beer in the year nineteen forty-three was fifty million gallons -- that, of course, is a rough estimate -- and that under the restrictions the amount allowed to be sold in Ontario was thirty-seven million gallons.

Now, that sounds as if the amount of beer that was consumed, or the amount of beer that was demanded, is rather a large quantity, especially in view of the fact that prior to the war it was very much less -- almost one half, as a matter of fact. But, after all, when almost twice as many men are working in the factories, I do not know that it is entirely unreasonable to expect that they

will drink twice as much beer, and that, perhaps, is one of the answers to this rather large increase in consumption and demand. Most of the materials which are used to manufacture this product are grown in our country. It is not like tea and coffee. We all know the difficulties and impossibilities of obtaining these commodities in the quantities that are required, but where you have a situation of this kind, where, I have been told, a very small amount of labour will be required to increase the amount of beer, or would demand a comparatively small additional amount of material, there seems to be no reason, at all, why this restriction should remain.

We have had no explanation that has convinced the public, at any rate, - certainly there is no explanation which has convinced me, - that would indicate that there is any excuse, at all, for depriving men of the amount of beer they reasonably might want to buy.

Now, there is a fourth kind of legislation, and this kind of legislation is in rather a special category.

In the last Session of this House an Act was passed known as the "Collective Bargaining Act". That was an attempt to put into legislation certain mandatory provisions which would force a fairly large element in the community to do something which they appeared to be rather reluctant to do. It is always a very ticklish sort of legislation to be considered in any governing body, and there were various considerations which applied.

After all, in the Labour movement, the right to be recognized has become a major, fundamental right, and so long as that right was not recognized by Law, and as long as the Law would not go so far as to enforce that right, Justice, in the minds of the Labour movement, was not done.

And I may say, in addition, to members of the Labour movement, there were very large numbers of working men, who perhaps were not members of any of the recognized trade-union bodies, who felt the same way. And for some time strikes had been taking place, not especially for the immediate rise in wages, but on the simple proposition that Justice had been denied, and strikes were breaking out throughout this country where men were demanding the right to be recognized through the organizations of their own choice.

Now, a strike on that issue is a strike that will be long, if necessary, and men will undergo great privations and hardships in order to get something which they consider to be their natural and just due.

It was because of the reluctance on the part of employers in this country to recognize this right as fully as they should that the Collective Bargaining Act was passed. That sort of legislation might, in some communities and in some circumstances, cause some sort of a fundamental cleavage in society. But in this province, apparently, that did not happen. There were many defects in that Statute. We do not need to consider those defects here, but there were certain objectives which that Statute, with its mandatory provisions, did accomplish. And I think that it is now generally agreed that in spite of the defects which were all recognized in the procedure that was laid down, and in the method of handling some of the cases, that it has had the effect of bringing employers to the point of view that they must recognize the organization as a fundamental right of Labour, that they must deal with organization that is recognized by the men themselves. And I have seen it happen

on several occasions myself where employers who were reactionary to begin with, as the result of that legislation, have changed their view on that major principle.

The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) was somewhat critical of the Labour Code brought down by the Dominion Government, and he went so far as to suggest that the cause of Labour was being betrayed by this Government, because they were prepared to support that Code. He pointed out - and he was quite right - that the group of Conservatives who met at Port Hope were prepared to pass legislation which had a mandatory provision, and to make Collective Bargaining compulsory upon employers. I happen to have been at that conference, and I happen to have been in that Labour Committee, and the Committee were unanimous in favour of legislation that would go that far. The same thing happened at the Convention in Winnipeg, and the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) pointed out that at Winnipeg a policy was laid down for the Dominion Progressive Conservative Party, which provided for mandatory provisions in connection with Collective Bargaining, just as had happened at Port Hope.

Now, I wish to disagree, to some extent, with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) as to the effect of the Code we are prepared to - under the circumstances - accept at the present time. I am not here to praise this Code in all its aspects, but, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams), the policy of the Progressive Conservative Party was two-fold. In the first place, we declared that we thought that Labour relations should properly be vested in the Dominion Government; and, in the second place, we believed that Collective Bargaining should be made mandatory.

Now, we have a Code, which in spite of all its defects — and I am not at this stage going into that aspect of it — which is presented as a Dominion Code, and can be rendered available to all industries in the Dominion ifwe chose to do so, and in view of the subject presented, and the special circumstances of the case, as you have heard, it is proposed this should be made applicable to the province of Ontario.

But the main burden of the criticism of the ho n. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) was that when you come to the Collective Bargaining Section of this Code, the word "may" was used, and not "shall".

Now, I do not know whether the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) has read this Code, and fully understands what is attempted to be done, but I hope to show that the intent, at any rate, is exactly the opposite. I am not suggesting that it is worded in the best possible way; I am not suggesting that the procedure set out is the best possible procedure, but I am saying this, that this Code, in its wording, does purport to establish Collective Bargaining on a mandatory basis.

Now, in Section 4 of that Dominion Code, it is provided as follows:

"Every employee shall have the right to be a member of a trade union or employees' organization, and to participate in the lawful activities thereof." Then, the next is about employers, and then, No. 3,

"Where bargaining representatives have been certified under Section 8, the bargaining representatives or the employees' employer may" -- in this Section it is "may" -- "in accordance with the procedure hereinafter set out, enter into negotiations

with a view to the completion of the collective agreement between the employer concerned on the one hand, and the trade union or employees' organization on the other hand."

That was the first step, according to this Code. That is, there is a certification with certain Collective Bargaining Agencies; then that agency or employer "may" start the ball rolling by entering into negotiations, according to the scheme that is set out a little later, and to which I shall refer.

The first step is optional on one party or the other. You can obtain certification under this Code, and after that is obtained it may be, for the time being, at any rate, that neither party chooses to set the machinery in motion to conclude the collective bargaining. That is optional on one side or the other, and if neither party wants to act, I suppose things would remain in statu quo.

And then, in Section 10, it says:

"When bargaining representatives have been certified under these regulations, they may give the employer concerned, or the employer concerned may give the bargaining representatives, ten clear days' notice requiring that he or they, as the case may be, enter into negotiations with a view to the completion of a collective agreement."

That is the second step. Either party may then give notice to the other party, "We want to sit down, and we desire to negotiate." Then, in sub-section 2 of Section 10, it provides as follows:

"The parties shall negotiate in good faith with one another, and make every reasonable effort to conclude a collective agreement."

Then there are provisions later on providing for penalties if anybody refuses to do anything that is made obligatory under this Code.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the system set up is the most successful system for enforcement of the provisions, but what I am most profoundly concerned with is this, that from the wording of this Code we have not backed down one iota from the ground we think is perfectly right, namely, there should be some mandatory provision in the Law to enforce employers, if it becomes necessary, to bargain collectively.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD: What is mandatory about what you read there?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: "Shall negotiate". I do not know how much more mandatory it can be. After all, if you read the Ontario Bargaining Act, the wording is a little bit different; I think it is "shall not fail to negotiate", or something of that kind, but I simply point out that the intention of this Code is -- the intention may be somewhat obscure; it is hidden there a little bit, and I do not know whether the Dominion Government did not want the employers to see it, or whom they did not want to see it, but, nevertheless, it is sandwiched in, and the intention of the Code is that collective bargaining shall be mandatory, and that it shall be an offense if either party fail.

Now, this also is clear in the Collective Bargaining Act. Many Unions have been certified. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) mentioned that about one half of the Unions which had been certified were what he referred to as "company unions", and one half of them he referred to as --

MR. JOSEPH B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew) Genuine.

MR. PORTER: Real unions. I am not quarrelling with the terminology, and I am not defending what the members opposite refer to as "company unions", unions dominated and financed or in some way under the aegis of the employers, but under this Collective Bargaining Act which has been in force in Ontario, sixty-two unions, I think it was, were certified which were not connected with one of the great big trade-union organizations, representing about thirteen thousand men, and those who were certified as members of the trade union -- the big trade-union association -- represented, I think, about eighteen thousand men, so that there were actually more of the big trade unions who were certified than the others.

And it also is of some significance that of these so-called "company unions" which were certified, I believe in all cases except about six there was no dispute. Oh, I know it is suggested that there may have been some effort to get in before the big unions came along, and become certified, and have that condition present for a year before the unions entered the plant, but the point is there was apparently a greater number of big unions recognized than others.

I am not saying that the procedure is perfect, but I do say that it did accomplish something, and I may say that in addition to the unions certified under that Act in nineteen forty-three -- of course, the Act was only in force for the latter half of that year -- there was, a s a result of the negotiations carried on with the Department of Labour, a large number of Trade Unions -- I think about eighteen thousand who were members of the large Trade Union Organizations, which were certified -- perhaps not certified,

but they entered into Collective Bargaining agreements as the result of the offices of the Department of Labour. And since the beginning of this year, there has been a continuing process of certification, and I think there are an additional fifteen thousand members of the large Trade Union groups which have been certified since the beginning of this year.

So we have all these figures stacked up, and I do not know that the big union organizations have really done too badly.

As far as this Code is concerned, it comes down to a matter of common sense, under the peculiar circumstances with which we are faced to-day, and there are those to-day who say, "We do not like this Code", but I would say if it did not use the word "shall" in that section, there was very grave reason for disapproving, fundamentally, with that Code. But, since it does use the word "shall", and since the Code provides that Collective Bargaining shall be mandatory, all the other provisions in it are matters largely of procedure, some of which are perhaps clumsy, but, nevertheless, as the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has said, much will depend on how it works out under the offices of the Labour Board. So I wish to leave that question, reassuring the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) that the party for whom I am speaking at the moment has not failed quite so completely to live up to its principles as he apparently seemed to think. In some ways, of course, there are many of the hon. members who think the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) is inclined to be a little bit radical. I do not agree with that. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) is old-fashioned. As a matter of

fact, the real struggle for Union recognition has pretty well come to an end.

MR. CHARLES H. MILLARD: Oh, no, no.

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Williams) still talks as if Labour were a weak voice crying in the wilderness. Labour has become strong, and he does not seem to realize it. Labour has got recognition, and will continue to get recognition, and when he talks as if there was an attempt now, under present conditions, to hold it down, particularly on the part of the members on this side of the House, I am inclined to still think he is a little bit old-fashioned to-day.

After all, once recognition was gained, that was the first step in the progress of the Labour movement. Then, what is the problem of Labour Unions? After all, a strong Labour movement is probably the healthiest thing we could have in any civilized country.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. PORTER: Without a strong Labour movement, democracy is impossible. Without a strong Labour movement--and, after all, what does the Labour movement mean? It is a very simple thing. Some people seem to think there is more danger attached to it, but I have always regarded it as being a very simple and reasonable thing, and I never could understand why anybody raised any question about that, at all.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. PORTER: After all, if a man, by himself, applies for a job, he generally has to take whatever pay is offered. He can be fired, or he can be hired at will, and he can pretty well have to submit to whatever conditions the employer wants to impose upon him. But it was soon dis-

covered that that was not so when men associated themselves together into unions. It is the simple principle of several men banding together and associating together, that by so doing they increase the bargaining power, so that they can make sure that when they are employed, and even when they are fired, they are strong enough to insist upon a square deal. That is all. I cannot see any objection to that. I do not know that there is anybody in this House who sees any objection to that.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Ontario): You are in the wrong pew.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: Oh, I don't know that I am so far wrong.

MR. WILLIAMS (Ontario): You would like a church better, then.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: It is when you come to the point of attempting recognition that you are entitled to organize for the very simple and reasonable and necessary purpose, and then the next step is perfectly obvious.

Collective Bargaining is entered into by the employer on the one hand, and the Unions on the other, and the condition of all these men is settled by some association that has enough power to insist upon its rights, and to protect its members dealing at arms' lengths with the employers. Now, I do not know whether there is some complicated feature of which I do not know, but that seems to me to be at the very simple root of the whole Labour movement.

Now, what happens after this Collective Bargain is reached? One of the great difficulties about the Collective Bargaining Act appeared to be on the face of it -- that is,

the Ontario Act -- that once there was a certification, then how were you going to force people to enter into a bargain, Well, of course the answer is tha t you cannot force people to enter into a bargain if the people refuse to act in good faith and refuse to negotiate, and then you have a pretty difficult situation. But the important thing is this, that where these certifications were granted, there never was a situation of that kind, as the result of the collective bargaining Act; there was not one case on record, I have been able to find out about, where an employer in the face of that statute refused to bargain after certification was granted so that the attitude I think of the employers -- after all, I will say that these employers are just the same sort of people that we are, at least on the whole they are sensible, and I think will act in their own interests -- but so do we all -- but an employer takes this view; he knows perfectly well that every time he recognizes some association in his plant, things just get a little bit out of his control, and he does not like that. Perhaps he should like it but he does not. And I am not so sure that while that may seem ~~reprehensible~~ reprehensible in the minds of some of the hon. members, I am sure that is only a perfectly natural viewpoint for the employer to take. He sits, and has built up the business, and he likes to run that business in his own way, and he does not like outside interference from some organization, and the natural thing to do is to deal with somebody he knows, rather than deal with somebody he does not know, and that is all.

But, what has happened, when these various union

p 16

organizations have been certified, the employer finds perhaps they are not such bad fellows after all, and he decides he had better obey the law, and as the result of obeying the law, things do not go on ~~so~~ too badly.

Now, the next thing that happens after the collective bargaining is made, then what is the interest of labour in carrying out the terms of that agreement? You have been at arm's length. It is not always easy to jump from one state of mind to another state of mind in the flash of an eye, but what is the interest, -- assuming that these two parties of equal strength have struck a bargain, and are satisfied with the terms of it -- then what is the best interests of both parties? I would say that the answer to that is just as simple as the answer to the other proposition I have been discussing today, and that is that it is in the interests of both of these two parties to carry out that bargain in the spirit of it to the greatest extent, because it is perfectly true any increased wages comes as the result over years of increased productivity of labour; increased productivity of labour result from a variety of causes which result from the ability, perhaps of management to some extent; it results from natural resources which may be available to some extent; it results from many favourable conditions which might be present, but it also results from the productivity of the man himself, and where you have a man as an employee who is well educated and is well fed, and is intelligent and is industrious, the productivity of that man will become higher and higher. Where, on the other hand, you have a man who is exploited, who is paid too little, who is ignorant, who is undernourished, then the productivity is very much

less, and it may be that he may not be able to get out of industry a very high wage.

So that the next great step after the collective bargaining is struck is the business of carrying it out. If it is carried out fairly and in the right spirit, and with the proper point of view, then there is a real hope from year to year, from decade to decade in the future, that by reason of this very increased productivity, in every way, that the workman puts into the work, the wages will naturally be increased, and they will be increased and the men will be protected in that increase by the power they have in their labour unions.

Some of the hon. members laughed when I said that the battle for redognition was largely at an end, but I am not so sure but what that is true. I believe that in most of the big industries today recognition has been given, and it is inconceivable to me in view of the change in times, of employment, as well as the communities as a whole with regard to the necessity and the fundamental merits of the labour movement, that there will be any drawback in that regard.

And, as far as this side of the House is concerned, I do not know whether I can speak for the gentlemen on my right -- but I believe that the only group of capitalists left today are the farmers. I went down to a cheese makers' banquet the other night, and I never did see so many prosperous looking capitalists for several years -- as I said I do not know whether I can speak for these hon. members, but in my view, I may say, for what it may be worth, that the real battle for recognition can surely be regarded as won.

It may never be completely won. It is something which will always have to be maintained; it is something I am not suggesting anybody should take for granted, but, nevertheless, the real job for the future, and in the future, for creating and maintaining employment will be the increase of productivities, of every unit in industry.

Now, I may point out that in this House -- I am not so sure but what this House is unique in parliamentary history of Ontario. It reflects with considerable accuracy the various elements of society which go to make up the people of Ontario. The nineteen trade unionists are welcome in this House.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Twenty-one.

MR PORTER: Yes, well when is a trade unionist not a trade unionist? I do not know if my figures are so accurate, but I will say that as a matter of fact the labour movement has never been adequately represented in this House before.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR PORTER: Well, of course, it has had the light and shining armour of my hon. friends, but I mean in quantity it, at any rate, has never been satisfactorily or adequately represented in this House before, and I say that the trade unionists in this House are welcome, and almost necessary a body to make this really reflect the views of the people of the province.

Now, we have, I don't know how many farmers -- twenty or more farmers. I say they are welcome in this House too. They represent the best in the agricultural community who have elected them. Then we have a number

of doctors, business men, one professor, one a specialist, a padre, and I believe not more than ten lawyers.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. PORTER: And let me say in closing that a government that is sincerely determined to carry out its program will not resent the sort of constructive criticism which has been given in this debate. The government which stands for action will welcome constant reminders by the hon. members. There have been many suggestions of value contributed by various groups in this House in the course of this debate, and we may look forward to the legislation of this session not merely as the legilsation of one political party, but legislation in a real sense of this House. The policy of the government is based upon a spirit of co-ordination; the method to be followed is collaboration. Drawing upon the welling springs of initiative, energy, industry, ideas and imagination of all interests and of all movements in the life of our people, we may with some confidence look forward to a future of security with freedom.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Taylor (Huron) seconded by Mr. MacDonald that a humble address be presented to the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

"To the Honourable Albert Matthews,
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 your Honour has
addressed to us.

Shall the motion carry?

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): A recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion as follows:

Ayes: 49

Nayes: 31.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the ayes have forty-nine, the nayes, thirty-one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Drew moves that the House do now adjourn.

MR EDWARD B. JOLLIFFE: I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister can tell us anything about tomorrow.

HON. GEORGE A. DREW (Prime Minister): Yes, tomorrow we will proceed with Bills we have for second reading, and there will be the introduction of a number of other Bills. We will not have an evening session.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until three of the clock Wednesday afternoon.

The House rose at 5:25 p.m.
