ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 13, 1951, et seq.

Volume IX

Tuesday, February 13, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume IX

Tuesday, February 13, 1951.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Reports by committees?

MR. H.A. STEWART (Kingston): I beg leave to present to the second and final report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

"To the Honourable
The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Standing Orders begs leave to present the Committee's Second and Final Report:

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

Petition of the United Church of Canada, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of investment of the said Corporation.

Petition of the Corporation of Jewish Community Centre, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands etc., of the Corporation from municipal taxation except for local improvements.

Petition of Frank O'Brien, Norman K. Byrne, et. al., praying that an Act may pass incorporating The Hamilton Foundation.

Petition of the Windsor Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass empowering the Commission to enlarge its pension plans.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass confirming certain Orders of the Ontario Municipal B oard, and for other purposes.

Petition of The Greater Niagra General Hospital Trust to incorporate The Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Sarnia, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the appointment of a City Manager.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of Moore, praying that an Act may pass permitting the said Corporation to grant a fixed assessment on the properties of the Canadian Oil Refineries, Limited.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of London praying that an Act may pass authorizing the formation of the London Transportation Commission and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the expropriation of certain lands in the Township of Grantham, and for other purposes.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H.A. STEWART
Chairman"

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker,

I might move this motion now which was, I think, agreed upon yesterday.

I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett (Minister of Highways) that when this House adjourns the present sittings thereof it will stand adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they may apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will be far enough advanced on the Order Paper by the end of this week to get into some committee work.

I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett (Minister of Highways) that the hon. member for the electoral district of Middlesex, North (Mr. Patrick) be appointed as chairman of the Committee of the whole House for the present sitting this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

SOME hon. MEMB ERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE MARRIAGE ACT .

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. Temple, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Marriage Act", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE HAMILTON FOUNDATION

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dowling, that leave be given

to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Incorporate the Hamilton Foundation", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF LONDON

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Elgin), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of London", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWNSHIP OF MOORE

MR. G.W. PARRY (Kent, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Johnston, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the Township of Moore", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF SARNIA

MR. B.L. CATHCART (Lambton, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Villeneuve, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Sarnia", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

MR. J.F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Johnston, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting The United Church of Canada", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE WINDSOR UTILITIES COMMISSION

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Beaches) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Windsor Utilities Commission", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE GREATER NIAGARA GENERAL HOSPITAL

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Brown, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Incorporate The Greater Niagara General Hospital", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Brown, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. D.H. MORROW (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Johnston, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Ottawa", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF FORT WILLIAM

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, in the absence of Mr. Cox, William), seconded by Mr. Houck; 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.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF OSHAWA

MR. T.D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. MILLARD, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Oshawa" and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Thornberry, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Hamilton", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

MR. T.R. DENT (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I move, seconded by Mr. W.M. Dent, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting The City of Toronto", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY

MR. H. M. ALLEN: (Middlesex South): I move, seconded by Mr. Martin, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Victoria University", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF TORONTO

MR. S.L. HALL (Halton): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, moved by Mr. Blackwell, seconded by myself that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Jewish Community Center of Toronto", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of tabling answers to questions 57 and 94.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No 1, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary):

In rising to participate in this debate, I would like to say a few words on a subject that I am sure we would all prefer not to discuss today or at any time, that is the question of Civil Defence.

However, in the light of present day events, and the obscure international situation, it is a subject in which we are all vitally concerned, because Civil Defence is self defence.

The most authentic intelligence and staff reports advise us that no area of this continent is too remote to be reached by one-way bombing aircraft, and the difficulties involved are far from being insurmountable. The splendid immunity of North America to direct attack is a thing of the past, and this presents us all as individuals with the problem of defending ourselves, our neighbors and our productive capacity.

If Stalin or any other aggressor decided to use bombs, either atomic, hydrogen or any other type, they would be used for two reasons. Bombing can disrupt the productive capacity of the nation, slow up war production, the production of essential materials in large quantities for our armed forces and our allies, by material destruction of manufacturing plants, hydro installations, roads, canals, railroads and the danger to our forests from incendiary bombs.

It can also achieve a similar objective and divert panic and uncertainty in the minds of the civil population and divert the resources of our people to objects other than the direct prosecution of the war. As an example, during the last war a Japanese submarine lobbed a few shells on to

Vancouver Island, but that incident resulted in Canada keeping 30,000 men immobilized on the Pacific coast for the duration. Their services were lost to the armed forces, and many hours of man power and much material badly needed elsewhere were not used to the maximum advantage.

We have the major number of targets, unfortunately, in this Province, the Department of National Defence consider -- Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Windsor and Sault Ste. Marie. In my opinion they might add Sudbury, which produces 75% of the world's nickel, Niagara Falls and Sarnia. In addition, we have many other important areas and industrial locations that must be protected against material damage or panic from bombs, but also against the no less obvious danger of sabotage.

The Civil Defence organization considers the vital areas I have mentioned as "Target Areas." Surrounding these areas within a radius of 20 to 50 miles, another area, a "Cushion Area." A still larger area surrounding the "Cushion Area" can be designated a "Reception Area."

The "Target Areas" are important to our economy for very many divergent reasons, industrial production of cars, steel, and any of the necessary materials for our war and civil effort. Sault Ste. Marie is of immense strategic importance, carrying more maritime traffic than the Panama, Manchester, Kiel and Suez Canals combined. The primary defence of such targets is of course the job of the armed services, primarily the air force and the warning communications of army and navy. But when you consider that in spite of the tremendous concentration of A.A. and radar equipment,

in any raid on England the maximum number of enemy raiders brought down was only 10%, it seems reasonable to assume that the odd sneak raid will reach its objective. The only defence against atomic or in fact any kind of bombing is to have a trained, disciplined population, willing to give their services voluntarily before, during, and after a raid, to minimize casualties and physical damage by fire, blast, debris, gas or water.

In my opinion Civil Defence is just as much an integral part of our national effort as the armed forces. Modern war is not waged by professional armies as in former years, but by whole nations devoting their whole productive capacity to war waging materials, and wars are won by the nations having a superiority in naval, army and air equipment with superior striking power. Our industrial productive capacity is our salvation; let us fight to preserve it by building up our Civil Defence of our cities. I have heard speakers, and read accounts of speeches that seem to lead our people to believe that in the event of an attack some welfare organization will appear at the door with a station wagon to evacuate the inmates to some remote place where they will be fed, clothed, amused and educated until all danger is past, and then returned to their homes. I deplore this type of thing greatly; that was not the attitude taken by our sailors, soldiers or airmen. Quite the contrary, they fight their ship, their platoon post or their aircraft to the last. Let us not follow the example of the "Graf Spee" captain who sailed out and scuttled his ship, but rather remember Sir Richard Grenville and his

action in the "Revenge". I know our people will follow the latter example, remain on the job and maintain production. Of course, children, the aged, infirm, hospitalized, must be cared for in all respects, but if we are to survive, every one of us has a job to do.

The success or failure of any civil defence body depends almost entirely on the voluntary co-operation of our citizens with their municipal committees, in organization, training, and support, and the amount of progress is directly related to speed with which these basic groups are formed and trained. Civil Defence is a voluntary effort by each of us, working with our neighbours to save our own lives, and extend help to those requiring it, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the advanced organizational leadership required when this job is completed, will be forthcoming.

The course of events in any raid, atomic or otherwise, can best be illustrated by a comparison with the sequence of events in, let us say, a serious apartment fire. First, we have the discovery of the fire and the alarm being given. Meanwhile, the injured and casualties are being evacuated by the people on the spot. The fire fighting equipment arrives, and goes to work, police throw a cordon around the area, ambulances and doctors and nurses evacuate the injured to hospitals where they are treated, housed, clothed and fed. When the conflagration is finally extinguished, other groups move in, Hydro, Telephone, Gas, Water Mains and Services are restored, roads are cleared of rubble, the site of the disaster is cleared up and normal life resumed.

The same sequence of events, expanded a thousand times, would occur if a bomb were dropped on say, Toronto, only in this case the alarm would come from a distance. After the raid firemen, police, welfare, medical, rescue and pioneer squads all take over their respective duties. And consider the problems that arise in getting these services where they are needed at the correct time -- the police job alone. If all our population decided to leave Ontario by motor at once, we have enough vehicles to accommodate them all. We have 230,000 vehicles in Toronto alone. If they left at intervals of 50 feet, driving 30 miles per hour, the convoy would reach almost to Vancouver and the last vehicle would pass the starting point 70 hours after the leader. Imagine what a traffic jam would ensue without adequate control, the roads would be impassable, no fire or ambulance vehicles would be able to move, casualties and the hospitalized would not be evacuated and chaos would result.

If each municipality is organized to play its part in a co-ordinated plan of the police, fire, ambulance services, etc. and have the trained personnel available, by forethought, planning and co-operation with the adjoining municipalities such disaster can be minimized.

We have the advantage of the experience of many of the cities which were bombed so extensively in England, or the Continent, and in Japan, and the experiences while not entirely applicable to Ontario point out many valuable lessons. The outstanding lesson is that the great element producing

material damage is fire, fire storms and blast. Flying debris and particularly glass are the greatest cause of personal casualties. Much public attention has been drawn to radio activity as a result of atomic bombing, but the experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki does not seem to confirm much of what has been said. Undoubtedly the danger exists and instructions in defence against it are included in our personal training programme.

Nevertheless, we must accept the fact that there is a danger. There is particularly a danger if we happen to get an atomic bomb exploded under water, and that applies, unfortunately, to a good many of our target areas, both in Canada and the United States, because they border on the Great Lakes. An atomic bomb that is burst in the air is not so likely to create casualties from radio activity, but an atomic bomb that is burst under water is, and we must accept that and in our education along this line we are trying to teach people how to protect themselves against these things, which we all hope will never happen.

Knowing the critical nature of international affairs and the necessity of defence against bombing, the Ontario Government is intent upon building up an adequate civil defence organization, and much of the groundwork has already been done.

It was decided at a meeting last September in Ottawa between the Federal Government and representatives from all ten provinces that a voluntary civil defence organization be established under the direction and control of the three levels of government, municipal, provincial and Federal.

As a result of that conference a pamphlet was produced which outlined a suggested organization that would be sufficiently flexible to allow any municipality to meet any purely local condition and still conform to the over all set-up. This organization is based on voluntary effort within each municipality. There would be co-ordination between municipal bodies and their neighbors in a larger area organization.

The Ontario Government has distributed this pamphlet to every municipality and it is forming the basis of local organization. Over 1,246 municipalities and organizations have received the pamphlet and about 70 are fairly well on with their organization. This government is assisting municipalities and members of my staff are at the disposal of any requiring guidance. Some are working with the federal government on the national level.

Early in December this Government prepared a questionnaire which was sent out to all municipalities to determine what physical assets we have in this Province covering a variety of subjects, particularly in the Health and Welfare field. This questionnaire is presently being returned to us and when tabulated it is hoped that we will have a fairly complete knowledge of what emergency facilities are available.

Last summer a Provincial Committee representing many of the Government departments, including the Fire Marshal's office, the Provincial Police, Welfare, Health, Lands and Forests, etc. was established. Its principal task will be to work with and co-ordinate the work of the various zones of the Province.

Many vital organizations have volunteered their services and they have been referred to different phases of organization and to work with municipalities as organized bodies and individuals. In fact the Ontario Government is acting as an assembly and clearing house for all the information and services which are vital in an effective civil defence organization.

The Department of Lands and Forests has offered its Richmond Hill provincial radio network to the Toronto Metropolitan area to be used as a control centre in their civil defence organization.

This Government is also distributing another pamphlet designed for personal use and outlines what precautions should be taken by the individual on personal defence measures. Over 100,000 of these are now being distributed through various channels.

Twenty-two men from various cities, towns and provincial Departments have been trained in courses on A.B.C. Warfare in Army courses at Camp Borden and many additional fire personnel from throughout the Province have received and are receiving training.

All these men are being trained with the object of having them train instructors for the municipalities who in turn can train volunteer personnel in fire, police, etc. The Red Cross and St. John Ambulance are expanding their training programs, and the necessary pamphlets and equipment for this training are available.

The Fire Marshal has expanded his training programme, and is training men from all over Ontario from various fire

brigades, who in turn will be available for instructional duties to volunteers.

Ontario is sending 24 men to organizational courses in Ottawa and when the Federal school is operating at Uplands as many men as possible will be trained. All these people are at the disposal of the local municipalities for education, training and organization. Films and slides are being made available from British, American and our own resources for training of volunteer civil defence workers and the general public. The Department of Education is teaching some elementary personal defence in the Secondary Schools, and this same syllabus can be extended to the general public.

The target areas of Ontario have asked to prepare an "Urban Characteristic Study". From this study, municipalities will be able to assess probable damage and effects of attack more intelligently.

In all our contacts and discussions with municipal authorities, the problem of finance invariably arose.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is right.

MR. WELSH: Everybody says: "Well, that's fine, but who is going to pay for it?".

MR. JOLLIFFE: "Where is the money coming from?".

MR. WELSH: That is it. That is the fundamental. I will tell you what we are doing about that.

This was discussed at Ottawa last September, and at that time certain proposals were made by the Ontario Government to the Federal Government, but the Department

of National Defence were unable at that time to state definitely what they proposed to do about this problem.

On February 23 a conference is being convened in Ottawa to discuss financial steps necessary to implement Civil Defence, Standardization of fire equipment, warning signals, training and organizational programs, protective clothing, auxiliary fire equipment, medical supplies, compensation for injury in training, shelters, stock piling of necessary supplies, payment of permanent instructional staffs and a multitude of similar problems will be discussed -- and I hope settled.

I spoke to the hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) last week and he asked me to submit to him a list of the things that we wanted to discuss, and I gave him the list over the telephone and confirmed it by letter, and he said: "Well, I do hope we will be able to give you the answer". And I believe that he will, because he is quite sincere about this work.

I want to say here, as an interjection, that the attitude of the government of the Province of Ontario all during this question of civil defence has been never to try to make any political capital out of anything that has happened. I do not think it is a matter for any government, municipal, provincial or federal, to use for political purposes. Primarily I am a Canadian, and then my political views are secondary to that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Do you use other things for political purposes?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Oh, that comes

from that side.

MR. JOLLIFFE: "Holier than thou".

MR. WELSH: We are going to Ottawa and we are going to talk about these subjects. Last September I suggested that one of the first things that should be done is to standardize our fire equipment across the Dominion of Canada. We have in the Province of Ontario alone 60 or 70 types of fire equipment not interchangeable, and you have all seen examples of how fatal that might be. We had anexample of it in my own little village. We had four fire engines sitting there and there was only one of them that could work. We had the same thing happen in the City of Brockville not so very long ago. Equipment came over from the United States, from neighbouring towns and cities - lots of equipment -- and they first could not use it. I suggested at that time that the Federal Government mass produce the five or six adapters that are necessary to standardize equipment across the Province of Ontario, and that if they would do that on a mass production basis that we in Ontario would agree to the installation of them not only in the fire departments of cities and towns and villages but in industry. So far we have not had an answer to that suggestion.

Ontario is already spending money to get a civil defence organization established and this government is willing at any time to put an insurance policy on our provincial house, for any necessary expenditures for civil defence.

The civil defence organization which is presently

planned by the Ontario Government in co-operation with municipalities and federal authorities and service organizations should reduce casualties by 50 per cent. We will get the skeleton organization in each city and county completed as rapidly as possible and in the event of an emergency the organization is there and capable of expansion to meet any emergency.

Every municipality can find enough men and women of character and ability who will not lose interest but who will familiarize themselves with the problem and be there when the time comes. Over-expansion and over-elaboration now must be guarded against. Complete plans can be put into effect by stages as the international situation dictates. Just as a football team goes stale by overtraining and not playing a game, our organization might get soft and flabby and this is a danger to be avoided.

What we are asking the municipalities to do today will cost very little; when the other steps suggested are necessary Ontario will be prepared to do her part, and war emergency or no war emergency, such an organization would be invaluable, as we are bound to have recurring peace time disasters.

That is one of the things we are going to discuss.

Then, of course, we have the problem of warning signals. Training and organizational program expenses have to be considered; we have to consider the question of protective clothing, because it seems unreasonable to me to expect a man to give his time voluntarily for training, and perhaps damage a suit of clothes which he cannot replace without considerable expense. I think somebody should assume

that expense.

At the same time, the man may be injured. Who will compensate him? That is another question.

Of course, then we have to consider the auxiliary fire equipment, and I think that any fire equipment in excess of what any municipality or city requires, in addition to their peace-time requirements, should be provided from some level of government.

Then we have the question of medical supplies. Are they going to be stock piled? Where are they going to be stock piled? In what quantities?

You have the question of shelters. All these things have to be considered. We have to pay the permanent instructional staff, although we are doing that already in the Province of Ontario.

There are a multitude of things to be considered. I am going down there on February 23rd, as I know other Provincial Representatives are going, and we will do our part, and we are hoping to get the answer of a definite program, and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that irrespective of what policy is adopted by the Federal Government -- and I think they are fully aware of the importance of this work to our national effort -- the Province of Ontario is willing to pay its part, and I can assure the hon. Members of this House that we will do it.

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, in closing, I would like to say that I think in every municipality in this Province we can find enough men and women to carry, built and establish the type of organization we wish to have established,

an organization which has a definite plan, on all these various subjects I have mentioned; an organization which can be expanded in the event of an emergency rising; an organization which understands the part they are to play in the over-all picture. We know we have these people, and we have them in every organization, in every town and township and city in the Province.

And, in addition to that, we have all these volunteer organizations which are willing and anxious to work. For instance, we have the Red Cross. I do not need to give the Red Cross a "plug"; we know the job they did during the last war; we know the job they are doing now.

I saw a circular very recently which was send out from the headquarters of the Red Cross outlining to them what they would be asked to do in one field alone, and that was the building up of a blood bank for Civil Defence purposes. That is a tremendous job, but they have done it before, and I am satisfied they can do it again.

But we do not want to build up an organization too rapidly. It has to be built up from the bottom; it must start with the municipal authorities; we must get people to volunteer who are willing to put some time on this and to act as the personnel. We must get the people and instruct them so they can, in time, instruct others.

That is necessary, because this organization does not know when it will be used. Unfortunately, I cannot tell you the date of "D-day". That decision will not be

here. It may be to-morrow; it may be next week. I hope it will be never, but that decision will not be made on this Continent; it will not be made in Great Britain; it will be made in Moscow, and, unfortunately, "Joe" (Mr. Stalin) is the only one who can tell us when the day will be.

However, the coming of that day may be soon, and it behooves us, not only as a Government, and representing constituencies, but as private individuals to play our part, do what we can, give what help we can to local organizations -- or any organization, as a matter of fact -- because, after all, as I said at the beginning, Civil Defence is purely self defence.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would ask you to convey to the Hon. Speaker of this House my felicitations at this the Third Session of the Twenty-Third Legislature, and my acknowledgement of the pleasing manner in which he conducts the duties of his office, which is of great assistance to the "back benchers" when they feel they have a contribution to make.

I should also like to congratulate the mover (Mr. White) and the seconder (Mr. Villeneuve) of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, at the high honour conferred upon them by their group in the House.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, participation in the Throne Speech Debate gives the Members an opportunity to report on the state of their constituencies and how they are affected by national and world conditions.

The Cold War, hostilities in Korea and political unrest throughout Europe and the East undoubtedly have stimulated business throughout Canada, with Hamilton and Wentworth receiving a large share of this business. We have seen the City of Hamilton extend its borders under continued pressure of necessity for finding room for new homes and land suitable for industry. It is contemplating further expansion into the surrounding Counties of Wentworth and Halton. The Planning Board of the City of Hamilton in co-operation with the adjoining Townships are taking measures that they hope will not repeat the mistakes of the past, when cowpaths became highways and fringe areas of towns and cities were only shack towns. I am pleased to say that the building By-laws are not too stringent to allow a working man to build his own home, though the high cost of building materials is acting as a deterrent to many. Well planned communities with space allocated for parks, playgrounds, schools, wide streets and alleyways will certainly make for better living. A Private Bill which I am introducing for the City of Hamilton, is asking for certain powers which will enable them to pass By-laws covering the items I have outlined, and will also give them power to legislate against the unreasonable omission of smoke and noxious fumes.

Despite the large numbers of homes that are being

built by private enterprise, we find that is inadequate in settling the housing problem of our people today. I have heard of many applicants for houses built under N.H.A. being turned down by the loan companies because their income is too low. This compels them to remain in shared or temporary accommodation which is certainly not conducive to happiness and to the raising of a family which we think are the right of all Canadians. It is certainly time this Government accepted its responsibility and showed leadership in the establishing of rental housing units for that large section of the population which cannot afford the inflated prices being asked for the homes of to-day. Certainly the municipalities are in enough financial trouble without being asked to give the lead. Whilst I am one who is of the opinion that Canada needs a much larger population, the present mass immigration schemes now going forward will aggravate the present housing shortage. If this Government participates in this scheme, then it is duty-bound to accept the responsibility for providing houses for its citizens. Now there are a lot of people bewildered and indignant at the action of the Hon. R. H. Winters, the Government's spokesman on Housing, in announcing the suspension of the Second Mortgage provisions regarding houses being built under the National Housing Act. I have given up trying to understand the actions of the Federal Government in regard to housing. If my friends on my left can explain what they mean, then we in this House would be extremely grateful. You cannot explain or defend their actions just by saying they were elected at the last election by a large majority. That is pretty weak.

Now I would like to say a few words about a problem

that is relatively new to this Continent. That is the question of Civil Defence. With the present unsettled conditions throughout the world to-day, the attention of the people is focused on attempts being made to set up local defence and local disaster committees. Demands are being made for adequate leadership in the formation of these committees and the charting of the course these committees must take. There is ample evidence that the people are ready, willing and able to do their share if the respective governments can decide what is needed and how the share of the cost can be allocated. It is my opinion that the Federal Government, having the widest taxing powers and having initiated a $5 billion defence programme, should assume the cost of civil defence also. Now, living as we do to-day in an age of ever increasing speed and concentrated power, with the frailty of the human being ever present, we have been appalled at the numerous disasters that have occurred in recent months. The heavy storm that we had during the early part of the winter was severely felt at Van Wagners and Crescent Beaches in my riding. The gale that struck the district was classed as a near hurricane. The wind blew steadily down the lake at 45 miles per hour, at times reaching a velocity of 70 miles per hour. It raised the level of the water about ten feet and the waves rolled in at about fifteen feet high. The air was filled with flying sand which often blinded the workers. Unfortunately a number of lime bags had been provided and the dust from these mixing with the water caused painful burns and temporary blindness to many. Those who were on the Beach that

night were privileged to see what our people can do in any emergency. They were positively reckless in the face of danger, and worked until they almost dropped in the freezing water. A lot of these people were unaccustomed to manual work but they toiled at filling and carrying sand-bags until the danger was past. After twelve hours of constant battle, the wind changed and the following days were spent in strengthening the dykes and in attempting to repair the damage. About four homes were totally destroyed, dozens were badly damaged and a hundred and twenty-five people needed medical attention, some being taken to hospital. One boys was missing for two days and was feared drowned, but he had gone to sleep at a house and woke up 22 hours later. At the gale's height, power and telephone lines were cut and roads washed out. I should like to thank the Department of Lands and Forests, whose personnel worked under Phil Rhynas, for the splendid assistance given to the Provincial Police during those long hours, and the Provincial Hydro crews who worked hard in the bitter weather helping to restore the service.

Now what lessons have we learned from this disaster? One of them is the need for having a previously established central control authority -- in other words, a Local Disaster Committee in every community. This is what happened. In answer to the first calls for help that went out from the radio stations, hundreds had responded. Lack of leaders led to confusion. Too many were working in one place, not enough at other danger points. Brigadier P.A.S. Todd, who is the head of Hamilton Street Railway, arrived early with the first bus-load of volunteers and he was placed in charge

of the job, and a central headquarters was established. The beach was divided into 5 sections, under 5 officers and things were gradually unscrambled. Now we are determined that we are not going to be caught unprepared again and we have established a Disaster Committee for Hamilton and District under Brigadier Todd, and a Disaster Plan has been completed. This does not cover precautions to combat the effects of Bombing attacks, but was designed to handle short term emergencies, such as floods, explosions, plane crashes, etc. The Committee are now forming a plan, that could be put into effect in case of enemy attack, but it will take 5 or 6 months to complete.

Now there is one thing I must mention, because it has a great deal to do with matters I have previously raised in this house. I am referring to building stone groins to prevent lake erosion of valuable agricultural lands bordering Lake Ontario. We had established a Relief Fund to aid those who had suffered and $23,000. was raised. Now these people are in constant danger of recurring storms. Yet they do not want to leave these communities and they had expressed themselves more in favour of spending moneys to protect the beach against future storms. Now a total of $9,268.00 have been paid for the settlement of damage claims to date and $14,000 on the construction of seven stone groins. The chairman of the Relief Committee, Reeve Corman of Saltfleet Township, is enthusiastic about them, and noted that 35 ft. of shore line has been reclaimed already, but it will take some time and a few bad storms to find out if we have the answer to erosion. Now one thing I want to stress is that the cost of these were met by kind people all over the Province

who donated to the Relief Fund. To protect the whole Saltfleet Township shoreline would place a heavy burden on the taxpayers and they look to the Province for financial assistance in this matter.

Now to go back to the problem of Civil Defence for a moment and to point out the awareness and readiness of our people to prepare themselves for any eventuality. I was to read a resolution, sent to me by the good citizens of Ancaster Township who attended a meeting addressed by the Reeve, Colonel W. J. Briggen.

RESOLUTION:

"Whereas there appears to be a lack of co-operation and co-ordination between various levels of Government having to do with Civil Defence;

And whereas Hamilton and vicinity have already been mentioned by Defence authorities as a likely enemy aerial target in event of a hot war developing;

And whereas a Dominion-Provincial Conference on Civil Defence, held last August, defined the municipal field of responsibility as being that of establishing a public warning system, organizing transportation and food supplies, arranging for the care and evacuation of the injured, and the organizing of services to aid Fire and Police Departments;

Be it therefore resolved at this meeting that the secretary of the Committee on Civil Defence

for Ancaster be asked to communicate with the Hon. Arthur Welsh and request from him a statement as to the part to be played by Ancaster Township in the over-all defence plan for the H amilton Area; and

Be it further resolved that the Ancaster Legion and all the organixations represented at this meeting, offer their services in the carrying out of any duties relative to Civil Defence assigned to this area. "

Now, one thing that the Hon. Minister should bear in mind when he discusses costs with the Federal Government is the important fact, that, if the municipalities are saddled with too large a load, there will be a reluctance as well as financial inability to undertake Defence Plans. The hon. Minister has been quoted as saying the costs will be enormous. Well, I think this would be a good time to place that $8,000,000 surplus in a Defence Fund, for I can tell you that this is the worst year that the municipalities have faced since business began to boom. I would read you the headlines in last night's Hamilton "Spectator":

"Schools 5 mills may mean 12-mill Hamilton Tax Rise. City Powerless to cut Budget".

Mr. Speaker, if the cost of Civil Defence is imposed on the hundreds of young people who have recently bought homes, who are heavy laden now with local improvement costs, it will mean disaster.

Another problem we have further along the Lakeshore is at Crescent Beach, this is a problem of pollution at Stoney Creek Pond which empties into the Lake there. This

pond is a natural breeding ground for most of the species of lake fish, but annually the mouth of this pond silts up when there is not enough water flow from the area and thousands of fish die and with the heat of the sun warming the water, the stench becomes unbearable. During the past summer the Saltfleet Board of Health, interested from a health standpoint hired a power shovel to open a channel to the Lake. The residents themselves had previously dug by hand a small channel and I had seen the fish passing out into the Lake. Local Sportsmen's Organizations are interested from a conservation angle and I believe if this government were to place two stone groins out into the Lake and dredge a channel they would be building up protection for the shoreline there and solving the pollution and fish conservation problem at the same time.

Four years ago pollution killed 20,000 fish, bass, pike, perch and numerous other species, and fish are all too scarce in Lake Ontario that we can afford to neglect their propagation.

This speech of mine is now beginning to have the appearance of a Grand Tour and I am now asking you to go with me a short distance further and we come to The Queen Elizabeth Way, which here passes through the most beautiful and prolific fruit growing section of Ontario, and yet in this modern garden of Eden, a serpent still wanders, but in this instance the serpent is called the Department of Highways. As the thousands of American Tourists pass through this beautiful Country, temptation is put in their way. Not by the serpent, but by the sight of the fruit laden trees and the tempting displays of the fruit farmer. Can you blame them if they stop to purchase the forbidden fruit? Don't

forget it was the "Forbidden Fruit" that started all the trouble in the world in the first place, and certain people got kicked out of Paradise, and it could happen again on the same issue. Now, I am quite aware of the necessity of having controls on high-speed highways and it was at my suggestion that the Department established Community Fruit Markets, but I regret to say that they have not met with the success that I anticipated. The growers complain that the markets have not been made sufficiently attractive with proper and sufficient signs, and people being what they are, there had been considerable dispute over what were believed preferred positions. It does not make it any easier for the fruit farmer to understand why he is prohibited from establishing fruit stands when he sees the Department of Highways placing picnic tables along the Queen Elizabeth Way, creating a similar hazard to the one they are attempting to prevent. On July 1st of last year, an order-in-council was passed extending the application of sub-section 1 of section 80, the obnoxious section, of Bill 118, to 6 cities, 70 towns and 79 villages throughout the Province. I would like to hear from other members whose ridings are affected by this Bill and how it is working out. I hope to have more to say on these matters if the opportunity occurs later in the Session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no speech of mine would be complete without some reference to that unique and vitally important section of my constituency known as Burlington Beach.-- a community that started out as a summer resort of a few cottages and is now a densely populated community of 900 permanent

families living athwart one of the most important highways in North America. They had looked forward with high hopes of an early start on the New Highway and Bridge which had been outlined in the $5 Hundred Million Highway programme. Swallowing their disappointment, when they realized that steel would be diverted to the Defence programme, you can imagine their feelings when it was announced that a vote would be taken on the Beach on the question of establishing cocktail bars. In order to understand how this came about, I should like to explain to you just what type of municipal government they have. It is what is known as a Park Commission, but it is under the Department of Municipal Affairs who appoint the Commissioners. Under the Liquor License Act it is necessary for 25% of the registered home owners to present a petition for a vote to be held to establish liquor lounges, providing that 3/5 of the voters assent. Or a Municipal Government may pass a By-law, requesting that a vote be taken. In this instance the latter course was followed.

This had aroused great indignation, and it wasn't long before strong opposition was lined up and a committee was formed to organize the opposition. Now, I want to tell you that the opposition forces were not all "drys". They were people who did not want to see Burlington Beach become the Rum Row of Lake Ontario, with all the threat to life and limb that would develop. I am happy to say that common sense prevailed on Election Day, and the two questions to establish new liquor outlets were soundly beaten. The story isn't ended yet. They are so burned up that they are again going to try to establish responsible government on the Beach

and they intend to circulate a petition amongst the residents to find if there is enough support to put it over this time. More power to their elbow, I say.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You know, two years ago it was put to a vote and the result was a vote of 4 to 1 to continue the improvement districts. I want to make my stand clear, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, this Government is very much opposed to improvement districts in Ontario where there are men trained in municipal affairs who can take over. I think Burlington Beach should back an improvement district. They voted 4 to 1 to continue; so what can you do about it.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): The information given to me was that in the very last moments there was a lot of propaganda put out. This was not in accordance with facts.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Well, I did not know that.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): The point is that they realize, the members themselves, that it is the people down there who have the responsibility of changing it if they wish.

I would like now to spend a few minutes on a subject that has been mentioned by most of the previous speakers because of its paramount importance in the future development of this Province and of this Country. I am speaking of the St. Lawrence Waterway and Hydro Development. Naturally, municipalities bordering the River and the Great Lakes are looking forward to sharing in the great expansion in industry and population that will take place if the proposition

is carried through. The big question is, are they prepared to take advantage, if the opportunity arises? The larger cities find themselves already overcrowded from lack of industrial sites and home sites, and what about the adjoining municipalities and the rural lakefront areas? What have they to offer? I am afraid the opportunity will be missed if this Government does not rouse itself. I am predicting and hoping that the Department of Planning and Development will become one of the most important in the Government before long. And I would say one of its most important jobs would be to design a brand new type of municipality, forgetting the old fashioned township boundary lines and types of communities that have grown up haphazardly, but townsites scientifically designed, of sufficient size, with sufficient taxation fields so that they would be able to finance sewage, water systems, roads, schools and all the amenities of a modern community. Unless this is done and enabling Legislation passed, the opportunity will be muddled, if not missed.

Mr. Speaker, what I have been leading up to and trying to point out, is the lack of preparedness which is apparent in the Government's handling of some of the most important issues of the day. It is sometimes fitting for speakers to find quotations to bring out the points in their speeches, but I had some difficulty finding something to fill the bill covering unpreparedness. The first one that came to my mind was the "Parable of the Foolish Virgins", but it didn't seem quite fitting. I did find something, though, in the works of Milton, called "Aeropagitica", and it goes like this:

"Consider what nation it is thereof ye are,
And whereof ye are the governors,
A Nation not slow and dull
But of quick, ingenious and piercing spirit,
Not beneath the highest point
That human capacity can soar to."

These words I commend to this Government. Thank you.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

MR. J. D. BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I would like to take this opportunity, as a number of others have done, of extending to you my congratulations on the way in which you conduct the affairs of this Legislature and I would like further to say something that I am not sure all the members are aware of, that on the National Sunday Evening Hour three weeks ago those of us who listen to it from 7:00 to 8:00 o'clock were very happy to hear the voice of the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature as the Minister on that occasion. It is a high honour to be called upon to speak on that hour and I can assure you, that he, who is our Speaker here, did a grand job and brought honour not only to the church which he represents and to himself but to this Legislature over which he presides during its sessions from year to year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR.J.D.BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): I was very much interested, as a young member of this House, and a back bencher, in the Prime Minister's contribution to the debate the other day. I could not help but notice that he took 55 minutes of his 90-minute address up in attempt to refute a 15-minute radio address of the hon. member for Brant (Mrs.M.C.Nixon).

HOn. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I only spoke for 55 minutes altogether.

MR.J.L.DOLLING (Hamilton, East): Then, you did not say anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. J. D. [illegible] (Prince-Edward-Lennox): It would seem to me he devoted his complete attention to this little band. That is a further indication of the ability of this party, of which I have the honour to be a member, to find flaws in the armour of the government and bring them to the attention of the people of the province of Ontario. I had hoped that in his remarks at that time he would give some indication of plans whereby grants to the municipalities might have a lessening of the strings attached to them. I saw a news item some time ago that he had indicated that to a certain delegation which visited him; because all of those who live down where old man Ontario lives know that the County Councils and the school boards are still at their wits end to try to figure out from year to year the amount of the grants which may be coming to them.

I have in mind at this time a school board down there which operates five school busses. They were told in 1949 that these busses, being largely of wooden construction, were obsolete, and they would to buy new, more up-to-date busses and of a kind approved by the Department of Education. They would not receive any grant on the capital expenditure but their operation costs would be taken into consideration with a view to returning this initial expenditure to them. Operation costs for 1949 - 50 were approved on that basis and what was their surprise when they came to get approval for 1950-51 to find out that the approved expenditures for operation costs had been reduced to the extent of

$1100. On one route it was reduced over $300. in spite of the fact that this school board had been able to do something which I doubt very many other school boards have been able to, that is to get contracts at the same rate in 1950-51 as in 1949-50. I say to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that actions such as that of these school boards being in a position that they find that even if they carry on at the same level of cost their grant is reduced is causing good, keen bussiness men serving on these boards to give up. What they want to know is where are they going to come out each year and when is the government going to come to the municipalities in a provincial-municipal conferences and lay the cards on the table and say "Your grant will be allowed on this item", and name an amount on it from year to year. That is why I was listening when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was speaking in the hope he would have something to say in this regard.

I am sorry the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not in the House at this time. He was here a few minutes ago and I had hoped he would stay a minute in order that I might have an opportunity to say something to him on the need for improved marketing legislation and the need also for clarification of many of the pieces of legislation on the books today.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) is held up from time to time a bit ridiculously in this Legislature and I have no desire to do that to him because I have rather a warm spot in my heart for him.

He came into a nearby constituency close to the one which I represent and the hon.member for Hastings, West (Mr. Sandercock) and myself were on the platform that night. Wer were expressing our mutual friendship and when the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) got to his feet he said, in reference to the hon. member for Hastings, West (Mr. Sandercock) and myself, "I think Politics have all gone to pot in this part of Ontario."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARTER: What I want to say about the marketing legislation is this, that the Attorney General's Department must scrutinize all regulations apparently set out to the people of this province, from the legal aspect. Some of it is most bewildering. No doubt most of the hon. members, if not all, received the same propaganda, at least a letter from a farmer who was very much in the dark about a new regulation that had come out respecting the Farm Products Marketing Act. In the Ontario Gazette of last October 17, we find that regulations made by the Board are to be amended by adding the following:

"Licenses for growers, no person shall engage in Ontario in the business of a grower of vegetables without a growing license in form two A".
and form two A is here for them to see. The second part;

"Every grower shall be deemed to be the holder of a license in form two "A.

They were told to get a license and in the

next breath they were deemed to have that license. One of them went to the Department of Agriculture to find out about it and was told it was nothing more or less than legal mumbo jumbo and did not change the Act from what it had been ten years previous to that.

Another thing I mentioned last year when I was speaking on the Throne debate was in regard to authority being delegated to marketing boards. And now, I know that those who hear what I am going to say will feel I am speaking on behalf of a certain group or business in which I happen to engage, the processing business. If more authority is going to be given these marketing boards, it must be with supervision from the Department and from their marketing experts in order that these boards will not use their authority to do that which will be detrimental to business. The vegetable growers and processers in the province at the present time are engaged in negotiations to arrange prices for processed fruits and vegetables for 1951.

Hon.G.H.DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):- Not a combine, is it?

MR. BAXTER: No, not by any means but the price of the tin plate or tin cans which are used in the processing of these vegetables has gone up from 12 to 15%. Indeed, some of us are beginning to feel if you are talking about a combine, the can producing industry in this Dominion is getting to that stage.

MR. FROST: Are you for controls?

MR. BAXTER: I think the time has come for

controls.

MR. FROST: Use your influence on the crowd at Ottawa.

MR. BAXTER: I have been given a mandate to come to Toronto instead of Ottawa. The farmers have a right to get an increase in the price of material going into that can just the same as the can maker has in the price of the container itself. There is always a possibility, however, that with this greater bargaining power they may come to the place where they raise the price of the product to the point where it will not sell very readily and where production will be increased so greatly that there will be a glut with the result in a year or two the price will be immediately depressed again.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It will be a long time before that day.

MR. BAXTER: You never can tell, we saw it happen in 1947 and 1948. In 1947 and 1948 the prospect for processed fruit and vegetables in this province looked very bright indeed and in 1949, no less than four processing companies went to the wall.

Another thing I want to mention at this time is the position of the dairy farmers in this province. I have had many discussions with members of the Federation of Agriculture in regard to the matter of that butter substitute called margarine and my answer to them has been this, that it is time the dairy farmers of this province had a more positive attack on this matter of margarine. I do not know how many hon. members in this Legislature listen to the farm broadcast

over CBL every noon, at 12:30 but I do quite frequently and as you will no doubt recall we generally tune in at least 15 minutes before the broadcast comes on so we will not have to get up later. For this 15 minutes we have to listen to 15 minutes of "Good Luck Margarine" every day. If the Federation has any power in this Dominion, it seems to me they could get this programme taken off in order that the listeners would not have to listen to it at that time.

MR. MACLEOD: Is that not a soap opera? Are you in favour of a soap opera without the commercial?

MR. BAXTER: I do not care for soap operas at all, I do not care if I never hear them. The Federation of Agriculture in a brief presented to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. members of his cabinet last November, urged the government to make available to the dairy industry all the financial and technical assistance which may be required to further its research in the field of an all dairy spread.

MR. FROST: Rather what we could encourage. Just yesterday I was talking with certain members of The Federation of Agriculture on that very point and I might say that any assistance we can extend to the farmers of this Province to provide for a substitute butter along the lines they have suggested we will give, and we have offered them every facility, and, I was going to say, "the sky is the limit".

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): You certainly give them a lot in that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BAXTER: I am very happy to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say that,,and I do feel it will be most acceptable in the right places, and that the dairy industry in this Province will follow along with the view expressed in the brief and will eventually find they are able to market their product at a price that will bring them sufficient for their work.

I see the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has come in, and I would like to say to him that there is a very definite feeling that we require more traffic signals on our highways, particularly for the protection of school children. I know it is an expensive proposition installing these lights, but I also know that in a good many places the installation of lights at certain intersections where school children are obliged to cross the road on their way to school would mean a great deal of comfort to the parents of these children and in a good many cases would be instrumental in saving a life. I know in my own constituency we have two or three places where lights are sorely needed and there is one where the Canadian Legion Branch in that locality has been pressing again and again for the installation of a light because it so happens that before the highway went through, the school was across a quiet little country road and the town was on the opposite side of the road to the school, and now that road is a busy highway, and the children have to cross it to go to school.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of this House is the matter of the capacity

of the trucks on our highways., I brought this up last year and I bring it to the House agaih, because from my observations the situation is getting even worse. I have seen time and again trucks going out into our ghighways with up to 46,000 pounds of freight, although we have in this Province, as a part of the Dominion railway network, two railways, one of which at least is being subsidized in order to keep it going, and the minimum weight of a car on that railroad is 24,000 or 30,000 pounds depending upon where the car is headed for. It seems to me we are paying a tremendous amount for the upkeep of our highways in this Province and it would seem that there could be some arrangement made whereby the transports of this Province could take a load, we will say up to 30,000 pounds, and any load over that could be carried by the railroad. We have to subsidize the railroads, we want the highways, but it seems foolish to have that railroad with not enough work to keep it going and the trucks loaded to that extent.

I neglected at the start of my address, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips) on his elevation to Cabinet rank. As our new Minister of Health, I am sure he will bring to his position a very high standard of leadership. It is quite evident, because he has already given notice of his intention to introduce a Bill on behalf of the Nursing Profession.

I regret very m ch that the hon. Member for Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton) has found it necessary

because of business reasons, to resign from his position as Minister of Reform Institution. He was a very valuable man and I am glad he has been retained as a Minister without Portfolio.

I am also very glad that my good friend, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) has stepped into Cabinet rank as the new Minister of Reform Institution.

I think he will bring to that position a great deal of favorable consideration for those men and women who find themselves incarcerated behind our prison walls and will in many ways improve these conditions throughout this Province.

I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that he left his position as Deputy Liquor Commissioner. I had high hopes that with him in there--and his thoughts and mind run quite similar to my own-- that some measure of control would be provided for this problem in Ontario. However, without him, it seems to have gone entirely in the opposite direction. We have been told now that in the last five years in the Province the sales had increased about 51%. Now, I am sure, that "Old Man Ontario" has at last made up his mind that the Liquor Control Board of this province is the greatest sales promotion organization ever witnessed here or elsewhere.

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) that it is completely unfair to say anything like that. There is no sales promotion at all. I might say, for instance, there are no advertisements in the Province. We have prohibited liquor adver-

tising in this Province to such an extent that periodicals and magazines are going to other cities outside this province for publication. We realize we are taking chances in that respect and we are losing business and industry in Ontario, but to say it is "sales promotion" is just a reckless statement upon which there is no foundation. The hon. member (Mr. Baxter) ought to be fair enough to realize that the figures set down here for Ontario show an increase, but nevertheless, it is not comparable with increases that are taking place in other comparable jurisdictions in America. It is not fair to say there is any promotion. There is no promotion.

MR. BAXTER: Well, there may not be promotion, Mr. Speaker, but to many of us who are on the opposite side of the fence in our feelings in this regard, there seems to be very little being done to try and curtail the increased sales within this Province. I will call the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and of the hon. members of this House, to the latest GallupPoll. Probably you do not have much regard for these Gallup Polls, they have been proved wrong in times gone by but according to the last one, 53% of the people in Ontario are sure much more drinking is going on, and they were in favour of curtailed sales and increased education to a great extent. Two years ago in speaking in this House, I called upon the government to bring a halt to the establishment of more liquor outlets but to any of us who walk down Yonge St. in the City of Toronto, it is quite evident that they

are ample and even more than ample. Since that time, I do not know who is responsible for it, but apparently sales of beer by the case, for instance, does not sell it fast enough, so now we have sales of beer by the keg. Recently, there was a new shake-up in the Liquor Control Board and another man brought into the picture and it was shortly after that was announced that staggered store hours were brought into effect, to make it easier to purchase strong drink.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): That is absolutely untrue. We have to give our employees a day off a week, of course.

MR. BAXTER: At least, the hours have been staggered.

MR. FROST: It is to give the employees a day a week off. Do you think we want them to work every day? You sponsor Bills over there for controlled hours and that sort of thing which you want carried out. Do you want us to treat the civil servants decently or not?

MR. BAXTER: It all has the effect of --

MR. FROST: Do you want them to stay open all the week long? That is all the purpose that has.

MR. NIXON (Brant): There is something in that "staggering" though, is there not?

MR. FROST: We did not use that expression, he did.

MR. W. M. TILLE (High Park): You have plenty of people staggering.

MR. BAXTER: I could not help but notice recently the record of the Ontario highways for 1950; from January 1st, to October 31st, the number of traffic deaths was 636 adults, 12 childred under 5 and 4 children 15 to 16; and then the comment on this whole picture by Inspector Vernon Page of the traffic division of the Toronto Police, in which he said that 22 per cent more drinking drivers were involved in accidents than in the same period in 1949.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that this is a very hard problem to handle, that people's appetites cannot be controlled by any government or by any legislation, that education must go hand in hand, but I do feel the time has come when we must take very positive action on this matter. An educational program must be set up in our secondary schools.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (COchrane South): Hear, hear.

MR. BAXTER: And the hours of sale must be lessened. The other evening I was in one of our local hotels here in Toronto around 11.30 or a quarter to 12,

and as we were going toward the rotunda of the hotel, we passed the beverage room entrance, and outside of the entrance was a mother and two small kiddies standing there waiting for the father to come out of that room. My thought is this:- we cannot stop the man from going in there and drinking, but at least we can try to shorten the hours of sale so that his family are not waiting there at midnight and after. The ministers of the churches, of the United Churches of this city, have called on the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) asking for certain definite lines of action, and I do hope that he and his Cabinet can see their way clear to implement some of these requests. I do say from my own knowledge of the feeling of this province, not particularly in the cities but in the outlying areas, that the whole question is becoming more and more distasteful to them, that something has to be done for the protection of the people on the highways.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

MR. BAXTER: And for the protection of the young life of this province. And I will say this, that they are in the mood today where if the government does not do something about it, they are quite ready and anxious to do something about the government.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAXTER: And so, Mr. Speaker, I do ask at this time that this government do more than they have suggested in the Speech from the Throne where they are going to take care of them after they have become

alcoholics, but that a little bit ofpreventive medicine be used in order that we will not have this terrible drinking bill of alcoholics, year after year.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with the government, and I must support our hon. Leader of this party (Mr. Oliver) in the amendment to the amendment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HONE. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, may I asky my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) is there anything in the amendment which he proposes supporting referring, even remotely, to the liquor question?

Now, if you want to come out from behind the barn, come out and let us hear what you are going to say. There is not a thing in the amendment about the liquor business at all, that is the amendment the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) says he is going to support.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Then it is not an amendment you could not support yourself.

AN hon. MEMBER: You said you would vote for it.

AN hon. MEMBER: Sure he will, in the long run.

Hon. MACKINNON PHILLIPS:(Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Mr. Speaker to-night is Mr. Speaker's Dinner, and I think the desire of the House is to adjourn a little early. I would like at this time to proceed with second reading of some of the routine bills that are on the Order Paper. If there are any items here which any hon. members would like held over, I will be very glad to do so. I told the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) a few minutes ago--or an hour ago--that I would like to do this.

Therefore,Mr. Speaker, I will call Order No. 22, that is Bill No. 46 -- or just a moment, please, I think perhaps that one was up. I will call Order No.23, that is the Railway Fire Charge Act, if that is all right.

THE RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

CLERK-ASSISTANT: Order No. 23, second reading, Bill No. 67, An Act to amend the Railway Fire Charge Act,, Mr. Scott (Peterboro).

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 67, an Act to amend the Railway Fire Charge Act.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) explain?

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) going to give us an explanationof the Bill?

MR. SCOTT: I am sorry, I thought I had explained it sufficiently. There are only three minor amendments to it. In Section 1, the maximum annual charge which can be made, the maximum annual charge that may be made by the Crown against the owners or tenants of railway land for fire protection is increased from $10 to $15 per square mile. It was on the legislation at $10 when the old rate for protection of Crown land was $6.40 per square mile. We have raised the protection charges on Crown land now to $12.80 and we are increasing this rate somewhat in proportion.

The actual charge on these lands is only $12.80 per square mile, but we have made the amount larger, as was the case in the other legislation.

Then we have changed the date, to bring it into line with the date that fire charges are imposed under The Crown Timber Act, and the interest has been changed from 7 per cent. to bring it to 6 per cent., in line with the similar charges under the Crown Timber Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. PROUT: Order 24.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order, second reading of Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act."

This Bill provides where an amendment to The Public Schools Act, and it provides that debentures may be issued to

take care of initial payments or contributions by a school board to a pension scheme. There was no specific authority to do that under the Act as it stands.

In the second place, it is proposed to strike out certain words which authorize the Board to make contributions to a pension fund, for teachers, officers, inspectors and employees. Boards do not contribute to teachers' and inspectors' superannuation, which is provided under The Teachers Superannuation Act, and the authority to contribute as to officers and employees is already given under Section 129 of the Act.

In the third place, this amendment is to make it permissible for a public school board or a board of education having jurisdiction in a township or a portion of a township which employes one hundred teachers or more to appoint an inspector.

Those are the points covered by this Act, and I support the second reading of this Bill.

MR. A. A. MILLER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps what I want to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would probably be better in Committee, but I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would come prepared to tell us why this Section 1, which appears to me to be a case of placing an unsold issue of debentures into this pension scheme. Is that a new principle being established?

MR. OATER: Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me a question. It was only I think yesterday that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) pointed out, I thought quite rightly -- it is not very often I think he points things out rightly, but this does seem to me to be a

sound proposition -- that on the second reading of a bill, every hon. member is entitled to speak on the Bill once. I have introduced it, I have moved second reading of the Bill and this is not a time for answering questions across the floor of the House. What I hope will be followed is the usual procedure, where every hon. member will have an opportunity to say what he wishes to say about this Bill and then I shall be able to reply to any points there are raised, if I see fit.

I do not propose to answer questions that are put across the floor of the House.

MR. A. E. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, that is not the point, because the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) suggested that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) come prepared to answer questions in Committee.

MR. OSTER: Oh, no, the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) asked me a question now.

MR. ISLER: No, I did not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is a very poor listener.

AN hon. MEMBER: This is "Minister of Education" (Mr. Porter).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Everybody in the House heard what the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) said, so let us not quibble about that. With respect to the other remark of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) indicating that a second reading is not the proper stage for asking questions, I would suggest to him and to other hon. Ministers that one of the reasons this irregular practice has grown up is that it is so rare for hon. ministers, including the hon. Minister

of Education (Mr. Porter) to give adequate reasons for a Bill on second reading. They get up in a lame sort of way, read the explanatory notes to the best of their ability, and then sit down without giving any reasons for the Bill. Now, if there are reasons, let us have them on second reading, and it is the obligation of the hon. minister concerned to give them. That might make many of these irregular questions quite unnecessary.

MR. FROST: I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) gave a very clear explanation of the Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We need more than explanations, we need some reason why these Bills should be passed, if there are any.

MR. PORTER: They just do not listen.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There must be some reasons, and all that is necessary is for the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to disclose it. This should be another occasion where the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), with his perspicacity, might be able to agree with me.

MR. WISHER: He is not a schoolmaster, we do not need any more lectures.

MR. FROST: I might point out, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. friend the member for -- Riverdale, is it not? --

MR. WISHER: Yes, Riverdale.

MR. FROST: -- the tenor of his question was not calculated to get any reply. What he said was this: is it part of government policy that unsold debentures form part of a sinking fund? Now, the question was not asked, and my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and all the hon. members of the House know that the question was not asked for the purpose of getting any information, it was for the purpose of making a nasty insinuation. That is all it was asked for.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Now I say, let us try to get ahead with the business of the House. We have a lot of work to do, I think we can do it without insinuations and innuendoes and whatnot. Let us get down to business for awhile --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then address yourself to your colleague on your left (Mr. Porter). It was he who made the first insinuation.

MR. FROST: The hon. member on my left (Mr. Porter) made a very clear, nice explanation. Let me say this to my hon. friends opposite: if there are principles in this Bill they object to and that they feel should not apply, let us consider them on their merits.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should recognize that there is some obligation on the ministers who introduce a Bill to justify the Bill, not merely to stumble through the reading of the explanatory note. Surely there is more competency than that on the Treasury benches.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Well, you are stumbling now. You would think you were staggering.

MR. C. E. HILLIARD (York West): Mr. Dunbar is back in form.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I think we have in second reading wandered all over the place. I thought I pointed out yesterday that the place for questions dealing with individual items and portions of a Bill is in Committee, as I understand the rule. The principle of the Bill, the entire Bill, is discussed in second reading, and it is on the principle of the entire Bill that we vote, so I think if we are going to pick little things here and there in the discussion of a principle, then we perhaps can dispense with the Committee stage. Because we have been pretty well in Committee stage on practically every second reading so far this Session.

The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing), I think, was next.

MR. [illegible]: Before that, Mr. Speaker -- the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested that I was insinuating --

MR. SPEAKER: That is finished, I believe.

MR. [illegible]: But I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is a principle in Section 1 of this Bill, which is a brand new principle in municipal finance in this province, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) should come prepared in Committee to establish why we should embark on that principle.

MR. FROST: Well, he will. He will be very glad to.

MR. HILLIARD: Well, that is what he asked.

MR. OLIVER: Then that is that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Order No. 25.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order, second reading of Bill No. 75, An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act, Mr. Porter.

HON. MAX PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 75, an Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Bill on its second reading, I may say that the first amendment has this effect, that, it will be to bring teachers engaged under contract by the Ontario College of Art within the scope of The Teachers' Superannuation Act. Now, if that is not clear to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) --

MR. JOLLIFFE: We can read too, and read it more rapidly than you.

MR. PORTER: I would have thought after all this time my hon. friends having had an opportunity to read the Bill and refer to all the other Acts mentioned in the Bill, I would have thought this explanation would be entirely superfluous.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We require no explanations, we require reasons, if any are known to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: Well, the reason is so obvious on the explanation, that we propose to add teachers employed by the College of Art to other institutions that appear in that section of the Act already.

AN hon. MEMBER: Why?

MR. PORTER: I do not know why we need to support that by any profound reasons, other than in view of the fact that the Ontario College of Art is an organization owned and carried on under the Department of Education through a board

of Governors that is set up there, that we think that they are in just the same position in respect to us as the other organizations that are mentioned in that section of the Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now you have my vote.

MR. PORTER: What's that?

AN hon. MEMBER: And mine too.

MR. PORTER: Well, I am sorry the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) could not see that without that prolonged explanation, but I am prepared to revert to elementary education if that is what is required.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, Mr. Speaker, what is required is that we should be satisfied that the hon. Ministers know the reasons for what they are doing, which is sometimes doubtful.

MR. PORTER: I happened to be moving second reading of the Bill, and if the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) wishes to interrupt my speech on the second reading of the Bill, which is going into considerable detail into reasons, very profound ones for those amendments, which I hope will win support of the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) as this first point has already. I think the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) said that we had his vote on this Bill, so perhaps I should not say any more.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So far.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: So far.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

AN hon. MEMBER: Overwhelmed by the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) explanation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Twenty-sixth Order.

FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order, second reading of Bill No. 76, An Act to amend the Fire Departments Act. Mr. Porter.

HON. [illegible] PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 76, An Act to amend the Fire Departments Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for one amendment to The Fire Departments Act which has come about as a result of a conference with the Fire-Fighters Association. The present maximum work week for full-time municipal fire-fighters is 72 hours. This Bill proposes to reduce the maximum to 48 hours. It will be effective the first of next year, so it will not interfere with current municipal budgets.

I hardly think that any reasons are necessary for this Bill. I think it speaks for itself.

MR. C. E. [illegible] (North West): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) why it has been found necessary in this case, even though representations have been made to the government on this question, why it is necessary to depart from the principles established in The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, which was also introduced by this government. Forty-eight hours there is the week's work.

What reasons are there that in this particular case there ought to be an extension beyond the 48 hours that are already provided in The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act? I would like to know the reasons from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) -- as Attorney-General, I would assume -- why

56 hours is now put into an Act where the government has already agreed to have 48 hours as the maximum work week.

(Take F follows)

MR. PORTER : Is there any further debate?

Then, Mr. Speaker, of course, this matter has been mentioned in this House on former occasions. We have a great many conditions in fire departments throughout the province, and as the hon. members know, a very large proportion of the time of the fire fighters is not engaged actively in fighting fires. They have to be on call very often, and in some of the smaller municipalities they may not even have to be on the premises of the fire department, but they have to be on call at certain specific hours, which are laid down, so that they cannot engage in any recreation which takes them very far from a fire station.

For many years, as the hon. members know, the work week has been 72 hours; as a matter of fact, before this Act was changed a few Sessions ago, in some cases it was more than that. The number of hours the fire fighters were held on call, in that respect, was very, very high in some cases.

In many of the fire departments in the larger cities they have come down to a 48-hour week, where the firemen have to be on the premises all the time, and no doubt have special duties to perform in the way of drills, and one thing and another. But in some of the smaller places where fires may happen very rarely, they do not have to be actually on the premises, and are not tied down to any particular type of work during working hours, and the fire fighters themselves have recognized that the ordinary work week does not necessarily apply fairly all across the board.

In view of the fact that in most cases they have come down to 56 hours, and even less, and they feel that

the Act should be changed for a certain group of fire fighters. The government is entirely in accord with that proposition, and I am in hopes the House will agree.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 27th Order.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order, second reading of Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend the Housing Development Act," Mr. Griesinger.

Hon. J. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend the Housing Development Act."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the explanatory note, that is our present land assembly deals, local improvement services may be installed by the partners, that is, the Federal and the provincial, and at the expense of the partners. This provides that when a lot is sold, the purchaser of the lot will pay for the lot only, and assume a debt for the services, to be discharged over a period of fifteen years.

The main purpose of this amendment is that the municipalities may collect the annual charges as if they were local improvement taxes, and reimburse the partners at a later date.

Another reason is to remove the doubt in the minds of some city solicitors that the municipalities have the right to enter into agreement with the partners.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 28th Order.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, second reading of Bill

No. 78, "An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act," Mr. Phillips.

Hon. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act."

Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes it possible for us to provide a more equitable and uniform method of reimbursing our public hospitals for patients who are transferred from our Ontario Hospitals to our public hospitals, for any special treatment, whether it is medical, surgical, or obstetrical.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that hospitals today are finding it very burdensome with their indigent patients, on account of the expensive drugs , such as penicillin and other drugs. In the case of the Ontario Hospitals, a great percentage of our patients are "long-stay" patients, and we feel we should aid our general hospitals.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 29th Order.

THE SANITORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth order; second reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend the "Sanitoria for Consumptives Act," Mr. Phillips.

Hon. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to Amend the Sanitoria for Consumptives Act."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is designed to provide more effective control of tuberculosis by authorizing the Medical Officer of Health, with the approval of an inspector, to direct the examination not only of suspects,

but also the examination of contacts, or any former patient in sanitoria who had refused to have an X-ray examination.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) to say if he would be prepared to make a slight amendment, and insert it in the explanatory note? It has come to my attention on some occasions. I have received communications from people in the province who are concerned about this word "contacts."

I think there is a misunderstanding on the part of the public, and they write in, and say they fear to go and see a patient in a sanatoria, for fear of being included as a "contact." I am sure that is not the intention of the Bill. I think "contact" means where they have been living in the same household, or had some means of contacting a patient whom they knew had tuberculosis. That is followed up, through the local health authorities.

I am quite in agreement with the principle of the Bill, and in committee might we not have some clarification of what is intended by the word "contact."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 30.

THE BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th order, second reading of Bill No. 80, "The Boilers and Pressure Vessles Act, 1951," Mr. Daley.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (minister of Labor): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 80, "The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951."

Mr. Speaker, I think, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) suggested, there should be reasons. In this particular case the reason should be quite obvious, as modern changes and new methods of manufacturing have developed so fast that the original Boiler Act of away back twenty-five years ago is now obsolete, and administration and inspection has led us to believe it was necessary to bring this rather important Act up to date.

I think as far back as 1884 there was the beginning of the problem of guarding against the dangers inherent in the use of steam in industry, which led to the original passing of the Act, and in later years it has been extended to pressure vessels and mechanical refrigeration plants.

(Take G follows)

I think that I would be safe in saying that in Ontario the Boiler Inspection Branch of the Department of Labor has done a reasonably good job in seeing that the designs of boilers and the proposed boilers were sound, that the boilers were constructed according to design or, if not, adequate safety factors were considered in permitting such boilers to be used. I think that our inspectors have been conscientious in carrying out their duties and that they have the respect of manufacturers of both boilers and pressure vessels.

The construction of boilers and pressure vessels is now a very large industry and when it was decided to bring this Act up to date I decided on a new method of procedure and that was to submit a tentative draft of this Act to all of the many interested groups. It has been distributed to the following for their comments, suggestions and to point out any weaknesses: Canadian Manufacturers Association, The Canadian Steel Boiler Institute, The Canadian Refrigeration Manufacturers Association, The Canadian Boiler and Machinery Underwriters Association, The Association of Professional Engineers and the Canadian Institute of Power Engineers. The conferences were held with some of these groups who decided to meet and discuss various provisions.

Generally speaking, the Bill before the House meets with the approval of these groups. We feel we have sacrificed nothing in safety, we have compromised no part of our practices and procedures in inspection of boilers and pressure vessels. Over the years there have been many developments in respect of boilers and pressure vessels. New techniques for their construction

have been evolved. Riveting has been replaced by welding. Different alloys of metals have gone into their making. One of the developments has been the interest shown by the Canadian Standards Association and the American Standards Association and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in the problems of the design, the construction and operation or use of boilers and pressure vessels. They have adopted codes rules dealing with every phase of the subject and in common with many other jurisdictions we have accepted these codes and rules as a sound basis of carrying out our responsibilities. We propose to rely on these codes and rules in the future and you will note in the Bill that the chief inspector and inspectors will rely on these codes and rules when they are examining designs and when they are carrying out inspections under the Act.

As you are no doubt are aware, Mr. Speaker, it it common practice to insure boilers and pressure vessels against rupture or explosion. When this is done they are not subject to annual inspection by Departmental inspectors, because the inspectors of the insurance companies carry out their duty to determine if the insurance will be continued. The insurance inspectors are also active in reporting on the condition of boilers and pressure vessels to their clients and in recommending repairs. We have provided in this Act for closer cooperation between the department and the insurance companies and we shall now receive copies of reports of annual inspections from these companies.

We are for the first time requiring all inspectors

both Departmental and insurance company inspectors, to obtain certificates of competency as to their ability to do the work of boiler and pressure vessel inspection, based on passing examinations. Provision, of course, will be made to prevent inspectors presently doing the work to continue.

Welding is an important feature in the construction and repairing of boilers. Welders may do a good job one day and not so good the next. Their work must be watched at all times. The welders are required under this Act to take tests as often as the inspector demands and when they change their employment.

We believe that the present Bill brings practice and legislation into line. We believe that it is a constructive approach to the problem and that it is a workable statute. We believe that all who have to operate under it are fairly treated and that we will not have sacrificed safety. It may not be the perfect answer to all the problems which will arise and there may be defects in this legislation which we do not perceive, but in this particular field I think only time and experience will disclose them and if they become apparent this Act may require amendments in the future.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to adjourn the debate on this matter?

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I will be only a moment.

There are just two things I want to make mention of at this stage with respect to the Bill. Of course

it is an important Bill but, since it is a complete revision, we have the opportunity to discuss almost anything and everything up to the committee stage.

First, I think the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) is to be commended for the manner in which he introduced the Bill. He gave some reasons. Secondly, I listened very carefully to the list of Associations he mentioned as having been consulted.

The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) can correct me if I am wrong. I do not quarrel with the list he read except that it stopped short at a surprising point. Do I understand correctly that the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) did not consult any labor organizations or, in particular, The International Union of Operating Engineers?

Mr. DALEY (Minister of Labor): We did consult the operating engineers.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is what I would have expected but I did not hear it on your list. I was baffled.

Mr. DALEY (Minister of Labor): Professional Engineers.

Mr. Jolliffe: The reason I am a little startled is that the International Union of Operating Engineers is an old, established international organization which holds, I believe, over 6,000 contracts in this field in the United States and Canada. It has had a generation of experience with the technicalities which are involved in a measure such as this and I am, therefore, a little surprised that the list of the hon. Minister of Labor (hon. C. Daley) did not include

that organization which has, I may say, international representation in this country. There are, perhaps, other organizations which might have been of assistance. I think it is an excellent thing that the Department should be brought into closer touch with safety organizations and perhaps with underwriters and insurance people. I am wondering if the department should not be brought into a little closer touch with the men who work at this trade.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Do you want to adjourn the debate?

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Unless the hon. Minister of Labor wants to make any comments at the moment.

MR. FROST: Oh, no. Adjourn the debate.

(Page G-6 follows)

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like for a few minutes to revert to the Orders of the Day and make a statement to the House relative to a very important matter in which some of us have been engaged for some considerable time past.

In particular, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), and others in the last few weeks have been engaged in this very important matter.

(Take H follows)

I need not elaborate to the House upon the serious nature of the problems of cancer. It is sufficient to say that the diagnosis and treatment of cancer have been of most serious concern to the people for some long time. The attention of the medical profession, of Government and of a great many public-spirited citizens has been directed toward the alleviation of suffering from this dread disease. In particular, in Ontario, great work has been accomplished by the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, by the Ontario Division of the Canadian Cancer Society and by the Universities and Hospitals. Intensive study and most careful investigation of these serious problems have been undertaken. It has now been recommended to the Government by the Cancer Foundation, that of major importance is the establishment at once of an Institute of Radiotherapy, so constituted, so designed and so located as to provide every known facility and device for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer and for research into problems of cancer and its prevention and cure.

It has been recommended specifically that an immediate step is the establishment in Toronto of a diagnosis and treatment centre which would comprise the most modern equipment, directorship of international repute, and a team of radiotherapists, radiophysicists and biophysicists of the highest calibre. The recommendations include also the establishment or continuation of subsidiary diagnosis and treatment centres in Windsor, London, Hamilton, Kingston, Ottawa, the Lakehead and in other Northern Ontario points.

The Government intends to do all in its power to assist in the alleviation of the suffering of cancer victims

and to mitigate, and it is hoped ultimately to stamp out, this fearful scourge. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that is a pretty optimistic statement, in the face of the very grave problem, but it may be that in this province will be discovered a cure, or, if not a cure, a method of control, such as discovered by Doctor Banting and others, in connection with another fearful scourge. In the furtherance of this intention I announce to the House that arrangements have been made under which the recommendations to which I have referred will be implemented at once.

Through the most generous co-operation of the Board of Governors and of its Medical Advisory Board, a complete clinical centre will be provided in conjunction with the Wellesley Hospital in Toronto for the purposes of the Institute. It will enable the very best of treatment to be given to sufferers from cancer. The necessary land will be allotted by the Toronto General Hospital which, as hon. Members know, operates the Wellesley Hospital, at the Wellesley site to accommodate the buildings and structures required for the centre.

In conjunction with the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the Government will undertake at once the establishment of this very necessary Institute of Radiotherapy. This will mean the undertaking immediately of the construction of the following buildings:

Firstly, a clinical centre: This building will be constructed to accommodate the most modern equipment known to science, including the latest super voltage X-ray therapy machines and a radioactive cobalt bomb. It will also include facilities and equipment for isotype therapy, as well

as standard radiotherapeutic equipment. Space will be adequate for experimental research. It will contain the necessary administration offices, a suitable number of examining rooms, lecture and instruction rooms, out-patient clinics for follow-up examinations, laboratories, and such other space and facilities as may be requisite.

Secondly, the plan includes the construction of a nurses' residence. This will be designed to accommodate the nurses for Wellesley Hospital as well as those who will be working at the Institute of Radiotherapy, a very necessary addition, if this plan is to succeed.

The clinical centre will be so planned and constructed as to provide for any expansion which may be required in the future, particularly for the provision of additional hospital beds. It should be noted that the most special type of construction is necessary in order to house and operate safely the very heavy and dangerous machinery required for radiotherapy. As the hon. Members know, the type of apparatus required is such that it can be highly dangerous, to the person operating that type of apparatus.

The direction of the Institute will be undertaken by the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, but the management and treatment will be in the hands of the very highly qualified medical staff of the Toronto General Hospital in conjunction with the medical faculty of the University of Toronto, and in full co-operation and consultation with the medical specialists of the other Toronto Hospitals. Specialists from other Toronto hospitals will

be included in the Institute medical staff and cancer treatment generally will be closely integrated with that of all of the Toronto hospitals. Thus the Institute of Radiotherapy will have the benefits of the closest co-operation of all those concerned with the treatment of cancer.

It is the aim of the Government to provide the very best that can be had of knowledge and experience in attacking the serious problems presented by this dreadful disease. Ontario possesses some of the very finest personnel in the world in this field and their most valuable knowledge and experience will be reinforced by the most experienced knowledge that can be found anywhere.

The undertaking which has been outlined will involve, for physical construction, the immediate expenditure of more than two million dollars. It is being undertaken with the full co-operation of the Federal Government and it is anticipated that grants from the Federal Government to the full limit of its program will be provided for this cause. The most modern equipment known to science will be procured and the facilities will include everything known to science which will encourage the most forward looking research into cancer studies.

This program, which will be undertaken at once, is the result of enormous work on the part of a great many interested people and organizations. Great credit and honour is due, and is paid, to the members of the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation and of its Medical Advisory Board, to the Canadian Cancer Society, and in particular the Ontario Division, to the Board of Governors

of the Toronto General Hospital and to its Medical Advisory Board, and to the medical faculties and other officials of Ontario's great universities.

Final negotiations have been conducted by Dr. Mackinnon Phillips representing the Department of Health, Mr. Norman Urquhart, Chairman of the Toronto General Hospital Board, Dr. R.K. Stratford, Vice-Chairman of the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation and Commander K.S. Maclachlan of the Cancer Society.

Great credit and honour is also due to The National Cancer Institute of Canada for its work in fundamental research, to those many members of the medical profession in Ontario who have made this their interest, and also to the officials of the Departments of Health at Ottawa and at Toronto.

The highest respect and very great credit is paid to the late Dr. Gordon Richards, whose effots on behalf of cancer sufferers are beyond adequate praise, and whose untimely death, it is said, was largely due to his exposure to radiation in their interests.

It is the hope of the Government, with every confidence, that this new Institute of Radiotherapy will provide within Ontario the finest, most up-to-date and most valuable service available anywhere, in the study and ultimate elimination of cancer. It is also hoped that this recognition, not only of the serious ravages of cancer but of the devoted and most valuable work of those people who have given so much of their energy and diligent attention,

in the interests of sufferers from this disease, will be of immense importance, and will expedite the study and research of cancer problems.

(Page H-7 follows)

Mr. Speaker, what I have said here in a comparatively few words is, of course, the result of a great deal of labour on the part of many people. Actually speaking, this is the earliest moment it has been possible to make an announcement of this nature, and I am glad to have the opportunity of making the first mention of it to the hon. members of the Legislature who have been for years, interested in matters of this sort.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say to the hon. members that tomorrow we meet at 2 o'clock. I should like to clear off the second reading of Bill No. 66, Order No. 21, on today's Order Paper, and also Order No. 22, which is routine. I may be optimistic, but perhaps we might proceed with the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), which he moved a few moments ago.

We will then proceed to the first private members' day I have seen in this Legislature in my time, and perhaps even in the time of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and perhaps other hon. members of the House who have been here for a considerable period of time.

Then we might go ahead with the resolution in the name of the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott), which carries with it, I think, Order No. 36, Bill No. 47, in the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). The terms of these two orders possibly affect the same matter.

Then we might go to Order 34, "Hours of Work and

Vacations with Pay"---in fact, I think that is covered by Orders 34, 37, 45 and 47.

If we can clear those off the Order Paper in one afternoon, I think it will be fairly substantial progress.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, just a word on that. I may say that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), as you see, is not in the House today. He will not be in the House tomorrow, either, for the reason that there was a very tragic death in his family about six o'clock last night, which will keep him out of the House for a time.

MR. FROST: I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) that Order No. 1 deals with the resolution in the name of the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott), and relates, as you know, to the legislative vote being extended to all persons in municipal elections. The Bill happens to be on exactlythe same subject as the one by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and the debate on it may clear off both of them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.56 o'clock p. m.

- - -

16

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 14, 1951, et seq.

0

Volume X

Wednesday, February 14, 1951.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume X.

Wednesday, February 14, 1951.

- - - - -

The House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: As all hon. members know, it is our custom to have representatives of various schools of the city visit the sittings. Today we have four groups, one from the Pape Avenue school and one from the Emmanuel Bible School and there are two others in whom I know every hon. member will be interested. First of all, the sight-saving class from the Brock Avenue school; in the second row of the Speakers' Gallery. We had the privilege of inviting and enjoying the presence of this school last year. For the first time in the history of the Legislature, I think we are almost breaking a rule of the House in that I have taken the liberty of giving permission to four students from the Variety Village school to sit at the rear of the House because it is impossible for them to occupy a seat in the gallery.

SOME hon MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel quite confident if it is necessary to suspend the rules in order to support my action there will be no objections. Under the Speakers' Gallery to my right are some 26 students of the Variety School for Crippled Children who are here from all over the province. It is indeed a signal honour for us as hon. members of the Legislature to have these pupils from this excellent school as our guests this afternoon. It was my privilege to speak to the Cntario Society for Crippled Children at Variety School last summer and any of you who have not had the privilege of going out, I would suggest if you have the time you will be more than welcome and will see the excellent and outstanding work done in rehabilitation. We welcome particularly the students of the sight-saving class and certainly the

students of Variety Village.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

LABOR RELATIONS ACT

MR. G. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that leave be given a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Labor Relations Act", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 50.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fiftieth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading Bill number 66, "An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act", Mr. Daley.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, in rising to resume, and on behalf of this group, to conclude the debate on the second reading of Bill number 66, may I acknowledge to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) his courtesy in making available this extra hour. May I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am reminded of the limitation which was suggested upon discussions and I wish to acknowledge both his courtesy and your observation. One thing I cannot help remarking at the outset is that while it is the duty of this part of the House to make sensible objections to everything, that

no possible objection could be registered from any quarter of the House to these distinguished visitors, --genuinely distinguished visitors--who are on the floor today. Nor can one fail to feel the difference in the atmosphere of the House today from what it was Tuesday afternoon which goes to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, how tonic has been the effect of your hospitality yesterday evening.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: On behalf of all hon. members, and I say so because none I am sure enjoyed your hospitality more than myself, may I say, "thank you".

It will be noted from Hansard that I have deliberately tried and I think succeeded in touching on no point covered by other speakers. There is one perhaps beyond the bounds of the debate about which I will write to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). One cannot touch on the principle of this Bill without seeing in it two aspects, as it appears to be to me. There is only a small down payment on the implementation of the report which stands behind Bill number 66. Well, with that instalment, as the House knows, this group has no objection except as to its limitations.

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labor): A large down payment.

MR. CALDER: It could be larger and we hope it soon will be. The point about second instalments which has been constantly touched upon in the debate is, what is to be done about accident prevention and how soon? There is a good illustration of the kind of subject with which we have to wrestle in this House. It is not

a plain choice between good and bad, that just does not occur frequently. This House time and again has to make a nice distinction between what is the best and what is second best and we will not be content with the second best. I invite the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) attention to this distinction, which I think he will appreciate, that in his report the Royal Commissioner has given what amounts to a finding of fact against the present system as being only second best. He says that he finds that it is not adequate and needs revision.

Now, everyone appreciates how any government must have the discretion to use its own judgment as to hwat remedy should be applied to an unsatisfactory state of affairs but no government should be able to overlook the report of the Commissioner who says the present state of affairs is inadequate and in need of revision. It seems to us, Mr. Speaker, that you have in this case of accident prevention, to realize that so much depends upon the operator himself. You cannot achieve the prevention of accidents by law but what a law can do is to compress the range within which accidents can happen and that compression is what we are going to strive for. That very modest advance proposed by the Commissioner is not going to hamstring these factories, these shops which are now doing outstanding work in this field. Let us not be misled by any handsome red herrings; factories are now exceeding the letter of the law, no matter what it may be, because it is good business. What the law has to reach for are those shops in whichthe unwritten law is production first and safety last. We know they exist.

The case that stands out most in my mind is a most recent one of a high school boy intending to become an artist and already entered upon his course at art training work, doing night work, part-time employment in such a shop and who has now lost the use of his right hand. I stress in conclusion that the government must be made to realize how that kind of situation can be multiplied week by week and, therefore, we cannot rest with anything that is short of the best.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J.L. DOWLING (Hamilton, East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might perhaps say a few words about the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act? First of all, I believe I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and the government that they do have one of the best Acts to be found anywhere. I say that because I have had considerable experience with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I had occasion a few weeks ago to visit the Malton Clinic with some 35 other steel workers from Hamilton. We have in Hamilton in the steel industry numerous accidents and many of our members have ended up in the Malton clinic. We went down there and spent a day and I was very pleased to note that the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) himself joined with us for part of the time we visited at Malton Clinic.

The workmen's compensation today is not moving along just because the Act is there, it is a good Act but it is not moving along with the times. I have worked in industry and particularly during the war years when you have had speed-ups you have had modern and new

equipment brough in to speed up and increase production which has caused industrial hazards. These hazards are there and there are more cases going to the Workmen's Compensation Board today than at any time in its history. I think there is no department in the government that receives 30,000 pieces of mail a day and the Workmen's Compensation do.

There is one thing about these proposals and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has more or less verified what we stated here last year, the maximum of $3,000. was inadequate. The Roach Commission report --- and I appeared before that Commission, - -- recommended $4,000. I do not know why you do not eliminate the entire figure. It is not going to make that mush difference, There are very few employees in industry making $4,000. I have known of instances where an employee having a fairly large income as compared to someone working beside him were both injured, they both received 75% of their earnings, one man received a very large sum as compared to the other and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) in consultation with the staff of the Workmen's Compensation Board should set a minimum in which an employee should receive compensation. There are employees in industry today making around $1.00 an hour, their labor rating, that is $40. a week on a 40-hour week and under the 75% they get $30. a week from the Workmen's Compensation Board. They may have an identical injury to someone else making $1.80 an hour which would pay them $45.00 a week. I have handled lots of compensation cases and I can show the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that these are Workmen's

Compensation cases in the last year, which contain over 100 pieces of correspondence. I have at least three or four telephone conversations with the Board every week, they do give yoeman service in that department. I may say further, that is not anything to be proud of, it is a job I have to do. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would like to see these he may have them to check them. I would like to say that the Board is cooperating with organized labor but only as far as they can under the Act. Sometimes the Act is not sufficient to cover conditions and the chief medical officer many times has called me in Hamilton from Toronto and told me of the different conditions.

Let me give you one illustration. There was an employee of a large plant in Hamilton who received an arm injury. This man was 68 years of age, foreign-born, 30 years service in this plant, the arm injury was a permanent injury. The plant gave him part-time employment, the rehabilitation officer went into the plant and talked the company into giving the man part-time employment and then they gave him a letter, "To whom it may concern, this will advise that we do not employ one-armed men". This man is 68 years of age, he cannot get another job, what can you do about it? One serious aspect of the Workmen's Compensation oard, is that older employees, with their steps are getting shorter and their backs are becomming , see young men coming out of school. These boys come out of school, they have been playing sports, they are husky boys, they had things their parents and predecessors never had and employers in industry look for that, they want to replace

the old joe worker with young men because they can get more out of them. I have known many cases where the equipment and modernization of equipment has caused untold industrial hazards that the men cannot meet. After reading the report, I thought at last something was going to be done with accident prevention. I do not know why manufacturers are afraid of it. They have called me on the phone and said they do not want it, they do not like it, for some reason they do not want to pay the men to go in and tell them what to do. Well, our organization in Hamilton, the whole organization appealed to employers and in some cases very successfully trying to get some understanding to work together as a partnership to stop these injuries. I think the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) will agree with me on this statement [illegible] can verify that to the Board. We are working and doing our best but under the Act it is, difficult as I have tried to point out. [illegible] establish a minimum -- I am thinking of the case of a man I heard of a few days ago injured in 1917, who [illegible] lost his leg. [illegible] got a pension, something like $7.00. His rate today is 40%. If you lose a leg below the knee it is 40%. That happened in the past but today the pension is not adequate to pay for the injury. A man has to take care of his economic life, he has to [illegible] money to provide for food and for the children. I think [illegible] would be well advised to establish a minimum instead of a maximum, leave the maximum out of it entirely where an employee working in industry today would have at least an income of $40. a week, $1.00 an hour because if you get it down below that you have to cut down to keep the economy running despite the fact the man himself does

not get paid for his suffering, the inconvenience, his wife, his having to go to the hospital or down to the Malton clinic. All these are inconveniences. I commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) on what he has done. Can he go further? If he can, I think organized labor in Ontario today would stand up and commend him for it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I will not take very long as I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) wishes to speak again in the debate. I would like just to remind the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), Mr. Speaker, that on behalf of the building trades and others the vice president in Ontario of the Trades and Labor Congress appeared before the Commission and made a very strong case on accident prevention. I noted, as the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has suggested, the Commissioner took these representations, his and others, in the matter of accident prevention very seriously. He found, in fact, and so recommended that this be placed in the hands of the Board. And now, I am satisfied that it is not an easy proposotion for the Board to take up. In fact, I am quite sure if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will discuss this with his Commissioners he will find them very anxious to take on this added responsibility. At the same time, they are not anxious to be placed in the position of doing it so quickly that it just could not be handled adequately. That is the reason I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that in committee he add an additional section to this Bill, a section which will authorize the Board to

proceed to set up a department of accident prevention. In other words, give it consideration and get ready for going ahead with accident prevention as a part of the Workmen's Compensation Board responsibilities and activities so that in the early future the Board will be in a position with personnel, and equipment to proceed with what is perhaps the most important function of Workmen's Compensation in the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, during my three years as an hon. member of this Assembly I have had two sad cases brought to my attention of people who have suffered loss of a limb due to the lack of instalation of safety devices on machines. After the accident occurred and these employees were maimed for life the necessary safety guards were put on the machines in question. Now, I realize as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) stated the other day that the majority of manufacturers are decent and want to protect the lives and the welfare of their employees but I also know and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) knows that there are some chiseling employers who will not spend the necessary money to instal safety devices in order to protect their employees,

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Now, I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to give us one sound reason why he should continue to permit the employers -- the manufacturers -- to police themselves. I believe that when Judge Roach recommended in his Report that inspections should be in a neutral body, he made a sound recommendation, and it is a recommendation which this Legislature should adopt.

I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to tell us why we should continue, in this one case, to permit the employers to engage in self-inspection. We do not do that in any other department. We have outside authorities who undertake the job of inspecting everything, auditors, health, or whatever it may be, but in this case we permit the Canadian manufacturers to inspect themselves, and that is not sound, and should not be permitted.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I do want to associate myself with the remarks made by previous hon. members and I share with them the feeling that this Bill represents the sum total of legislation which will arise from the Roach Report, at least at this Session of the Legislature. If that is so, it is unfortunate. I believe the matter should be gone into thoroughly and covered entirely, by legislation.

My colleague has mentioned "speed-ups". I know of one case where the speed-up was away in advance of that recommended by the manufacturer of the machine itself, and it resulted in a very prominent young man's death, a few years ago. That is something which can only be corrected by outside supervision. The plant

inspectors, will, of necessity, overlook these things. Perhaps the protection was adequate, but because of the speed-up, which was beyond that recommended by the manufacturer, it resulted in a young man's death within a few hours.

Last year I put a question on the Order paper as to the number of people receiving total comepnsation for disability, and the answer was"685". They are not all probably based on 66 2/3%. I think that should be reduced, and is something which should be written into the legislation.

Another question I asked was, "What was the amounts paid?", and the reply was that the average amount paid was based on earnings, and was less than $100.00 a month.

There was one other feature I believe I pointed out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) last year or the year before, which should have considerable review, and that is that it may be all well and good for a medical authority to assess a man's inability to work at so many per cent, and he would be awarded a pension on that percentage. But what is not taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker, in many cases, is that a 10% disability is or may be just as effective in keeping him out of employment as a 100% disability.

I have in mind a recent case where a man was injured by being hit with a log on the shoulder, and from that injury, there resulted a nerve condition of the arm, which destroyed his ability to use that arm. He received no compensation after the hospitalization

was over, but the Officers of the Board -- and I can only speak highly of them, but they are restricted by the conditions of the Act -- were able to get him another medical court, and they finally allowed him $13.00 a month. That man is 58 years of age, and his wife is 51 or 52, and they have only the $13.00 a month to live on, and because of the injury to his arm, he is incapacitated 100%, while his disability was assessed at only 10%.

These things should be covered, and perhaps now would be a good time to do it, if this Bill could be reviewed further by this Legislature.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words; I would like to commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) on the fact that the printing of this Bill bears the stamp of the Allied Printing Trade --

MR. DALEY: We made sure of that.

MR. ELLIS: But the point which has been stressed up to now to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is in respect to accident prevention, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and the Government have not given enough consideration to the recommendations of Mr. Justice Roach, as contained in the Report.

I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) a very serious accident which happened in the Ford Motor Car Company's plant, within the last month, where an incinerator in the plant exploded, and five men were seriously injured, one of whom has since died.

This was a case where had there been proper management

and labour safety committee operating in the plant, the great possibility is that the accident would not have happened, because of the fact that the workmen in this particular plant had complained to management that there was great danger of an accident happening as the result of this incinerator, and as a consequence of similar previous explosions.

But the result was they were helpless to correct this hazard. They were promised that eventually something would be done about it, but nothing was done until these five men were burned severely and one man lost his life.

I think that pretty well indicates what Mr. Justice Roach has tried to point out in his Report, that there is undoubtedly a need for that type of accident prevention committee within our plants, because there is no question about it, the employees in a shop can see things which may eventually lead to serious accidents in these plants, which management itself, or the representatives of management, cannot see quite so readily.

So I want to associate myself with what the previous hon. members have said about the Report, and especially this particular section.

I plead with the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to provide for accident prevention Committees, as recommended by Mr. Justice Roach, and that more consideration be given to that feature, and I am very hopeful that in the near future we will see the Government coming forward with legislation along the line recommended by Mr. Justice Roach.

MR. J.S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on this subject. I am fairly well acquainted with the Workmen's Compensation Act, as I have been constantly paying under the Act since it came in, and I consider we have a wonderful Act. I suppose I make as many visits to the Workmen's Compensation Board as any hon. member of this House, as I am very much interested in the men who work, and I think all hon. members of this House should be, too. I think I am safe in saying that the ones who elect the hon. members to this House are the men who work.

When this Act first came into force, the compensation was 55%. That was raised to 66 2/3%, and is now 75%. There is a vast improvement right through. I am sure that everyone who goest to that Board is well treated, as I know I always have been.

I feel it is almost impossible to prevent accidents entirely in any plant. I am quite satisfied that inspections in the plant are satisfactory. There is a great deal of inspections carried on, and yet accident happen, in spite of the inspections. Very often things are noticeable after an accident happens, but not before. I think the Workmen's Compensation Board is anxious to help the workmen as much as they possibly can. I think that one of the main ideas of the hon. members of this House should be to look after the working men. They are the people who need the help. As I have said before, a rich man can engage a lawyer, but a poor man has to come to his Member, and I think all of us, if we want to be good Members, should do all we can to look after the interests of the working man.

I feel satisfied with this Act in every way. I have been interviewed by certain labour interests and they also seem to be satisfied; in fact, they are commending the Government for this piece of legislation. We all know there is room for improvement.

I was very glad to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) say they are going to have a new building, because they really lack reception rooms in the old building, and they have not the room to carry on. I hope when the new building is completed, it will provide plenty of reception rooms. Now, when a working man goes there, he becomes lost very easily, and the place is very crowded, and sometimes the working man feels neglected.

I think there is no doubt but that we are now getting somewhere as far as the working men are concerned.

I think this is a splendid Act. I have been approached by some of the workers, and they are very well satisfied, indeed. I see two or three sitting in the Chamber this afternoon who asked me to say a few words on this amendment, and they have told me they are very well pleased with it. I commend the Government for seeing fit to help the working men, because as far as the working men are concerned, they are the ones who really build up our good Province of Ontario. To my mind, there is no doubt about that. I read at one time:

> "Unless the light of your satisfaction is shown from the cottage, you shall not become a great nation."

And so, unless we put laws on the books to help

the workmen, we will not be a good nation.

MR. B.E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey), as he is an employer of labour and has discussed this question of labour management Committees, if he is opposed to a Joint Committee of Employers and Workingmen in the plant, as to accident prevention.

MR. DEMPSEY: Certainly not. I think there has been a great deal done to prevent accidents. I have seen moving pictures in connection with accident prevention, and I think that in practically all cases management is endeavouring to prevent all the accidents possible. They do not want to have the rate of compensation raised, because it would represent too much money, and there is constantly a campaign on to prevent accidents. It is similar to the campaign to prevent accidents when driving on the highways. All the manufacturers and plants are endeavouring to have as few accidents as they possibly can. We are all very sympathetic to a man who gets hurt --

MR. THORNBERRY: Are you in favour of the Roach Report?

MR. DEMPSEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. G.T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, there is one point not generally known by all the hon. Members, and I think perhaps many of the hon. Members are under a false impression concerning it, and that is that when the amount of compensation was increased to 75%, it did not increase for those who were already getting 66 2/3% or 50%, as the case might be. Many of the hon. Members,

especially those in this group, thought that when the 75% was given, it applied also to those who were getting 66 2/3 and 50%. In fact, I think I was the only one who knew that was not so, amongst our group here.

MR. FROST: Did you tell the rest of them?

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): They all know it.

MR. GORDON: That was one time I was right. There are many in my own constituency, who have suffered or are suffering from silicosis, and some of them are only getting 50%, some 66 2/3%, and that is based on the small wages they were getting at that time, and they have suffered considerably, and are suffering more at the present time.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. Members have concluded their discussions on this question, and if that is so, I would like to sum up the feeling of this Government on this very important question.

During my seven years' experience in working with the Workmen's Compensation Board, I am certainly cognizant of the tremendous thing it is, the difficulties under which it is operating today, and so forth.

As the hon. Member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) said there seems to be a greater number of accidents than ever, but that is easily explainable, due to the fact that industrial activity has increased to a great extent, but I do not think, on a per capita or percentage basis, the accidents are as great in number as they were in the earlier days.

But there are still too many. How many of them could be prevented, I am not in a position to say.

A question was asked here about the assessment, why one man should get a lesser amount because he had earned a lesser amount of money. The only way to change that would have to be by the introduction of an entirely new Act, because the Act is based on the assessment of the payrolls, and it is based on a yearly assessment, that is the Board is empowered to assess and collect for the requirements to meet the expenditures for the year, and if you were to bring in retroactive features, such as the hon. Member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) has suggested, there would have to be a different formula altogether. The firms for whom worked people who were injured years ago, may not even be in business today, and you can hardly require the present business people to pay what would be a terrifically huge amount to bring all these people up to the present scale. Just how that would be done is something I cannot answer at the moment. It would be a wonderful thing if we could do it, but there is a sum of money required, which just does not seem to be available. If it were required to be done, the money would have to be found from some other source than from industry itself.

In summing up, after all the discussions which have taken place here, I would like to close the debate with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker.

On receipt of Mr. Justice Roach's Report, -- which the hon. Members all know has only been in our hands

a few months at the most -- I immediately set to work examining the Report, to try and establish what there was in it, that is, what the tangible things in it were, the things you could see, and which were actually of benefit to the injured workers in this Province, and what we could do in a short time to develop these amendments so that they would be ready for this Session of the Legislature.

I believe the amendments we have suggested, -- and which, Mr. Speaker, no one has criticized, because we have in several cases improved on the suggestions of the Commissioner, and I think that probably eventually some more of these proposals made by the Commissioner may be incorporated into the Act, but at the present time, from a very careful examination of the ability to do things, I think we have a proposed amendment which will be of tangible benefit to the workers of this Province.

There is one question aside from what we have in the amendment, and that is in connection with accident prevention.

I simply say I want more time to study this phase of it. You will admit there has not been too much time, since the Report came out.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: About ten months.

MR. DALEY: We have in this Province today a great force of volunteer workers, and representatives of employers, who are busily engaged in the work of accident prevention.

Tomorrow, in this City, Mr. Speaker, they are

having a convention of Class 20, and I am advised there may be as many as 2500 people at that convention, all definitely interested in the prevention of accidents, and all volunteers.

Now, if you could see this group of people, Mr. Speaker -- and that is only one class -- I think you would see a group of people who are conscientious and certainly serious in the work of accident prevention, and who are consideringthis great problem. As I say, I think if you could see these people, and talk to them, you would get an entirely different picture of accident prevention.

Some of these men have been in accident prevention work for many, many years, and certainly may have acquired a great deal of knowledge and experience during that time.

I am not prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, there is no possibility of improvement in this particular phase of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Four years ago I called the representatives of accident prevention into my office and had a discussion with them. I think there is possibly a way this thing could be improved, and I have already said I believe the employers would be wise -- and I reiterate it -- to utilize at the plant level, the men who actually work on the machines, and who have certainly a great deal of knowledge and who certainly can see the possibilities of accidents. They inform me they do that, but I believe it could be to some extent accentuated, or there might be more of it.

I suggest to the employers that they do that, that they utilize the men right down in the plants.

Of course, they do utilize the foremen, and in some cases the shop stewards, all of which I think makes a very fine contribution.

I have already said that with the completion of the new building -- and I wish if you have time you will go down to the present quarters and see how we are jammed in there, and under what difficulties we are working -- but upon the completion of the new building, I am hopeful that the offices of the Accident Prevention shall all be in one building, so there can be close cooperation, even if there are no changes in the Act, -- and I think there will be. I hope there can be close cooperation between the Accident Prevention groups and the Workmen's Compensation Board.

On the question of inspection services; that question enters into this field. As one of the hon. Members said, the employers should not be able to have "self inspection". I do not know what he meant by that, but I think the hon. Member is overlooking the fact that in this Province we have a factory, shop, and office building inspection, in which we have over 40 inspectors inspecting continually. It is quite possible, we should have more but we are doing a reasonably good job, I believe, in connection with the factory inspection.

Now, on the other hand, accident prevention classes in some cases have inspectors of their own, and it has been pointed out by the Judge that a couple of classes have no inspectors. And we find in some of these industries

the accident prevention class is not doing the inspecting, because of the factory, shop and office inspectors, who are doing that work.

I have been considering that possibly the factory inspectors should have the force of law behind them so the inspectors could all work in conjunction with the accident prevention people without actually having inspectors employed by the accident prevention classes. I am just considering that, as I say. I do not know. I have not had time to really break down something I could recommend to this House, which could be carried out.

It is all very well to talk about these things. Theory is very ofen one thing, but the practical administration is something which has to be given consideration, and today we have in connection with the inspection some duplications of effort.

I have known of cases where a factory inspector went into a plant, made an inspection of the plant, and made a report, and the following day there might be an inspector from the Accident Prevention class going into the same plant, and the management would be required to do the same thing that he did the day before. There we may be able to prevent some duplication of effort.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can only say this; I am not prepared to tell the thousands -- and there are thousands -- of accident prevention people in this Province that their work is unnecessary, and they are not doing a good job, because I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal has been accomplished by this

great volunteer force of accident prevention workers, and I am not prepared to tell them that, until such time as I can give them a better formula, and say:"This is the way which would be better than the way you are doing it today."

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have not that formula at this time.

In regard to some of the other questions which were raised, such as the ones about the lung, cancer, and heart disease, something about the fire fighters, and various other questions which have been raised here; I am satisfied, after examining the Act very carefully, and with the advice of my official adviser in connection with Workmen's Compensation matters, that our Act today is quite ample to cover those cases. We are paying them today, as a matter of fact, because of the Act, and when we broadened it a few years ago in regard to industrial diseases, and included the words:

> "And any other diseases peculiar to or characteristic of the peculiar industrial processes, trade or occupation",

we actually paid a man who dropped from a heart attack, just after returning from a fire. It is possible that man might have dropped dead, had he not been to the fire, but it was reasonable, and that is why I said the other day that in the administration of the Act, we find we must not have too many definite technical things, beyond which you cannot go.

We paid that man, because we felt it was from the exercise or excitement from riding on the fire reels, through a congested district, and the actual work he had to do in connection with that fire, -- we felt that that was the cause of his death, and we paid him, under that Section.

It is broad enough now to take care of these things if we get good administration.

I feel we have incorporated into the amendment the real, tangible things which the Judge recommended; in fact, as I said before, we have gone a little further in some, and I am asking the Legislature to approve the Act as it stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a word in response to a question addressed to me by the hon. Member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry). He sent me over this great file of workmen's compensation cases, and I have only had an opportunity to glance through them, and I notice they run back to 1946 and 1947, and from then to this year.

I would say to the hon. Member (Mr. Thornberry) that these cases are typical of cases I have received myself, only my file is at least twice as thick as his, for a shorter period of time, so I will show him my file, if he cares to see it. At the moment, I can see no difference between my file and his in the handling of workmen's compensation cases.

I can only say that over the years I found the Workmen's Compensation Board, and its officials, helpful to the utmost degree.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

I can only say this, that over the years, I have found The Workmen's Compensation Board and their officials helpful to the utmost degree and I think that in the great run of cases I have been able, with their help, to produce a satisfactory arrangement. I am sure the hon. Member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) has done the same thing.

Now, I am going to return this file to him and I invite him to come down and see me and I will show him mine.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Will the hon. Prime Minister agree that in the cases where we cannot get satisfaction we can send them over to him?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): These fellows over there have opposed everything that is in it. I would like to see what they think about it, really.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): You are giving a slice of bread where a meal has been recommended.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Will the hon. gentlemen opposite give their first favourable indication by voting for this Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: At about 3:30 p.m. the students from Variety Village will be leaving the House. I think it will be very fine if we can suspend the proceedings of the House for possibly five minutes in order to allow the students to leave. Very many of them are on crutches, and so on, and I think they will not feel any embarrassment and there will be no unnecessary disturbance. So, if there is a debate going on at about 3:30 p.m. just give the nod to

whoever is speaking and I am sure he will be very glad to comply with the suggestion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I am sure, that on behalf of all the Members of the House, we will gladly accede to that suggestion. We ask the members of this Hospital to come back and see us again at some other time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): While we are waiting I have an answer to question 21 which I shall table.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): You are out of order.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): I am afraid they are piling up faster than they are answered.

Motion agreed to unanimously on division.

Yeas - 77
Nays - 0

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Notices of Motions, Order No. 1.

THE CLERK: "Mr. Scott (Beaches)--Resolution--That in the opinion of this House, to be consistent with the principles of democracy, every resident of a municipality who is entitled to vote at elections to the Assembly should be entitled to be entered on the voters' list and to vote at municipal elections in the municipality, and no person should be entitled to more than one vote."

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the chance to move this resolution and, for the benefit of the members who did not have their books out, I would like to read it to you so it will be clear what the debate is about. The resolution reads:

> "That in the opinion of this House, to be consistent with the principles of democracy, every resident of a municipality who is entitled to vote at elections to the Assembly should be entitled to be entered on the voters' list and to vote at municipal elections in the municipality, and no person should be entitled to more than one vote."

I move this resolution.

Speaking to this resolution I might say that I do not intend to speak at any great length and I want to put my reasons for quoting it as concisely and shortly as possible. I would like very much to hear the arguments of the members of the Assembly.

I am very firmly convinced that this resolution is a just, equitable and a democratic move that we could take at this time. I know, also that many of the members of the Assembly have wide experience in municipal affairs and on municipal councils and I am most anxious to hear from those members who have been active in municipal affairs and to receive the views which they hold on a resolution of this kind.

The first thing I want to draw to the attention of the House is the regulations for municipal voting and the changes which would be incurred in those regulations if this resolution were carried by the House. The Municipal Act, Revised Statutes, Chapter 243, Section 58, deals with the qualifications for a municipal vote. The first few are obvious, that you be 21 years of age, a British subject, not otherwise disqualified and it goes on to say that in order to vote at a municipal election you must be entitled to be rated for the last revised assessment roll as an owner or a tenant, or the wife of an owner or a tenant, or a farmer's son, and then it goes on to state the money qualifications that entitle you to be rated on the assessment roll: In villages and towns, $100.00; in towns over 3,000 $200.00, etc. and in cities $400.00. That is roughly the qualifications as laid down in The Municipal Act in order to vote. What it means in a city such as Toronto is that in order to be placed on the Municipal Voters' List you have to be either a home owner, or a tenant who occupies two or more rooms in which the preparation of food takes place and in which you actually live. The result of this is that in the City of Toronto and in other cities and towns in the Province of Ontario, there are a large number of people who are entitled to vote at elections to this Assembly and who are not entitled to vote at elections to municipal councils.

Another result of this is that if you own property in more than one ward you are entitled to a double vote.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that this qualification be revised so that the people voting in the municipal elections will be the same group almost, as vote at elections to the Legislative Assembly. This would entail the following regulations. It is covered in The Election Act, Chapter 112, Section 18. It states that in order to vote for election to the Assembly you must be of the full age of 21 years, a British subject not disqualified, have lived in Canada for 12 months, and it lays down the residence qualifications. It says that in the case of a city, a town or a township to which part IV of the Voters' List Act applies a person must be ordinarily resident in such a city, town or township, and in the case of electoral districts to which part IV of the Voters' List Act does not apply, they must have been ordinarily resident for two months preceding the issuing of the Writ.

So that, what it would amount to is that if this recommendation were to be accepted, in order to vote at municipal elections, voters, if the town had a population of over 10,000, would have to be ordinarily resident within the confines of that electoral district electing the council. Now, "ordinarily resident" would have to be interpreted when the amendments were put in and would undoubtedly have to entail a residence qualification. To me, "ordinarily resident" would mean living in the locality, working in the locality, being a citizen in the locality. Secondly, this resolution would mean that in electoral districts under 10,000 you would have to be

ordinarily resident for a period of 2 months preceding the issuing of the actual Writ. Again, I think that would have to include the electoral area from which the council was being chosen.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I would like to have the members note is that this would not entail ability to vote on money by-laws. Money by-laws are satisfactorily covered under the Act and separate qualifications are laid down in The Municipal Act to vote on money by-laws. They are not considered as being part of a municipal election under the Act. They are held at the same time as municipal elections purely for the purposes of convenience. Under the Act the persons who would be qualified to vote on money by-laws are those entitled to vote, who can vote, at the municipal election with certain exceptions, those exceptions being tenants, farmers' sons, farmers' daughters and people of that type, so that even if this recommendation was accepted it would not mean that the people who could vote at the municipal election would be entitled to vote on money by-laws in any municipality.

I would like to just deal for a few moments with the advantages to such a move and with the disadvantages. The advantages, to me, appear to be fairly obvious. A measure of this kind is, firstly, an extension of the democratic processes of this Country. I think all of us are anxious to extend a democratic right to vote as far as it is humanly possible to do so. Secondly, a measure of this kind would encourage a sense of municipal responsibility on the part of people who were given such a franchise.

Thirdly, I think it would demonstrate the faith of this Assembly in the younger people of this Province. They are much more responsible that some of us are willing to admit. Fourthly, it would increase the representative character of the municipal government of this Province. So much for the changes that this would incur and so much for the advantages which appear to me to be fairly obvious.

I want to deal with the disadvantages, because those appear, at first glance, to be very important. I want to deal with them now. The first objection which is taken to a measure of this kind by municipal people is that younger people and whose who are not paying taxes have no "stake" in the community and that, consequently, they would not be participating in municipal elections. I want to say in that regard that this simply is not true. The municipal councils today are more and more dealing with issues that are not restricted to property questions, and are taking greater interests in problems which are far afield from purely property questions. Last year we had an excellent example in the Legislature where we assigned to municipalities the right to vote on the question of Sunday sports. That is not a property question, that is a moral question. One cannot decide a moral question on the basis of a property qualification to vote. So that, as I say, the argument that these people have no stake in the community and therefore should not vote, is not a valid one because of the fact that municipal councils in deciding questions do not have their basis in property considerations.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Are you suggesting that they should hold office also on that vote.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): It seems to me that if that is the wish of the people they should not be restricted. I honestly hope that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. G. H. Dunbar) will mention his views on this. I would be very interested in hearing them. At present I would not object to them holding office.

The second objection to a measure of this kind is that the people who would be given the vote are not taxpayers and consequently should not be allowed to inflict upon the people who do pay the taxes measures which those people might not be willing to assume. That is one of the large arguments that I have always heard used on this matter.

I want to say this, that that, again, is not really a valid argument, for two reasons: firstly, because the people in the cities and the towns who have rooms are just as much taxpayers as those who own the homes and who are tenants. As a matter of fact, in a large city people who rent rooms and pay rent are in many cases paying all of the taxes.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Because their rents are so high that they cover the taxes of the owner of the house, it is true they do not receive a tax bill and go down to the City Hall, or Town Hall and pay the taxes but they are indirectly taxpayers. They are very real taxpayers, nonetheless. I say that the argument that they do not pay taxes is really not a valid one when one begins to examine it. The second reason which does not support that argument

is that it is based on a fear of all municipalities that they are overloaded today with services that they are compelled to give to people in the municipalities and that they are afraid of any move which might increase their responsibilities. That is caused by the disproportion or lack of balance which exists between provincial responsibility and municipal responsibility within these spheres. It does seem to me that there is growing pressure in the Province for a reconsideration of those things which should be handled by the municipalities and those things which should be handled by the Province and that when that does take place a lot of the fear among our municipalities over being inflicted with increased responsibilities will disappear. I think that that fear is basic to the reluctance to allow more people to have the vote.

The other objection which is taken to a measure of this kind, the third objection, is that of residence. That is to say, that if we were merely to go out and to allow everyone who votes at provincial elections to vote at municipal elections, there would be cases where a person voting would be able to come into a town or a local area and elect a municipal government and then leave. I realize also that it is necessary in a measure of this kind to make protection against a situation like that arising. That is why I think that in drafting the amendments to the Act it would be necessary to clearly define what we mean by the words "ordinarily resident within the particular area." In the case of electoral districts the Act states it must be

2 months prior to the issuing of the Writ but in the case of towns and villages "ordinarily resident" would have to be incorporated--it may mean 4 months residence, it may mean 5 or 6 months, as it does in various parts of the United States--in order to get around the difficulty which could arise from a floating or transient vote coming in and disrupting government. Those are the things I want to put before the Assembly this afternoon.

It seems to me that this measure is a just, a democratic and an equitable step that should commend itself to an Assembly of this kind, that it would be a demonstration of faith in the younger people of the Province of Ontario. Certainly they are responsible enough and fit enough to shoulder a gun to fight in times of war and, if they are good enough to save the Country they are good enough to help to run it. It has been attempted in other parts of the United States and I believe the City of Winnipeg has inaugurated schemes of this kind.

I know the resolution as a resolution is not perfect. I did not intend it to be perfect. I think the principle is sound--that we should extend the democratic right to vote, with safeguards, and that people who can vote with respect to the Assembly should be entitled to vote in elections with respect to municipal government and should be given the privilege of participating in this very important level of government in this Province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) brought in this resolution last year. I was against it at that time and I am against it today. It has been a long debate in general, one which has been "booted around" for quite a while. Discussion can be had on both sides of the question. There is one argument which has been brought up and the hon. Member has brought it up very well, and I am glad to enlarge on that for just a few minutes. It happens in a lot of municipalities where a poll tax is paid the payer of that tax thinks that because he cannot vote it is taxation without representation. It is quite an argument in favour of the resolution that the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) has presented to this House. On the other hand, we must realize that those people who have the advantage have no real stake in the community. They are good people but they are here today and gone tomorrow. A municipal election is vastly different from a federal or provincial election in the fact that in the federal and provincial elections you are voting on issues on federal and/or provincial level. In municipal elections votes are cast with respect to matters having regard to the finances of the municipality alone involved.

May I use the City of Niagara Falls, as I did last year, as an example. In the course of a year, or say two or three years, we will have from three to six thousand outside people there. According to this resolution those people would have the right, through the vote, to tell the people of Niagara Falls what could happen. Unfortunately the turn-out at the polls in municipal elections is very small.

If I may use this point the Speaker used in regard to a vote on Sunday sports, up to the present time we have not been asked to vote on that question at all but suppose that vote was brought up and these 3,000 to 6,000 were to vote in favour of it, whereas if they were not there the majority of the people of Niagara Falls would be against it, they would control the vote and the result would be "yes". The majority of the taxpayers would be against it. I use that as a point only.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am definitely against this resolution. I think it would be a backward step, as far as the municipalities are concerned. Indeed, I may say would be an insult to the taxpayers who are now far overburdened with the taxes they have to pay to the municipality.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the hon. Member from Beaches (Mr. Scott) on his resolution.

I would like to point out first that the hon. Member, himself, says that the resolution is not the most perfect resolution. There are undoubtedly some things which probably should not be in it.

I would say, first of all, the greatest recommendation for this resolution would be to do away with the confusion which exists in the minds of [illegible] people in respect of voting

in federal elections, provincial elections and municipal elections. Apparently people who vote in provincial and municipal elections are informed they have not a vote and they do not understand why. That is a condition which exists. Definitely we, who are in municipal life, realize the day we can chart some municipal election machinery whereby the people are allowed to vote in all three levels of government it will be a day for which we can cheer and on which we can feel we have gone a long way towards removing the confusion, if nothing else.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

However, the argument that has been used against the right to extend the vote to other than taxpayers and tenants in our community is a well thrashed out argument, that is, that they do not have a stake in the community and I would like to point out to the hon. members of this house that municipal revenues are derived from three sources, they are derived from a taxation of property, from taxation of industry and taxation of commerce within the combines of a municipality. In the final analysis, therefore, these three mediums of revenue covers everybody that lives in the community whether he is a property owner or just a worker in the factory, he contributes to the municipal revenues and the community. Let it just be a worker in some plant who occupies a room, nevertheless, the room that he occupies is in a house that is taxed by the community and therefore he makes his contribution in that line. He patronizes the local stores, the butcher shop, the clothing store which are taxed by the community and through patronizing these stores he makes his contribution and also in that he works in an industrial plant which is taxed by the community. I say that the individual that now does not have the right to vote definitely makes a contribution to all our municipal treasurers and he definitely has rights that he today has not got representation for.

Now, in many places they collect a poll tax and as was pointed out, this is one of the most indiscriminate ways of taxing people, collecting a tax because they are single and other reasons and they tell them that they have not the right to participate in the community life

of the community to the extent that they cannot vote for councils. That is definitely not right. I think that the very fact that we say that the young people who are now under the age of 21 are not capable of being able to vote for councils, yet are capable of flying an aeroplane in times of war, a machine which would cost a couple of hundred thousands of dollars, is a great discrimination. I think these young people when they reach the age of 18, whether they own property or not, should have proper rights in the community and in the province and in the country. When that day comes, that is the day we start to build towards a greater and finer race of Canadians.

SOME hon MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The House took recess.

The House resumes.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about one group of people who have approached me on many occasions and they are sons and daughters living at home that are virtually supporting the home, they are paying the whole shot of maintaining that household in the city, and that includes, of course, payment of municipal taxes, but they have no choice in choosing the men to run the community. There is a surprising number in that category in every city and I have been approached by these young people on many occasions pointing out the unfairness, of it that they did completely support a household in the city and had no voice in choosing those who would administer the same. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) pointed out, how about a person holding office? In

reply, I would say that a person can own a piece of vacant property in the city assessed for $400.00 and live entirely outside of that city himself and still run for office, so I do not think it is a serious difficulty at all.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You do not think he should be denied that vote, do you?

MR. ROBINSON: Not under the circumstances.

MR. DUNBAR: What circumstances?

MR. ROBINSON: Well, if we are going to permit a man who owns a piece of vacant property assessed at $400.00 or more to seek the highest office in the city, I cannot see why we should deny that right to a person who by virtue of their peculiar circumstances may contribute far more to the city than he does has no right to contest it.

MR. DUNBAR: You are talking about holding office now. He has to live so many miles from that city or he is disqualified.

MR. ROBINSON: He could live outside the confines of the city, his household could be entirely there, free of any taxation to that city and still he could contest and hold the highest office in the city. When that situation exists I do not think it is a serious argument -- I think it is a serious argument that you should say any person who lives inside the city, inside the confines of our present Act, has no right to contest an office but still may contribute a great deal more to that community than the party we mentioned who has his household and all he owns outside the city.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

So I do feel that in principle there is a tremendous amount to be supported. There are some arguments on the other side, certainly. One of the points of course is residence, and I thought a residence rule could be laid down of sufficient duration that it would take care of any transient vote. If it was made five or six months, then anyone who had lived in a city that length of time certainly must have had some more than casual interest in the city and could not be classed as simply a transient resident.

One other point I think I should make is that there might be some difficulty in regard to the compilation of a list of voters. Just how that difficulty could be overcome, I do not know, however I do believe it can be overcome.

Before I sit down, the point I wish to make is that while it is not the simplest thing in the world to set such legislation up, it is much more democratic in principle than the legislation under which we are now operating. I know literally dozens---yes, it would run into hundreds---of cases in my own city where sons and daughters are virtually completely maintaining the household, right across the board, but they are living there as sons and daughters in the home and they have no say as to who shall administer the affairs of the city. That happens not in one case but in dozens and dozens of cases in one city, and I think these people deserve some consideration, as also should consideration be given to those who pay poll tax.

Therefore, while I realize there are some very important difficulties, in principle I think the motion is sound.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to cover a few points that have not been mentioned by previous speakers. I want to speak from my municipal experience during the war in public offices.

During the early part of the war and previous to the war, there was not the same housing shortage that there is today. There was a possibility, a reasonable possibility that a man could get a house as a separately assessed unit whereby he could rent that unit and exercise the same privileges as a taxpayer in that municipality. I know a lot of yo ng fellows who gave up their homes, the tenancy of their homesand went away to war, and on coming back four or five years later they found that all their houses were occupied and, unless they had the money to purchase a home, they had to go into rooms. In many cases these rooms were not separately assessed, therefore they could not get on the voters' list. The reason a lot of these roomers were not separately assessed was due to the fact the landlady or landlord did not give the correct information to the assessors because they were afraid the taxes might be boosted, when in effect all they did was to separately assess the building and give them extra water rates.

Another group of people who, twenty or twenty-five years ago possibly, were then in the prime of life, working and able to pay the rents, the rates which were established then, and also owing to the fact that there were lots of houses to rent---I am talking about people who now because of their diminished income, being old age pensioners, some of them people living o annuities, other types of pensioners, and widows, were perfectly good citizens in

those days when they could afford to pay the rental of the homes, but now because of their diminished income they are living in very crowded conditions, in single rooms in lots of instances, and they have been voting in municipal elections all their lives and they find it difficult to understand why today because of these regulations inside the municipalities they cannot vote. They feel it very strongly.

Regarding the argument raised by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), he says that five thousand or six thousand persons coming into a municipality, possibly only there for a short time, could command and direct---could tell the citizens of Niagara Falls exactly what they should do. Mr. Speaker, I have never found yet a group of people more than a dozen of whom you could tell how to vote, how to think and how to act on any one question. They just do not do it, they are human beings with minds of their own, and if they go into a municipality, I am sure they exercise the common sense which everyone is born with. They do not go in, as I say, in a solid body committed to one argument or to another on the other hand.

I think it would be a very good move if we could extend this principle of voting annually to more of our citizens. We preach a lot about democracy. When our younger citizens only get an opportunity to exercise a vote once every four or five years, they may through inexperience be more susceptible to the plea of demagogues. They have not had that same experience in using their common sense annually in electing people to office, and they would have more experience if they voted annually than they would when voting every four or five years.

AN hon. MEMBER: Are they any worse than those who now vote?

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add any new point to the discussion, but I would like to amplofy one or two points that have been made or touched upon.

I would like to remind hon. members of this House that we meet in the city of Toronto, and I would like to have them, if they will, reflect for a moment or two on the conditions in this banner city of the Province of Ontario. At the last municipal election, in spite of everything that could be done by a cooperative press in trying to get out a vote, in spite of the issues, in spite of a change in time of holding the municipal election, the fact remains that with all the urging and pleading for people to assume the responsibilities and to exercise the franchise as citizens, the city of Toronto could only get less than 50% of the people on the voters' list to participate in the municipal election. Now, that voters' list was possibly only two-thirds or possibly not two-thirds of what it ought to have been if it was to be representative of all the citizens.

I would suggest to hon. members of this House that our democratic process is in jeopardy, - it is in danger, and I believe it is in danger because the people are not being educated to participate in the democratic process.

I suggest that there is no better opportunity to educate than in the municipal level of government. I suggest further that if people are expected to assume responsibility in provincial and Federal elections ---

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): Three years later.

MR. MILLARD: Three or four years later, possibly, then surely they are qualified and have the degree of responsibility necessary to qualify them to participate in municipal elections.

Now, I am going to agree, Mr. Speaker, that there are a great number of problems concerning the municipal franchise and its exercise. I do not believe that considering the importance of this matter, those problems are insurmountable. I do not believe that there is anything to stop having a universal voters' list so far as provincial and municipal elections are concerned. As a matter of fact we do on many occasions in provincial elections adopt the last municipal voters' list, plus an additional group that are added. In many municipalities the municipal voters' list becomes the provincial voters' list for purposes of a provincial election.

I want to urge upon hon. members of this Legislature, and particularly on those on the government side, the importance of mending our ways. Let us look abroad for a few moments. We read in certain countries that when they hold an election, voluntarily, over 90% of the people participate in that election. It seems to me the reason the results are different in this country is because they have had more training, more experience in the thing that we are talking about here today. I want to plead with hon. members of this House that if we expect our children, our boys and girls, to grow up and partake of the rights of citizenship, then they ought also to be given the responsibilities of citizenship, as well. They ought to be given training in citizenship. They ought to appreciate that they have...I have heard it said in this

House already today that people without property have not got a stake in the municipality; well, for goodness sake, if they have not got a stake to that extent in the municipality,-that we can depend on them, surely we are going far afield to ask those same people to bear arms, to assume all the responsibilities, and to hazard their life for a municipality and for a country in which they have not got a stake sufficient to warrant having a vote.

I want to remind hon. members of the House that a man sat in the gallery of this House yesterday, coming from the constituency of York West. That man came to me during the war years, and he did not need to tell me the story, it was written on his face. Finally he was able to blurt out: "I had a telegram." Well, I knew what he meant. It was one of those telegrams that tells its own story even before you open it. Finally he said to me, calling me by my first name, "I am not worried or concerned because this sacrifice has been made. I am not crying about that. No," he said, "what concerns me is that this boy who died over North Africa, that we spent $26,000. to train for his position--he was there respected, honored, he was rated then as a hero," he said, "from the time that boy came out of school to the time that he enlisted and became a pilot, we couldn't find him a job in Canada."

That boy had no stake in this country, he could not amass any property, he could not own property, he could not get married, he could not have a family. We enlisted that man, we trained him, we made him a hero and he died for his country. Now, surely the time has arrived in this day and age when we are going to say

to our young people: "You are citizens, we want you at the age of 21 at least, to become full citizens. We want you to participate in the democratic process. The anomaly here is of course, that we allow a man to go out and vote, even to stand as a candidate for the Legislature--the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches), who introduced this Resolution, could stand as a candidate and be elected to this Legislature, but he could not even vote in a municipal election, let alone stand as a candidate. Yet we have hon. members of this House who would support the idea that he should not even have a vote or certainly should not stand as a candidate at a municipal level, but it is all right for him to be a candidate and to be elected to this Provincial Legislature, - to assume the responsibilities that such a position entails.

I plead with hon. members of this Legislature to treat this legislation on its merits, to turn over a new chapter, or a new page in the chapter of democracy in this province, and to hand the franchise to our young people from whom we demand so much, from whom we expect more and more both in the realm of industry, in the realm of science and in the realm of citizenship; let us be equal to the demands that we are making and the responsibilities we are placing on the young people today, and let us encourage them to become full citizens and to participate in the democratic process and to exercise their franchise at every opportunity, particularly on a yearly basis in a municipal election.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: I want to go on record as being solidly behind this Resolution and to urge every hon. member in

this Legislature to support it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I get the impression that up to this point what has been said has had but little if any effect on the government.

AN hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not think that the mind of my own good friend the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is open on this question.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): We listen to everything with an open mind.

AN hon. MEMBERS: Quite true.

MISS MacPHAIL: Open on both sides.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not expect I shall be able to pry it open.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I sometimes wonder how I lived so long and do not know the meaning of democracy. You people teach me the meaning of democracy.

AN hon. MEMBERS: That is not hard.

MR. MacLEOD: No, that is not true. Nobody in this House believes that. Nobody in this House would suggest for a moment that hon. members who sit on the government benches do not believe in democracy.

MISS MacPHAIL: Sometimes I am suspicious.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: What are you muttering about?

MR. MacLEOD: They do, and a lot of hon. members on the government benches fought for it, proved by the sacrifices they made that they believe in democracy, but again I do not believe hon. members who sit on the govern-

ment benches should feel that they and they alone are the custodians of democracy. Other people have opinions on this question as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are not discussing this important matter in the most favorable circumstances, and here I would like to admonish, if I may, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of Ontario. For two years now the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has moved a motion in this House calling for the setting up of a Select Committee of the Legislature to review and to revise and to amend the Election Act of the Province of Ontario, and of course such a Committee in the course of its deliberations would, I think, be within its terms of reference if it considered this matter and perhaps delved into some of the practical problems which attend a change of this kind.

The mover of the motion (Mr. Scott, Beaches) has pointed out that he recognizes that this motion is not perfect. It is a motion that embodies a principle, and it is recognized by him and by all of us that in its practical application we do encounter difficulties that require a lot of thought.

I am sorry that that Select Committee of the House did not meet in 1949 and did not meet in 1950. I say that because the experience that we had with a Select Committee of the House in 1944, when we amended the Election Act, proved just how valuable these Committees are. And I may say that a very valuable member of that Committee was no less a person than the present Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the former hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and other hon. members of this House sat on that Committee, and we brought in a very good Act, and it is too bad that

it never became the official Election Act of the Province of Ontario. Perhaps you will exhume it from the archives division and give us a chance to deal with it again.

(Take F follows)

I think we all agree that it would be much better if we were discussing this matter on the basis of a piece of Legislation introduced by the Government. This is perhaps not the appropriate way to deal with a matter of this kind. But the Government leaves no other alternatives.

This proposal should have come before us as a Government sponsored motion. But after eight years in office, they apparently have not gotten around to the point where they understand that the property limitation insofar as the right to vote is concerned, is obsolete; it belongs to another age; it belongs to the age of feudalism. It has no place whatever in a modern liberal democracy.

I can remember, as I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and other hon. Members of this House can remember, some very impassioned speeches by Sir John A. MacDonald, in which he nailed his colours to the mast of property, as far as the exercise of franchise is concerned. We have moved a long way since then, and I think it is about time that this Progressive Conservative Government recognized that we have to change with the times. My hon. friend, the Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), spoke of the several thousand people living in the City of Niagara Falls who, if they had a vote on the Sunday Sports' issue, might have carried the day. Similar arguments are advanced from time to time, to build up a case against what the hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) proposes. Well, I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

(Mr. Dunbar) this question; what is it that enhances the value of a piece of property in any community? Onviously, the number of people who live there. Why then should the right to vote not be given to a man whose property increases in value because a lot of other people live in the community? Why should these people not have the right to go the polls to cast a vote on election day?

An hon. Member: Unearned increment.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, unearned increment. My hon. friend, the hon. Member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) pointed out a year or two ago that we have examples in the City of Toronto, where a man, or a woman, not too blessed with intelligence, shall we way -- qho happens to have inherited a piece of property in ward 1, ward 3, ward 5, ward 7, or ward 9 -- because they own property in those wards, either one or all of them, are permitted to cast votes corresponding to the number of pieces of property they hold, if that property is located in a number of wards. On the other hand, a professor of biochemistry, or a professor of philosophy, or the moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, or the moderator of the United Church in Canada, who does not happen to own the required amount of property, is not permitted to vote at all. That is the situation. I say it is ridiculous.

I do not think there is anyone in this House who would more readily admit the absurdity of that situation than my friend, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

I do not think he would be prepared to defend a situation like that. I do not think he will get up and attack it in the House, but I think if he were sitting as a member of a committee and looking at this proposition in a practical, common sense manner, he would have a different opinion than he is likely to express here today.

I do not think the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) has any illusions about the vote on his resolution. It will go down, and will have as a companion on the executioner's block, the Bill which stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

But after you have rolled this over, and have flattened it, you will not have disposed of the issue, which will rise and rise again, and eventually when the hon. members of this Government have learned the facts of life, I have no doubt that they will come in the fullness of time --

MR. J. W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): I hope you are not referring to me.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I think, in the fullness of time, the Government will probably tackle this itself. Until that occurs, all that the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) and others can do is to keep on introducing motions and bills dealing with this matter until the Government has had a change of heart.

(Page F-6 follows)

I would make this final proposal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

I have never proposed anything to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that would lead him astray, so may I put this proposal to him; why do you not set up a Select Committee empowered to look into the Election Act and other matters, and when you move the motion and name the Committee, you put your hand on your heart, and assure the hon. Members of this House that the Committee will meet.

Since there is not going to be an election this year -- and I am so told by a very distinguished hon. Member of this House today -- why could not the Committee be set up, and this motion and other bills dealing with these matters be referred to that Committee? Give the House the assurance the Committee will have an opportunity of meeting to deliberate on these matters, and so far as I am concerned -- and I am sure as far as the hon. Members are concerned -- we would be prepared to pass this matter oh.

Is that not a common sense proposition?

I can hear the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) saying, "What good will it do any way, so what is the use?", but I make the proposal anyway.

MR. CALDER: For once I feel very keenly for the poor Government. As I understand the situation with regard to a private bill, we approach it on its merits, and so far the Government has not opened its mouth, and inferentially they have said: " We have closed our

minds", and are prepared to close yours too.

I am asking them to be consistent, and I may say that I will keep my mind open until the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has finished his smashing reply.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I would not expect to change your mind.

MR. CALDER: That is one of the great principles of democracy, that we be consistent.

My particular reason for rising is to report on Hansard the changed position I may take on this question, but because the hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck)- for whom I have great respect - has my support today, does not mean that I will vote with him in future years.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): When will you change your mind?

MR. CALDER: You have to consider this is a most attractive principle, and as far the words are concerned which so far have been spoken, this Act logically has as much for the resolution as against it. But what persuades me is my association with a group who know a great deal about this question, more than most of us who have spoken, and amongst whom I am honored to be numbered, and I am persuaded not only by their words, but by their character for the time being, that they are right.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I believe this Resolution is one of the most important resolutions which will be debated in this House this year, and I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Municipal

Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has not jumped into this debate ere now.

MR. DUNBAR: I never had a chance. I was getting up when you jumped up. I never had a chance.

MR. DENNISON: I will be glad to give way to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. DUNBAR: No, you go ahead.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to hear some arguments against this Resolution.

MR. PORTER: And reasons.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, arguments and reasons. It is not right to say that only property owners have a stake in a local municipality, because some property owners have very little [illegible], If you own property only worth $1.00 in a municipality, that gives you the right to vote in that municipality -

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, Sir. The owner can vote down to a small amount, but the tenant has to be a tenant in property worth at least $400.00, but there is no restriction on the owner, and an owner paying $1.00 in taxes, gets a vote, yet a person taxed under the poll tax - which I think is $10.00 in some localities - is denied a vote.

MR. Speaker, I believe the opportunity of extending the civic franchise to everyone over 21 years of age is but another expression of our belief in democracy. That is my opinion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: It may not be the opinion of the hon. Minister of Municipal Appairs (Mr. Dunbar), but I hope it is. I hope that today the hom. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will give the private hon. members on that side of the House - because, after all, the private members are not all on this side; every hon. member of this House outside of the Cabinet is a private member - and I hope the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will take the whip off and give a free vote on this matter and give the private hon. members on the opposite side a chance to prove that we have established a democracy in Ontario.

In feudal times, it was believed the common man did not have enough understanding of the issues to have a right to vote. Even in Ontario, up to 1838, the vote was not given to the common people and it was not until after 1838 that the right to vote in the Province of Ontario in provincial elections was given to everyone over 21 years of age.

Governor Bondhead -- I believe that was his name at the time -- was very violently opposed to extending the provincial franchise to people over 21. He said: They have no stake in the community; it is the property which pays the taxes, and these people have no right." I believe on one occasion he referred to the "low grovelling principles of democracy" with disdain, because he did not believe in

extending democracy.

Fortunately for Ontario, wiser people prevailed at a later date, and I was happy to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say the other evening at your dinner, Mr. Speaker, that had he lived in 1838"he would not have agreed with either Bondhead nor MacKenzie, but he would have taken a position in between," and I hope today that position will include the right to vote in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, democracy means a willingness to trust the common sense and judgment of the common man. In a dictatorship, the dictator has a fear of the common sense and judgment of the common man.

Democracy also means the willingness, when you are defeated at an election, to lay aside the reins of office, and turn the reins of office over to the person for whom the people have voted. In a dictatorship, where they do not believe in the principle of democracy, they never turn over the reins of office, because the dictator has a fear of the masses. He does not trust the masses, therefore he takes the vote away from them, or if he gives them a vote, they never give more than one name on the ballot paper, for whom to vote.

Personally, I cannot see the difference between a dictator who takes the vote away altogether, and the dictator who while giving them the right to vote, only permits one name on the ballot, that of the "stooge" for the dictator. In a way, they are really in the big majority.

I hope this House will remember that when Hitler over-ran France, and the Low Countries, the first thing he did was to take away the civic franchise; the first thing he did was to destroy the local municipal governments.

I have a clipping dated March 20th, 1949, which says, "Local franchise in Poland wiped out". And we are told that the Polish government tried to create their administration along Russian lines.

Surely, this resolution goes to the very root of the situation, and it is a more important piece of legislation than anything else this Session, and it will give a chance to demonstrate to the people who believe we should destroy democracy, that we in the Province of Ontario still believe in it enough to take the first step forward in regard to the great job the Reformers started in 1838.

I would like to quote now from a statement by Mr. Drew himself in support of my position.

A number of years ago there was a Resolution introduced in this House, and Mr. Drew, who was the Prime Minister at that time, said,

> "Insofar as any change of this kind is concerned, the Government is not opposed to this or any other statutory provision on the basis of limiting the power to vote, and I could not be more vigorous in my support than I am on the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Fort William

(Mr. Anderson). I would like to see everybody take an interest in our affairs, and have the right to vote given to more people, because the more who have the right to vote, the more there is a chance of keeping down the menace of communism."

That was the opinion of Mr. Drew, in 1948-1949, and I trust the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) shares his opinion, and I trust he will take a step forward farther than his predecessor, and wil implement that opinion, and assist us in passing this Resolution this afternoon.

I would like to point out that a way back, 31 years ago, on April 15th, 1920, this Legislature also adopted a resolution somewhat similar to the resolution before us this afternoon.

At that time we had a farmer-labor government in power in Ontario, and there was a Bill before this House extending the right to vote to farmers' sons and daughters, and they told the Opposition of that day: - If you like, we will extend this right to vote to everyone". And the Opposition asked -- as I am asking this afternoon -- to have an open vote on the matter, and all sides of the House voted, regardless of party lines, and the Resolution to give the franchise to farmers' sons and daughters passed in 1920, and for 31 years in the Province of Ontario, farmers' sons and daughters have voted in civic and municipal elections.

Now, I will refer to a man who later became quite a Conservative supporter, Mr. Karl Homouth, who proposed a Bill that would establish the principle of "one man, one vote". He made nearly a half-hour speech on it, and it almost carried, only being defeated 33 to 28.

Also a Mr. McBride, another supporter of the party opposite, introduced a Bill that it is the tenants who pay taxes, therefore the tenants should vote.

Let me tell the Government this; that one of the hon. Prime Ministers of Britain, William Gladstone, at one time, did not have the right to vote in civic elections. Another hon. Prime Minister in Great Britain Prime Minister Bright, at one time was denied the right to vote in civic elections, but today, Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and some others have taken steps to rectify that injustice, and today in every other part of the British Empire, if you pay anything toward your parents, even though it is only two or three dollars a week, you have the right to vote, and single people who are paying a room rent of $2.00 a week, have the right to vote. Why should this part of the Empire remain in feudal times, while the other parts are going ahead?

Let me tell you how popular this is. In 1940, in Winnipeg there was a referendum taken of property owners and tenants, and the question was: "Shall the civic franchise be extended to everyone over 21 years of age?" And the property owners voted two to one in favour of extending the civic franchise, and today in Winnipeg they enjoy complete civic democracy.

Let us not quibble about this thing.

The hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) told us about that. Let us vote on the principle of this thing, the principle of justice.

In the great democracy to the South, in the United States of America, they do not question the right of everyone to vote in civic elections, and various other elections, and if any hon. Member in this House fears it will interfere with free enterprise, let me say that it has never interfered with free enterprise in the United States, and I do not know anywhere where there is more free enterprise than in the country to the south of us. I do not see any danger of anything like that happening; no revolution will take place if anything like that is done.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

Finally, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in a great many cities, and in this city, there are landlords today earning their entire living out of letting rooms. Up in South Rosedale and the Hill district here in Toronto, many landlords make their entire living out of letting rooms. In other words, the tenants of those properties pay the entire taxes. They pay for the property in a mighty short time as well, on top of the taxes and yet we tell them, "Unfortunately, you have not a stake in the community and you have not the right to vote." In closing, I want to appeal to the Prime Minister not to confuse this issue, not to drag extraneous problems into this issue. It is a simple issue, and we would like to keep it a simple issue, just as it has been put before us in the resolution.

MISS A. McPHAIL (York East): If it is a simple issue, I think I should speak on it.

A few years ago, I was living up in the Hill district, and I had a house -- it was the only one I could get -- which was much too large and I had in that house with me, in addition to some relatives, a teacher in the High School in Forst Hill Village, the President of the Builders' Association of the Province of Ontario and a man who was doing very well indeed in an insurance company, but, due to the circumstances of the moment, they were not home owners, they were not property owners and I can remember how shocked I was when the municipal vote came on that these three persons had no vote. Three very competent people who vote in any other election. They were very intelligent, they were

very responsible, yet I was the only person in that house who had a vote because I was the person renting the property at the moment. It seemed to me ridiculous. It seems to me just like that yet.

I just want to make one other point, Mr. Speaker, and that is in reducing the age from 21 to 18 I think we will find youth will respond to responsibility. I think one of the things they need is responsibility. I always think when I go to a collegiate commencement that those people who are graduating, receiving matriculation, are no longer boys and girls, they are men and women and they should have the responsibility of men and women. They are competent, they are educated and they would like to have responsibility. I think if the municipalities gave youth responsibility in voting and in various other ways, drew the youth of the country into community responsibilities, it would be a very good thing. It would be very good for the youth of the country, it would be very good for the community.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I will have very much to say after all I have listened to, some of it very interesting, and we have travelled a considerable distance. We have been told what kind of government they have in the other countries, how they were turning out the vote, but I am wondering whether with this government they have any better countries than our country and if the municipalities are better controlled.

In the sixteen years of existence of the Department of Municipal Affairs--Ilooked through the records and my Deputy looked through the records--and there was not one request for such a change. Is it not strange that we would not have one recuest from some municipality. Here we have the Mayor of a municipality, is he sending to the Department of Municipal Affairs of the Government to have this changed. Not one municipality of the 954 made a request. There might be from an individual but not from the municipality.

When I listened to the hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) first, I really thought, until he came down to the end of his speech, that he had something in that Resolution but then he admitted that it would need some alterations or changes, that it was not perfect, but he asks you in that Resolution to accept this, the same as in a municipal election, that two months is sufficient to establish residence there and that in a larger municipality where enumeration is taken, that when the election would be declared, any person living there in a hotel, or any place else in the municipality would have a vote in the municipality. He went further, he said they would not only grant them a vote, they could run for office in that municipality. So that means if I am down at the Royal York or any other hotel, that I had been there for sixty days, I would be eligible to run for office in the City of Toronto.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): It would be better than what they have in there now.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Here in Toronto we have a $59 million budget and you would ask a man who dropped into town to say who was going to represent the ratepayers and the people who make up that money. You would ask them to vote that man into office. Here we have a $59 million budget and those men would not have a cents worth of property, have no assessment at all. Those men would say who was going to be controller, who were going to be aldermen in this great, fine City of Toronto. Some of the speakers here to-day cast a little reflection, I think, on the calibre of the men who are in public office in the municipalities throughout this Province, but in my experience, you find some of the finest men in public office, and, taking them by and large they are at least equal to what you have in this House, the Federal House or any other Government in the Country. Municipal government is well run in the Province of Ontario by intelligent and sincere people.

MR. A.A. McLEOD (Bellwoods): Who said anything to the contrary.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Did you have one turn at this? I thought you said my mind is made up. Now you will not give me a chance to say anything.

I often wonder, when I hear you talk about democracy, as I said before, how I got along in the world at all if there was so little democracy. But, nevertheless, I had a position. You are a school teacher my hon. friend. I was a school teacher also and I will take you to the City of

Ottawa, and if you will take me to where you were teaching school and see if my reputation as a teacher is not just as good as yours--and you cast reflection about democracy and the people you meet. Now, you may clap your chest, because no person else in this Country will. You may clap your own chest; there is not any person I have ever met who will. That is what they think of you. In the second place, the hon. Member from Beaches (Mr. Scott) said one man one vote. Does he mean to say in a city like the City of Toronto, where they have the ward system, or in any other city or town with the ward system if I own a home in the North part of Toronto and there was an alderman running named McLaughlin in North Toronto and I own another property down here and the other man's name was Fisher, they are not in the same section at all, they are entirely different, having a separate voters' list. Why should I note vote for two aldermen? I cannot vote twice for Mayor or twice for Board of Control. And you talk about democracy when you say a man owrs property in two, three or four wards as the case may be and you deny him the right to vote.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): How about fifteen wards?

Hon, G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Surely---

MR. R. DENNISON (St. David): Surely not.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. Member from Bellwoods (Mr. McLeod) made a mistake in his reference to Snake Lake. It was Snake River he meant. That is a place we all know well enough.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Are you in favour of that applying to the Province?

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): From which side are you talking? There is not much argument. You say my mind is made up. Yes, my mind is made up, after listening to the mover of this resolution when he said he was not certain, he knew it was not sound, that there had to be changes made. He was not the only hon. member who said that there had to be changes made. Several other hon. members said there would have to be changes. They knew it was difficult to administer and they felt that there should be changes. There is a resolution before the House which should be presented in such a way that no further changes will be required.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Let some of your Bills come in.

SOME hon. MEMBER: You just passed a Bill with respect to Workmen's Compensation, after last year.

MR. C.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Have your ears cleaned out a bit.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. Member is mumbling. I do not know whether it is in my favour or opposed to me--and little do I care.

(Page G-7 follows)

The difference in people voting in a Provincial election and a Federal election is that they have a deeper interest in a Provincial election because they are taxed for what is being carried on throughout the Province. No matter where or what the work is they are performing, are taxed in some way or other. But, in a municipality they are not. They have the privilege of the use of the sidewalks, the parks, the recreational centres, everything that the other people are enjoying---and no person is saying they should not---but at the same time the ratepayers have paid for these things out of their good, hard earnings.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): And the Province pays for it.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes, and the Province pays for it. And, do not forget at this particular time municipalities are crying pretty loudly that they are pressed as property owners. We have heard it in this House and we will hear it again, about the home owners. You are going to say here today, if this resolution passes, that people you would call transients should have a vote.

To give an example, down in Wylie Township, above Pembroke, at Deux Rivieres, where the big Hydro project, the Des Joachims power dam is being built, if every person who had been sixty days at the Des Joachims camp had voted, the township people might just as well have sat at home. They would have no say whatsoever. The workers at the project could elect their own council, run the township and put on their coats and hats and walk out the next day, or as soon as the work was completed.

S SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. Member from Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) who was a Minister at one time put his finger right on the button when he said what the resolution meant with respect to Niagara Falls, that it would take away entirely the value of the municipal franchises for the people who have built up that fine city. Those people who had come in for two or three years would just upset the situation there entirely. I do not know; you people may have a lot of representations. I may have, also. You take the Farmers Government. They did do something worthwhile.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes; certainly; they cut down the qualifications.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Did that let you in?

MR. DUNBAR: The property qualifications for a councillor were reduced in 1922 from: 1. In a village, if freehold, $200; or if leasehold, $400; 2. In a township, if freehold $400; or if leasehold, $800; 3. In a town, if freehold, $600; or if leasehold, $1200; 4. In a city, if freehold, $1000; or if leasehold, $2000; --- or if in unorganized territory--- 5. In a township, except at the first election, if freehold, $100; or if leasehold, $200; 6. In a city or town, if freehold, $400; and if leasehold, $800,--- to be the same as the qualifications for an elector of $100, $200, $300 and $400.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Where does the bee man come from? Someone made reference to the man who owned a piece of land which was worth one dollar, who voted.

What book did you find that in? You said that last year. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will remember in the debate on this in previous years--either last year or the previous year--he made the statement that he did not know, there was no restriction on the property owner, he got a vote no matter how small his property was. The only person who was restricted by the $400 assessment was the tenant. That was the statement which I took of his. I understand the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is usually pretty accurate when he comes to details of municipal matters.

MR. DUNBAR: It was an assessment of $100; not one dollar. You were not far out; I thank you for saying that I am pretty accurate. You are fairly accurate there, too; you are just out 99%. Of course, some people will say the Municipal Act is old. All these Acts are old, out of date in every way, but do not forget they have been improved and built on by the different governments, Amendments were made to them by this House. It did not matter what government was in power, the people who laid the foundation for The Municipal Act laid it in such a way that it could be built on and be sound, sane Act, after all.

So, therefore, we do not just want, without serious consideration and thought to knock one of the stones out of the foundation of the Municipal Act and wreck the whole structure.

MR. R. H. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, just a few words in closing the debate. I want to say how very disappointed I am that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

(Mr. Dunbar), the only government person who has spoken on the Bill, has turned the debate into a funny

(page G-10 follows)

laughing session. I brought forward this resolution in complete good faith that it would receive serious consideration from the government and in my speech I was prepared to be careful not to bring political antagonisms of any kind into the matter, because I feel very deeply on this subject.

(Take H follows)

MR. DUNBAR: We appreciate that, too.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): I felt this was a just and equitable extension to make. I have not heard any arguments from hon. members of the House that cannot be overcome with sensible legislation. Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has levelled as his main criticism of my position that I mentioned towards the end of my speech some changes might be necessary. I thought I had pointed out very clearly that the legal power to make these changes is right in the Act now, that all it requires is a legal definition of what you mean by "ordinary resident". I am not advocating in my resolution something that is only half there, something that will need other improvements, the legal power is in the resolution and in the municipal Act.

As I said, I am terribly sorry it has not received the sincerest consideration. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has said there have been no requests for a measure of this kind. That may be perfectly true but I am asking you to give leadership in this important field and not to wait until someone comes and asks you for things of this kind. You have brought up the argument of taxation. Now, again I submit that the people who live in our cities and pay rent, who buy from our stores and work in our plants are honest, tax-paying citizens.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): However, apparently, Mr. Speaker, the resolution will not carry. You have supported the idea of a vote in each of the nine wards if you own property there. I oppose it, I say it is not a

democratic procedure. There is one tax passed by one council, it is a city council that passes it. I cannot see the justification for nine votes if you own property in nine wards. I want to submit again, if ever there was a resolution before this Legislature in the three years I have been here that was an honest attempt to extend democracy, then it is this resolution. I am not pretending that we do not have to make a few regulations in the Act, I admit that may be necessary but it is a democratic extension of the franchise, it is something that is perfectly justified, it is something that will demonstrate a faith in the younger people of this Province and I am asking the government to give leadership upon it and support the principle this afternoon.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, could I make this suggestion? Perhaps we cannot deal with this at this moment because the division bells are ringing but that hereafter in these private members' Bills that instead of having the division at the conclusion of the debate that the division be postponed to just before adjournment time when we perhaps could hold divisions on a number of bills and save time. I leave that with the hon. opposition members to determine. In other words, as in this case now, instead of having the division at this moment, that the division be had at ten minutes to six when divisions may be held on a number of Bills at that time. It would save time and I suggest to the hon. members that consideration be given to that.

Motion Negatived on Division:

AYES 20

NAYES 58

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned, the defeat of this motion would technically carry with it Bill number 47 which stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of extending to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) the sympathy of the hon. members of this House in the bereavement which he has suffered. We regret very greatly that he is not here today because of the death of his sister, Dr. Bertha Willinsky who was a very well known physician and who passed away the other day. We extend our sympathy to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in his loss and we regret that circumstances have been such that he has not been able to be here today to speak on this particular motion which involved the subject matter of his Bill.

The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has introduced this Bill on a number of occasions since 1944. Our position, Mr. Speaker, is this, that under all the circumstances the business of the House must go on and it is with regret that I call for the discharge of the order in the absence of the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg). The terms of his Bill are almost identical with the Resolution moved by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) with the exception that the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) has added to his resolution that no person would be entitled to more than one vote. That, I admit, is missing from Bill number 47 in the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). But, Mr. Speaker, that does not deprive the hon. member for St.

St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) from speaking on this matter because he, of course, as can any other hon. member, mention the matter in the Throne debate later if he so desires. I would move, Mr. Speaker, the discharge of order number 3 under Public Bills and Orders covering Bill number 47.

MR. E . B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, We desire to be associated with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in extending sympathy to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and we regret that he is not here today.

With reference to the motion the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has made, if the situation were somewhat different I might be a little dubious about the propriety of it on this point. That is to say, if I felt that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) was being deprived of an opportunity to speak on the subject I might perhaps argue the rights of the minority in connection with this matter. On the other hand, the Throne speech debate continues in this House, I do not believe the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has spoken in that debate and if the understanding is that he will not be challenged or called to order if he wants to speak on this subject, I think no harm is done and no right of his of any substance has been lost, much though we regret the circumstances.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would be the last person to suggest that the business

of the House should not proceed even though he is unable to be here today. I am sure he will appreciate very much the sentiments expressed by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). As to the point made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would be permitted to deal with this matter when he makes his contribution to the Throne speech debate, I would point out, of course, that he is not permitted to do that under the rules of the House. The rules are very explicit on that point and he could not deal with this matter even if he was desirous of doing so. I do not know whether he will or not. He might very well feel that everything that could usefully be said on this subject has been already expressed by those who have spoken in the debate, but if he should raise this matter, he could only proceed with a special dispensation from yourself, Mr. Speaker, because he may quite properly be challenged under the rules of the House for referring to a matter on which the House has already passed judgment. However, if you, Mr. Speaker, are disposed to grant him that right, if the circumstances should arise, I am sure he would be very grateful for a special dispensation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I can say on behalf of hon. members in this group that there will be no objection, whatever the rule may be. If the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) desires to refer to this subject when speaking on the Throne debate, there will be no objection from this source.

MR. FROST: If the hon.member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) wants to raise that subject again we are satisfied, there will be no objection.

Bill discharged.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number one.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, second reading Bill number 36 "An Act to Amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act", Mr. Thornberry.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton, Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 36, "An Act to Amend the Hours of Workand Vacations with Pay Act".

MR. RROST: Mr. Speaker, may I just suggest this to the hon. members. We are rather finding our way on this problem and I see there are five Bills covering this subject matter. They are all different in some particular and, therefore, I think that in that case we will have to call the Bills separately. It would appear to me, we will have to call them all separately. Might I suggest that perhaps the sponsor of the Bill, and perhaps an hon. member from each of the opposition groups if they want to speak, with the government reply would be sufficient, That ought to cover the situation, with five separate Bills. I will call them all in order and I think that will meet the situation. unless if there is some unusual point that comes up. The five Bills which would probably take an hour each, that means five hours which is very precious

time when we are trying to cover the number of subjects we are trying to cover. I would, therefore, make that suggestion, inasmuch as in a case like this before us, we have no rule as to the length of speeches.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, in giving some reasons why this Bill should receive the unanimous support of the House, it is evident from the reading matter of the Bill that everybody would be in favor of it. It explains itself.

We can go back down through the years and cover the long agitation that there has been in order to reach the status where the eight-hour day was legal -- from 12 to 10 to 9 to 8, down through the years. The labor movement generally had achieved the eight-hour day long before it became a matter of law in this Province. It only became a matter of law in 1944, during the first Session of the 21st Parliament here at that time. In that respect the government was much behind both public opinion and the labor movement. The same thing probably exists now with relation to this particular amendment, where it will make legal a 40-hour work week and a five-day work week; also provision is made for eight hours overtime, or limits it to 50 in one year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reasons for a 40-hour week are quite similar to those which were valid for a 48-hour week, and I can quote from people who are champions of free enterprise, like Henry Ford and Mr. Charles Luckman, former President of the Lever Brothers Company. Mr. Luckman said:

> " I look forward to the growth of another national insight, namely that there is nothing particularly sacred about a 40-hour week. Business exists in order that people live. People do not live in

order that business may exist. Now, in good living, leisure for recreation and self-improvement is a most powerful stimulant to increased business."

I think that would tie in, Mr. Speaker, with the statement by Lord Tweedsmuir when he was Governor-General of Canada, when he said:

" People must have leisure time in order to acquire culture, and without leisure time working people become nothing more nor less than slaves doing the chores of everyday life."

At the present time almost half the workers in industry, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, are working the 40-hour week. This amendment to The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act would stimulate the workers in industry in which the employer is reluctant to give them those concessions in their agreements, or in those few industries where labor is not particularly organized.

I would also like to quote Henry Ford, who said:

"Both wages and profits have a broad social effect in sustaining consumption, and consumption sustains industry. If the wage link in the chain be weak, the chain will break and the whole machine will stop. Taking the industrial picture as a whole and from the impersonal viewpoint, the only employment which matters is that at high wages, and we shall have to learn the distinction between leisure and unemployment. We have accustomed

ourselves to thinking of a man without work as a man without support because in the past there has never been any margin of wages to finance leisure. When men commonly worked 10 to 12 hours a day and a concern went on the eight-hour day only during slack seasons, that meant a loss all around. Now the eight-hour day is nearly standard and men have more than when they labored longer and earned less."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that argument would sum up the argument for this particular amendment, and I recommend it to the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J.L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): What is this, a game of musical chairs?

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): I presume that this is closing the debate, Mr. Speaker?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

An hon. MEMBER: Are you not in favor of it?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Unless there is someone else who wants to speak.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) want to wait till later?

MR. DALEY: Yes, I would like to do that.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two points I would like to add to what has been said by the hon. Member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry).

The position of the 40-hour week as a practical measure has been advanced materially in the past year.

The judgment of Mr. Justice Kellock in the railway case in which he found in favor of the 40-hour week for railroad workers, demonstrates the growing understanding of the need for the shorter work week. When that judgment becomes effective, on June 1st I believe it is, it will have the effect of bringing a tremendous number of Canadian and Ontario workers onto the 40-hour work week level, and it will reduce still further the numbers of workers who are working beyond 40 hours.

Now, I appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) on this ground. There has been a tremendous increase in productivity by industry in this country in the last few years, and the reduction of hours is one of the methods by which labor shares in that increase productivity.

One of the most interesting findings in the report of the Royal Commission on Prices is to be found at page 38 of that Report, in which they say:

"The quantity of output was 80% above 1939 level." That will not necessarily reveal that the individual worker's output is up, except where we note that there has not been an 80% increase in workers in industry. Therefore, there has been a material increase in output per man as well as in the total quantity that has been produced.

There are not very many reliable figures in Canada about productivity as such. There have been no figures developed, as far as I know, by our own Dominion Bureau of Statistics. As a matter of fact, it is a study the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) might consider instituting in his department one of these days. However, there have

been studies done in the United States and I think it is possible to draw comparisons between industrial developments in the United States and in industrial developments here. There has been a variance from industry to industry in the output per worker per hour, but in almost all industry there has been an increase. In some of them the increase in the last ten years has been as much as 100%. So that within the 40-hour work week, workers are now able to produce more than they produced in the 48-hours when the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) introduced that into the Legislature in 1944.

I think a study would show that with a 40-hour work week today, we can produce more than we could in the 48-hour work week when the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) introduced that Bill in 1944.

AN hon. MEMBER: What about modern machines?

MR. PARK: We have developed that far in the productivity of our country, and I think we have to take cognizance of that development and permit the workers to share in this increased productivity.

Now, I know an argument that will be advanced -- I can almost see it in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) face, he is going to tell us this is not the time to do it; that we have a national emergency on our hands; or just about a national emergency; and that this is not the time. Well, let me just meet that argument before my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) begins.

In the United States the statutory 40-hour work week was in effect during almost the entire time of the war, as my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) knows. They got down to 40

hours in a series of stages in the United States. There was a 40-hour work week enacted, and it provided that over a period of years industry was compelled to reduce the work week year by year until eventually they got down to a 40-hour work week. The industries of the United States operated during the last war under a 40-hour work week law, and no one can suggest that American industry did not produce a great deal of material for the war. Therefore, I think that is the answer to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) notes. I hope that he will agree that we in Canada ought not longer to lag behind in this question, and that we as the leading industrial province in the Dominion of Canada will take the lead. It is from here that leadership in industrial matters and labor matters ought to come. We are the premier province of the country, and I think we ought to indicate that we are prepared to establish the best possible working conditions, the best possible hours of work for our people.

There is a great deal more that could be said, Mr. Speaker, but I do not wish to prolong the debate or to delay the House longer. I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), however, to give very serious consideration to this proposal.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say one or two words regarding the amending Bill that is before us, that is, that there is another very important consideration. It has been proved beyond any shadow of a doubt now that long hours not only spell low wages, but inefficiency on the part of the management as well.

We have found as a matter of experience that when hours are reduced, efficiency increases.

Now, when you add power and up-to-date modern production machinery into our industrial plant today, it is very important that you get the most out of it. That means in some cases the optimum of speed and efficiency, during the hours that that plant is working, or that machinery is being pushed by power provided.

Today workers are not able to keep up the high speed. I think medical authorities will agree, particularly those who are dealing in the question of industrial hygiene will agree that longer hours is too fatiguing, too hard on the nervous system, and that gradually your production and your efficiency drop with the longer hours.

I want to say further that our people in Ontario and in Canada generally paid a terrible price throughout the last war. In order to get production in the steel mills, as an example, at the rates of pay that then existed, it was necessary for men to work, not 48 hours, but 56 hours, seven shifts a week, -- seven days a week, and we found out at the end of the war, when we were able to get the reduction with the cooperation of management down to eight hours a day and the 48-hour week, we found, if you please, in one steel mill in particular that we were able to reduce the working force by 10½% and increase the production 12½% at one and the same time, with the reduction of hours. We reduced the working force and we increased production at one and the same time. We had almost a 25% change in the production picture, at the same time that we reduced the hours from 56 down to a maximum of 48.

Now we have had another opportunity of further reducing hours and we find that production is going up in steel and in other branches of the industry. I want to say again that we paid a terrible price; we had men engaged in exactly the same operation within five miles of the limits of Canada, at border points, doing exactly the same job, and when they worked 56 hours, as sometimes was necessary because of shortage of certain groups in the steel industry, they took home in their pay envelope almost twice the amount of money that we did in Canada because we did not have either the 48-hour or the 40-hour work week at that time. Now that meant a considerable difference to our people all along the line, and there is one point here that I want to emphasize, because it is a point that affects certain departments of our government and a certain very important industry. I believe that if we are going to continue in a war-type economy, if not a war-time economy, that the number of visitors that will participate in our tourist accommodation over the next few years may be considerably decreased if we have to depend on the flow of tourist traffic from the United States. It is urgently required that if our people are going to have the advantages that are here for them, they must have time on weekends and vacation periods to enjoy those advantages, to recreate their strength and to participate at high speed in our production processes.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

So I want, Mr. Speaker, to urge a consideration for this particular amending piece of legislation here, and not to have it dismissed lightly. I am quite sure the government will not dismiss it lightly, but I am equally sure that the government may feel strongly that, particularly at a time like this, as was indicated by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell) that this is not the time to reduce the hours of work, or the maximum hours of work without overtime.

I want to suggest very strongly that I believe that is a mistaken approach. That by the reduction of hours, keeping our plants working on a uniform hours, you will force management to become more efficient, to improve their plant equipment, and to utilize our power to the best advantage through the hours of work. Then, when you have that efficiency, if it is required to work overtime, to increase the production, and if there are the number of people available to put in extra shifts, then you have an increased plant and equipment, and efficient processes of operation. But as long as management -- and this is found to be true in the past -- can depend on long hours of work and low wages, and, therefore less than modern equipment in many cases, you find there is not that effort put forward and keep the efficiency which is required in this day, and it might become a very serious matter.

So I say that for this and other reasons we should consider very seriously today this question of putting a ceiling on power, so far as the regular work week is concerned, of [illegible] days and 40 hours, in order that

we can ensure the highest possible efficiency in our plants, and in our management.

Then we are in a position, if we need to put on extra shifts, and so on, to get the most out of our production facilities. And it may become very necessary, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite, to get the most. We may be taxed to the utmost, and, therefore, I urge uniformity. In the name of efficiency, I urge we get uniformity with our people to the south. We are close together; we have the same labor organizations; management is using the same formula practically, and the same industrial processes, and why should we not have equal treatment in regard to the hours? I am quite sure it will pay dividends in the long run to have a uniformity in the reduction of hours brought about at the present time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G.T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the House what might happen, for instance, with the local transportation in Brantford, if the 40-hour week is brought in, and affected that system.

In the past year, the system, which is owned by the citizens of Brantford, had a deficit of over $30,000., and if the 40-hour week were brought in it would mean we would have a deficit of over $50,000., and we could not increase our revenue, we would have no more car riders, and that would mean either an increase in fares, or a decrease in service.

What would happen if we brought in the 48-hour

week, at the present time?

MR. J.L. DOWLING (Hamilton, East): Mr. Speaker, the only reason I want to say one or two things about the 48-hour week as compared with the 40-hour week, is that we have been receiving through the mails periodicals from the Department of Lands of Forests, the Department of Travel and Publicity, and so forth, talking about enjoying our picnic grounds, within a few hours drive from our homes.

Now, operating 48 hours a week, means they have to work six days a week, and the only time left for relaxation is on Sunday, and those people who are Christian enough to want to go to church, have to sacrifice going up to the picnic grounds and enjoying a weekend, and stay at home. If you give them a 40-hour week, it gives them the opportunity of taking care of both of these responsibilities.

I can give you a good example of industry going from 48 hours to 40 hours, where last year when unemployment was serious, we had the case of a factory in Hamilton with 170 employees, reducing its hours from nine to eight hours per day, and then they employed 16 new employees. If that took place in every plant in Hamilton which operates on a 45 or 48-hour week, there would be no unemployment in the city of Hamilton. I have seen facts and figures where production increases and efficiency increases were brought about, yes, and increased profits, if you want to put it that way.

All we ask is a 40-hour week, with time and one-half for overtime. May I say to the hon. members

opposite, that if you have employees working for you, would you not want to work only 40 hours a week, and have two days a week to enjoy the society of their families, and to go to the picnic grounds, for instance, and to get some benefit from the money we are spending on highways? If you go down along the Queen Elizabeth Way, and cross the Beach, nine out of every ten cars you see crossing the Beach are American cars; they are not Canadian cars.

I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to consider it in that light. It will relieve unemployment; it will enhance production, and at the same time give the man in industry a chance to enjoy a few more leisure hours.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, in replying to and taking part in this debate, I would say that the attitude of this government has been well known for a long period of time, inasmuch as we have always believed in the shortening of the hours. I think I can honestly say that I, personally, and the members of my staff, a great many more times, have assisted in the negotiations for shortening the hours.

When the hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act was passed in 1944, a careful study was made, which indicated that the hours of employment ranged all the way from 84 down to 40. And the reason for passing the Act by this Legislature was to reduce the hours to 48 or less, which gave organizations, through collective bargaining, an opportunity to negotiate not from 84 hours down but from 48 hours down. And we have done a good job in that

I said here some three years ago, if I recall, that the trend was downward, and I think that still holds true. The 40-hour week might have been here before this, had it not been for the fact that industry in this province in the last number of years has been increasing, rather than decreasing. Industrially, we have been growing at a tremendous rate.

Similarily, research indicated with regard to holidays with pay that there had been a basis of one week's holidays with pay established by negotiations with organizations of labor, with the exception of the construction industry, which became included in the Act, and brought thousands of construction workers a week's holidays with pay who up to that time had not enjoyed any holiday with pay at all.

Now, the government puts forward the idea that it would be reasonable to establish outside limits, and that is what we have d one for the industry -- 48 hours. There is an opportunity, under permit, to work an additional two hours per week, or 100 hours per year, and -- I might as well express this now, Mr. Speaker -- requests have increased for permits; they are coming in more and more, and I must say that I have great difficulty in refusing them under the circumstances, considering the necessity for production facing us today. They are piling up. There are more requests for additional overtime work now than ever before.

Now, it has always been a maxim of the trade unions that it desires to bargain for their own people. That is an established fact -- collective bargaining.

That is what the trade unions do. That is their right, and that is what they are really in business for.

Now, do the trade unions in this country want everything set up by legislation in this Legislature? I do not believe they do. I was interested in reading about some discussions where the advocates of legislation, and the advocates of labor's objectives took place, and I see here "Labor delegates clash on official coddling". That appeared in the Globe and Mail of Saturday, January 13th, 1951, where appears a report of the meeting of the Ontario Provincial Federation of Labor opened its annual meeting at the Royal York Hotel. This says:

"Advocates of legislation to advance Labor's objectives, clashed with those who fear government coddling may legislate the trade unions out of business, as the Ontario Provincial Federation of Labor (AFL-TLS) opened its annual meeting yesterday at the Royal York Hotel.

This fundamental difference in the means proposed by Labor to win gains from employers followed a general line of division. Older, more strongly entrenched unions favored using their economic strength, while the younger, less powerful groups sought legislation.

The vigorous debate on the question stemmed from a resolution in which the Hamilton Street Railway Union asked for a law to limit the work week for motormen and conductors to a five-day, 40-hour week. Non-concurrence in the union's request was recommended by the resolutions

committee on the ground that it would lead to too much legislation. The resolution was finally sent back for reconsideration after both sides had hammered home their views.

William Boothroyd of Toronto, international representative of the Machinists' Union, described the committee's adverse reasoning as a miserable excuse. He said he was amazed at anyone defending the committee's theory of too much legislation when Labor itself was on record for the shorter work week.

The first blast against leaning on the government came from Robert Ford, president of the Ottawa Typographical Union.

'This business of trying to legislate improvements just shows the lack of intestinal fortitude on the part of some unions and their failure to fight for what they want,' he said.

'If labor unions are going to continue to be recognized as a labor movement, let's get out on our own feet and get what we want, instead of depending on governments'."

MR. MILLARD: That is what you are advocating, is it?

MR. DALEY:

"John Buchanan of the Toronto Milk Drivers Union said the labor movement is drifting altogether too far into the field of asking the government to do everything for them. Delegates should ask themselves whether problems before them were matters for legislation or for collective bargaining."

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

Now, I gave you the two points of view at this large meeting of organized labor and it is quite evident that they are not all of the same opinion. So, it is quite apparent that one great arm of the trades union movement does not take too kindly to the idea that they should seek to gain by legislation everything that they would like to have. I think that the hon. members of this House will agree that the proposals contained in the various Bills offered bythe hon. members opposite to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act are the type which members of the Ontario Provincial Federation of Labor think should be left to collective bargaining.

If all the hon. members of this House will stop to consider, I am sure they will agree that legislation which will apply to the people at large should be fair to all who must be bound by it and to impose no undue hardship on any of our provincial family. I view with some regret the fact that the hon. members opposite should pull out year after year, dust off those perennial favourites of theirs and have the House year after year consider the same type of thing. In the beginning I thought that probably it was lack of experience but now I am satisfied the hon. members who proposed these Bills really know what they are doing.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Those are the same things you said last year.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): How about your Bills, and what about what you people say? It is the same old record with the same old cracks in it.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): I think in sponsoring these Bills they fail to give due consideration to the fact that a large proportion of the business of this

province is small business, very small business.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): That is true in the United States, too.

MR. DALEY: And that there are many small businessmen and many employers who employ one or two employees who could not sustain the burdens of this type of legislation. That is a fair statement to make, I believe. Therefore I absolutely agree that, while this government does not oppose the organizations by collective bargaining, and, as they set the pattern, certainly it follows into other forms of activity that it should be done by negotiations.

I also am going to mention the fact that this is not the time to do it, but I do say that at one o'clock today I met a group in which there was some difficulty about wages, and it was said that the reason that there were demands for increases in pay was the increased cost of living, primarily, and another expression was, Mr. Speaker, the fear that there is going to be a freeze on wages, and they do not want to be stuck where they are now. They want to get up. I did not blame them. I find no fault with that. But, the cost of living is something that the adoptng of Bills of this type would certainly raise up. So, Mr. Speaker, because this government has at no time indicated that it was opposed to the things that were indicated in these Bills and that they would in course of time hope that through negotiations that probably different conditions would justify the passing of them.

I am going to move, seconded by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the subject matter of Bill 36, being one which properly comes within the field of collective bargaining under the provisions of the Labor Relations

Act of 1950 and under the Federal legislation in that regard, and legislation having been adopted by the Legislature approving the principle of maximum hours of work and minimum vacations with pay, and providing therefor without in any way restricting the principle of collective bargaining, Bill 36 be not now read a second time but be read a second time this day six months hence.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): A secret weapon.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt); All I rise for, Mr. Speaker, is to correct an impression which was left by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley).

I happened to be a part of he organization to which he referred in respect of w ich he read a part in the debate on a resolution regarding the 40-hour week.

MR. DALEY: You had both sides.

MR. PARK: You did not tell the whole story.

MR. DALEY: I did not read the whole thing.

MR. PARK: That debate surrounded a resolution of a very important union, the Street Railway Union, in Hamilton, and there was some exception taken by certain gentlemen in the labor movement who already enjoyed the 40-hour week. But also one other [illegible] of those whose names you quoted has no [illegible] 40-hour week. He is a civil servant at Ottawa. It has been the policy of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada and of the Ontario Provincial Federation of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada for several years to ask for legislation implementing the 40-ho r week in every province and at the Federal level. I can assure you that that has appeared in the presentation of the Ontario Provincial Federation to you, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley) up to and including the year 1950, and I would be greatly sur rised to find it is not in the presentation they will make to y ou in 1951. (Take L follows)

And I am quite sure it will be in the presentation which will be made to the government of Canada by the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada within a few days. The impression I am trying to correct, Mr. Speaker, is, because there is a difference of opinion existing between the labor organizations in this country is not to suggest that the majority of opinion in organized labor, in that congress or any other congress, is in favour of the Bill which you ask shall be read six months hence.

Motion negatived.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the next order of business that I intended to call was order number 4 under Public Bills and Orders. There is only 20 minutes left, perhaps it might be well if we let that stand over in which case I would move the House go into Committee to clean up some of the government notices of motion, but I will leave it this way, if the hon. members opposite would like me to call order number 4 I will do it, but there is less than 20 minutes and it would seem to me to be rather unfair.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, while we would like to have it called, I doubt that it is quite fair to the mover or some hon. member on the government side who might like to reply and in any event the hon. member who introduced the Bill is a victim of influenza today. One of my fears is that a good many more of the rather wan looking hon. members I see about me will be victims within the next few days. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that there is no 40-hour week in this business.

MR. FROST: Well then, Mr. Speaker, in that case I would move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee, Mr. Patrick in the chair.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would call the government notices of motion, one, two and three. I might say this, Mr. Chairman, that the passage of these resolutions enables us to get on with the next stage of these bills where explanation can be given.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution number 3, Mr. Goodfellow, Resolution -- that this House will resolve itself into committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the following resolution:
Resolved, that, payment may be directed out of the consolidated revenue fund by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to charitable institutions, as provided by Bill number 83, An Act to Amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution number 1, Mr. Foote, that this House will resolve itself into committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the following resolution:- Resolved, that the sum of .90¢ per day and in the case of a boy or girl belonging to a part of a provisional judicial district not within a city or separated town or a town or township having a population of 5,000 or over the sum of $1.80 per day for each day's actual stay of a boy or girl in a private training school shall be paid quarterly by the Treasurer

of Ontario to the society maintaining the training school out of any moneys appropriated for that purpose, as provided by Bill Number 58, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) would tell us if we are paying anything at the present time and if he can give us an example of the training centres that would be referred to under this Act?

Hon. J.W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, there are three training schools that need this increase, three of the Roman Catholic ones where their costs are over $1.80 a day. These people are doing an excellent work and I think it is time that this amendment was made in keeping with those that have been made from time to time to meet actual costs. Our own training schools have much higher costs than these three Roman Catholic Institutions because of the wages that are paid and our 48-hour week, and so on, and I think in all fairness to them that this amendment should be made.

MR. DENNISON: May I ask if we have any other in the province except those run by the province itself and by the religious group he has referred to?

MR. FOOTE: There are three here that are affected, St. Mary's, St. John's and St. Joseph's training school.

MR. DENNISON: At the present time you give no assistance whatever?

MR. FOOTE: Yes, $1.50 a day but it is an increase to $1.80. In the unorganized districts the

entire sum is paid by Provincial grant and in the other cases it is paid half by the department and half by the municipality in which it is.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution number 2, Mr. Goodfellow, resolution, that this House resolve itself into committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the following resolution:- resolved, that, there shall be paid out of such moneys as may be voted therefor by the Legislature to every municipality having an agreement under subsection 2 of section 2, section 3a or section 5 of The Homes for the Aged Act an amount equal to one-half the amount paid by the municipality for the operation and maintenance of the joint home for the aged, as provided by Bill Number 82, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act.

Resolution agreed to.

ORDER NUMBER 24.

REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO, 1950.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty fourty order, House in Committee on Bill number 35, "An Act to Confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 35 reported.

(TAKE "M" FOLLOWS)

Hon. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 26, House and Committee on Bill No38, "An Act to Amend the County Judges Act", Mr. Frost.

On Section 1:

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that on second reading of this Bill I answered a question from the hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who asked about the pay of the Judges. I did not quite understand the full import of his question, which I thought was intended to include not only the salary they receive from the Federal Government, but also the pay they receive for the Surrogate Court, which salary is paid by the County. I think I said the source of their salary was the Federal Government, and I did not go on to say there was an additional payment made.

In case any hon. Member of the House is interested, I give that explanation now

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on the same occasion, when the Bill was on second reading, the hon. Member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) raised some interesting questions about the County of Carleton in particular, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said he would look into that question.

MR. PORTER: Yes. I have had no request or any opinion from the Carleton County Council, or from Ottawa, as to provide any basis for adding to the number of Judges

in that area at the present time. Our opinion is that the business is being done with expedition, and we have had no evidence upon that, which would justify us in further adding an additional Judge at the present time.

If that condition is changed -- and it may be in another year's time -- we may be justified in doing that.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will get some representations.

MR. PORTER: Let them be all framed up, and we will look into them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is very interesting. Possibly the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the Government are making a wise and sound decision in the matter, but I am just a little interested in the implication of what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) said.

What he said, in effect, was, "We have not heard from the County Council, and we have not heard from anybody else, so there is nothing to it". That the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) seems to be completely oblivious to was that he heard from the hon. Member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand).

MR. PORTER: That never occurred to me. There are several hon. Members affected in that same area. I never heard from them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but you did hear from the hon. Member from Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) and the incident he gave of the unavailability of the County Court Judges at the time of the espionage trial, which I think was evidence enough.

THE HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Porter) may be right in saying that the evidence is not sufficient, but to say there is no evidence after listening to the clear prima facie case made out by the hon. Member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand), shows a very large gap in the mentality of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) about these things, something which I find very interesting.

MR. PORTER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will always think I have that gap. Well, I was born with that gap, and no doubt I will die with that gap. In the interval, I will get along as best I can, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that from the information I have--and we do not rely only upon requests made by local Councils; we also are in touch with the operations of the Courts throughout the Province, and we very soon hear of a situation which requires an increase of Judges or Magistrates, or any other officials of any kind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want to be fair to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). I do not want to be misunderstood as making any reflection upon him, but when he said he was born with a gap -- may I say I do not think it was congenital, but I think it was acquired by diligence and long application.

MR. PORTER: We had better not prolong this across the floor of the House, because perhaps the House is bored.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 38 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No 27.

THE DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN MAINTENANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order, House and Committee on Bill No. 40, "An Act to Amend the Deserted Wives and Children Maintenance Act", Mr. Porter.

On Section 1.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would tell us just how far he is prepared to use the Provincial Police under his jurisdiction to enforce this Act. Since I spoke on this, I have had a number of calls from deserted wives --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: And one or two from deserted husbands saying we should have a new clause in the Act.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): We have not come down to that, have we?

MR. PORTER: I will admit that the hon. Member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) made a very eloquent speech on this Bill; on the other hand, I introduced the Bill, and have taken the great responsibility of giving these great benefits of this Bill to the deserted wives, and not one of them has called me up. The inference is obvious. I do not know whether it would be safe, after what the hon.

Member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said, to suggest anything about deserted wives, to the police.

MR. DENNISON: These good ladies expect the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) now to produce the goods.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: You are only making it worse.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 40 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, House and Committee on Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 41 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order, House and Committee on Bill No. 42, "An Act to Amend the Land Titles Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this where the property was sold by "leaps and bounds".

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 42 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole House begs leave to report certain resolutions and five Bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the Report.

Motion agreed to.

(Page M-7 follows)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to table answers to questions 31, 30, 82, 90, 84, and 45.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) adjourns the House, may I say a word which I know each hon. member of the House would have me say, and which I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would have said, had he been in on the secret.

Speaking to a few of the ladies this afternoon who returned from the very enjoyable tea tendered by the wife of Mr. Speaker, I am told that today, Mr. Speaker, you and your wife are celebrating your 29th wedding anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, you have afforded splendid guidance to this Legislature, and we feel that a great deal of your genial character may be attributed to your very fine wife. Today being St. Valentine's Day, may I say that 29 years ago you received the finest valentine any man could be blessed with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUCK: You are an honour and credit to the splendid profession you represent. I say that from the depths of my heart, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure a like sentiment comes from the hearts of every hon. member in this House, and that they will join me when I say to you that we wish to you and your charming wife a great many more years of married life, every good health, good luck, and, above all, God's blessing upon you.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I associate this side of the House with what the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) has said, and wish

to you and Mrs. Davies health and happiness and long years together. The 14th of February, St. Valentine's Day is, indeed, a very happy occasion, and a happy day upon which to celebrate your anniversary and I would just like to repeat what was said last night, Mr. Speaker, during the very fine time we had at your dinner:

> "His Honour, as Speaker of this Assembly, graces the position in great measure, and adds to the dignity of his office, and adds to the tradition and all things which are associated with it."

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that St. Valentine's Day is a day to be called to the especial attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). I have here a valentine which I have received from my wife today, and I know that all of us have had some reminder of this happy day, and I would like to state to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that he is missing a lot in life.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I concur.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I say "Amen."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we meet at three o'clock and proceed with the Throne debate, with this reservation, that if at the end of the day there happens to be a lapse of a few minutes, we might proceed with some routine business, rather than break up a speaker's address.

MR. SPEAKER: May I, before the motion to adjourn is put, thank you very, very much on behalf of Mrs. Davies and myself. I think the reason we chose St. Valentine's Day was that I am given no opportunity to forget the date of our wedding.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.07 of the clock p. m.

- - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 15, 1951, et seq.

Volume XI

Thursday, February 15, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XI

Thursday, February 15, 1951.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. B.L. CATHCART (Lambton, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

"TO THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its First Report:-

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

Bill No. 1 - An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. 4 - An Act respecting Wycliffe College.

Bill No. 8 - An Act respecting General Trust of Canada (Trust General du Canada).

Bill No. 28 -An Act respecting the Brockville General Hospital.

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:-

Bill No. 3 - An Act respecting Barclays Trust Company of Canada.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be

remitted on Bill No. 33 of 1950, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie. Your Committee would further recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 4, An Act respecting Wycliffe College; and on Bill No. 28, An Act respecting the Brockville General Hospital.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

TORONTO, February 15th, 1951.

Bryan L. Cathcart

Chairman. "

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario," and that the same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in just giving a little statement concerning the Bill on the first reading, may I say that in introducing this Bill to provide for fair employment practices in Ontario we are following a line of policy, the development of which commenced with this government in 1944. At that time legislation was passed designed to prevent discrimination against any person or class of persons because of the race or creed of such person or class of persons. This Act is on our Statutes and is

known as "The Racial Discrimination Act.". No one would question the fairness or desirability of this legislation. I imagine that in Ontario to day there would be few, if any, who would question it.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It had the support of all parties.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is right.

Last year we went further and added amendments to The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act and we introduced legislation to prevent discriminatory conveyances against any person because of race, creed or colour. At the same time, in The Labor Relations Act of 1950, we inserted a provision to bar discrimination on these grounds in any Collective Bargaining Agreement. These three Acts placed our province in the forefront in Canada and indeed in most jurisdictions anywhere.

Now we are going further. This province which has made such a contribution and set such an example to the world in showing how the people of two great races in this country can get along together in this country, and we are taking a further step which is in accordance with the universal declaration of human rights as proclaimed by the United Nations, under whose banner we are. In so doing we hope that by our example we may make it easier for others to do the same thing. The Throne Speech contains this statement:

> "It is the belief and conviction of my government that all men of whatever race, colour or creed must be accorded equality in the fundamental rights of the human person, equality in

the respect due to man's dignity, equality before the law and equality of rights to employment."

Accordingly, we are introducing today this Bill the preamble of which is most unusual in this House, but which is accepted practice in other jurisdictions. It is accepted practice in many of the other provinces, but with ourselves a method which has fallen, perhaps, into disuse. It seems to us perhaps there is much to be said for a preamble to a public Act. Therefore we have included in this Act the preamble;

"Whereas it is contrary to public policy in Ontario to descriminate against men and women in respect of their employment because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin; whereas it is desirable to enact a measure designed to promote observance of this principle; and whereas to do so is in accord with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as proclaimed by the United Nations;"

The Act is designed to provide ways and means to prevent such practices in Ontario if they exist, with the emphasis on conciliation and with access to the Courts if such fail. Above everything else, however, the Bill is a great example which carries with it the genuine good wishes of the people of Ontario for the furtherance of a principle which is fundamental to peace in the world in which we live.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Hon LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answers to questions number 24, 42 and number 47.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following: The annual report of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission for the year ending October 31, 1950; the annual report of the Ontario College of Art for the fiscal year ending May 31, 1950.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. W.S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Cecile, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Natural Gas Conservation Act," and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): Explain.

Hon. W.S. GENNELL: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Natural Gas Conservation Act is being made as a result of the fact that a few years ago an Act was brought in whereby the Department of Mines could designate storage bases for natural gas and particularly because of the importation of this gas.

No provision was made whereby when a Company made an agreement with people holding the land on which the storage base was designated there could be an appeal to the courts if they could not arrive at a remuneration satisfactory to both parties. This is an Act which makes

that provision whereby they can appeal to the courts for that remuneration.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order; third reading of Bill 35, "An Act to Confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950," Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to Confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Second Order.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order; third reading of Bill 38, "An Act to Amend the County Judges Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the County Judges Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Third Order.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order; third reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of B ill No. 40, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):Fourth Order.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth order; third reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER: (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Fifth Order.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order; third reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6,

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 6: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendments to the amendment to the motion for Address in Reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. M. Phillips (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like first to pay my respects to you, sir and just to add my word of appreciation for the many things which you do for all of us, for all the courtesies which you extend to this house. I may say that I feel that these

words are simply words in common which would be used by every hon. member of this House.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. These two hon. members set a very high standard for the balance of the hon. members. I am very happy to say that at least so far in the debate that high standard has been kept up.

I also want to thank every hon. member of this House for their many kindnesses to me and for their congratulations to me when I became Minister of Health of this province. I cannot express words to show my appreciation to each and every one of the hon. members of this House.

I have been asked on a good many occasions why the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) and I are sitting in the back benches. I would like to say to this House that we were asked where we would like to sit and we told them that we had sat here now for two previous years and we were more than satisfied with our deskmates and we would like to stay in this position.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think you will all agree with me that the Department of Health has a very special place in any government. About features of other Departments, which may be of vital interest to us, we can risk being detached, without shortening our life expectancy. I may say that no one can lose sight of health matters at any time.

I think this was very well demonstrated by my predecessor, who was then the Hon. Minister of Health. We all know that the hon. member from Hamilton, Wentworth, (Mr. Kelly)

if he had any faults, he was too ambitious, both at his desk and in the taxing of his strength beyond endurance when he went about Ontario as a good will ambassador. I may say that it was simply through sheer cheerfulness and determination that he has made such a marvelous recovery. I do hope that his recovery continues but I know that he cannot expect to return to his usual former health. You may say that the hon. Minister of Welfare, (Mr. Goodfellow) who acted as Minister of Health of this province escaped what might happen to a Minister who does not know his own physical bounds. I want to say this, the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) should be congratulated by every hon. member of this House for his contribution to the Department of Health during his period of acting Minister. Certainly I will be forever grateful for the great help he was to me, especially in the first two or three months after I took this very important portfolio.

Before starting with my address I would like to pay tribute to my departmental officials -- the Deputy Minister, the directors of each and every one of the 13 divisions, my own personal office staff and in fact everyone who works for the Department of Health. In fact, I have been surprised to find just how conscientious all these people are, how they really want to do a good job for this Province. It is impossible for me today to cover all 13 divisions but I would like to give you something about the more important problems which are facing and which have faced this Department and what we are trying to do about it.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

First of all, let me deal for a few minutes with our public hospital boards. In Ontario, as you know, we have good people, the majority of our people are public spirited citizens who are willing to give their time, their talents and their efforts to any community project without thought of remuneration. Now, that is true particularly in the question of individuals who make up our public hospital boards. Probably without remuneration these boards work along with provincial grants and municipal grants, what they take out of the hospitals to try to keep these hospitals out of the red in these days of increasing costs.

Now, as to the administrators, I know you have all heard how badly the average public hospital is administered today. From hat we can find out the deficits in our hospitals are certainly not more than 5%, 5% of it is due to inefficiency on the part of the administrators. These administrators are doing a very, very difficult job in the face of many, many difficulties. In 1945 this government realized that they must give more help to public hospitals. In 1946 some of these hospitals received this extra grant and by 1947 and since 1947 they all have received their grants based on a new form. If we were to make a comparison, we find that in 1945 the maintenance grants in Ontario amounted to $1,045,000 and in 1949 it was $5,030,000, an increase of 138%. In that same period and I might say that I know we are all interested in municipal affairs, we all pay our fair share of taxes towards running the municipality, but if we look at the figures we find that in 1945 municipalities paid $3,144,000 and in 1949 $5,400,000, an increase of 71%. Therefore, in

this period this government has increased its maintenance grants in the five year period by 438%, to municipalities by 71%. During that five year period the operating costs of our hospitals have increased by just about 100%.

Shortly after the war, in 1947 it became very apparent that we needed more hospital beds and in that year this government inaugurated a capital grant policy o give a capital grant towards construction of new hospitals and additions to old hospitals and for sanitoria. Up until the present time, we have made commitments of almost $14,000,000 and we have paid out a little over half of that amount to date. When the building projects are finished, and we hope they will be finished this year, all these construction projects which have been approved by our Department, and they are in different stages of construction, we will have added to this province since 1947 11,069 beds. That 11,000 is made up of 9,310 new beds, 1,759 replacements and 403 sanitoria beds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for just a moment on two conditions, tuberculosis and cancer. We, in Ontario are very very proud today of our record with tuberculosis and we feel it is due largely to our tuberculosis prevention program. When you think that in Canada we had in 1948, 37 deaths per 100,000 people in Canada, in Ontario the same year we had 17 [illegible]. The Canadian mortality rate dropped from 37 in 1948 to 30 in 1949, ours dropped from 17 to 15. I have no figures for 1950, but we feel from the statistics we have that in Ontario it will drop only two points this year, that is, our mortality rate for 1950 will be around 13 per 100,000. I might say that this mortality rate would be ever better if it were not

for the fact that we have in this province about 35,000 Indians. In Canada there are around 130,000, Ontario has the biggest majority of these, British Columbia second and Quebec is third, and the mortality rate amongst Indians is nine times greater than amongst whites. You can see how this will raise our birth rate when I say that our mortality rate will be 13 per 100,000 in Ontario for 1950, which takes in the Indians as well. I might say to the House that the incidence rate in Ontario has not fallen off, it is though a little lower but very, very little. Probably that is due to the fact of our travelling chest X-ray clinics because they are picking up every case. In the past where a great number of these cases who were not diagnosed.

I would also like to mention cancer. I am not going to enlarge on the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on Tuesday except to say this, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the whole government have one objective in mind, and that is that we should have a cancer clinic in Ontario for research, for treatment, and as a teaching centre which is second to none on this continent, in fact, in the whole world. That is our objective today.

We have another very important division known as the sanitary engineering division and I would like to repeat to you a few of the remarks made by our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) at Port Elgin, July, 1950. At that time, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said that Ontario is growing at the rate of 140,000 per year, that we have a great growth of industry and that growth will continue for many years to come. For this reason everything possible must be done to conserve our water resources and to

prevent pollution or contamination of our streams, rivers and lakes. Realizing the importance of water pollution, this government in the Spring of 1950 established the Municipal Development Corporation with power to loan up to $50,000,000 to municipalities desiring to instal sewage services and sewage units. The reason for this was in order that the province could give to all municipalities monies at the lowest possible interest rate. Through this encouragement I am very happy to say that the province in the construction of such works in 1950 exceeded all previous records. These programs include new systems to serve a small community, extensions of existing systems to new areas where housing programs are under way and treatment plants for municipal sewage and industrial wastes designed to overcome stream pollution.

I think you have all heard or been asked whether industrial waste can be run in along with the regular raw sewage. The answer to this is that in most cases it can, but we have several industries, such as [illegible], abattoirs and canneries, there may be one or two others, where their industrial waste should be screened before it is allowed to go into the regular sewage. Also, oil plants should have a sedimentation test where the oil that comes out with the waste comes up to the top and can be skimmed off before it is allowed to enter the regular sewage channels. I am not going to burden you with figures, but I would like to make one or two comparisons. We will take 1945. In 1945 the Department of Health issued 319 certificates for new sewage and water systems, the water systems costing a little over $3,000,000, the sewage $4,000,000, with a total of about $7,000,000. That was in 1945. In 1948 we had

625 certificates, $23,000,000 spent. In 1949 we had 702 certificates and a little over $23,000,000. Last year, 1950, which topped them all, we had 826 certificates with the spending of almost $31,000,000.

We have been very fortunate in the last few years in getting steel for this program but there may be difficulty in the next few years in getting it. I hope that is not so because it is the view of this government, which is exactly the same as the international view---as you know they have an international council which is made up of Canadians and Americans, Doctor Berry is our representative and the Canadian division is under the leadership of General MacNaughton, and they are trying to lay down a program whereby pollution will not take place in our international waters.

This government would rather assist [illegible] and [illegible], encourage the municipalities to do this work on their own rather than introduce any legislation which has a "must" in it, and I feel that if these municipalities can get steel and other material that they will go ahead on their own because they see the need of one thing, that is, that we must not continue to pollute our beautiful streams and lakes in this province.

(Take C follows)

MR. J. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Acting Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) has the figures of the total instances of sewage going into rivers untreated now as compared to five years ago? Are we cleaning up the condition that existed five years ago?

MR. PHILLIPS: May I say to the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) I have not those figures here, but I would be very, very happy to give them to him. I will look them up and have them submitted to him.

We come now to one more problem, which has been a great problem, and that is the Alcoholism Research Foundation. We have set up in the last few months an expanded program on alcoholism under the Alcoholism Research Foundation Act, which was passed here a couple of years ago. I am very happy to say that the whole new setup can be put up under the old Act. There may have to be one or two very minor changes, but that will be all.

We realize today that chronic alcoholism is a public health problem, that it has a direct bearing on domestic and economic life. To help to improve home conditions and to restore useful citizens to their rightful occupations is in itself a worthy objective, but there are also the social and economic benefits to consider. The efforts of all those people who have been concerned with this problem from several angles will be combined with a view to finding a satisfactory solution.

This whole setup will be under what is known as The Research Foundation, and associated with it we will have the representations fromthe University of Toronto, and we hope that before long we will be taking in allthe universities in Ontario, The Brookside Hospital Board, Alcoholics

Anonymous and also others with professional, business and welfare experience. I cannot speak too highly of the assistance and cooperation which I have had from everyone, from the University, from businessmen who are really too busy except that they feel this is a great problem and although they cannot afford the time, they feel that they cannot afford not to play a part in this big program.

A central headquarters is being set up inthe city of Toronto to house the officers, for the education and research staff, the administration staff, advisors from Alcoholics Anonymous, and the clinic for screening applicants. When I say "the clinic", I mean the medical end of it, and this is under a Medical Advisory Board whihh is made up of the various professors of our University.

I want also to pay tribute to the great work which has been done in the past by Alcoholics Anonymous. Today on our nine man board we have three members from Alcoholics Anonymous. On our five man advisory board, which board is allowed to increase its numbers at the discretion of the Foundation, we have one member from Alcoholics Anonymous. Where these gentlemen are going to play their big part is in rehabilitation. I have been to the United States where they have been working on this problem for about two years, and there Alcoholics Anonymous came to science and told them that although they had done well, they had come up against a stone wall and from there on they felt they had to have the cooperation and the mutual understanding of science, and work along with it. That is what we are trying to do here. We are trying to have a united front, if you like, science and the "AAs", who play the big part in rehabilitation. And remember, this rehabilitation is not just for

one or two days or one or two months, we feel this rehabilitation must go on for a period of at least two years and probably more.

I am not going to say anything further on this question, for the simple reason that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote), who was Deputy Commissioner of the Liqulr Control Board for one and one-half years before he came a member of the Cabinet will be speaking shortly. During that one and one-half years, he gained a great deal of valuable experience in his study on research and education to the same problem, which is not an Ontario problem or a Canadian problem, but really a world-wide problem which started long before any of us in this House were born. He will give this story much more ably, on account of his great experience in this field.

I come now to what may be called our greatest problem, and that is mental health. I would just like to repeat to this House a few facts which, when I read them, gave me great concern. Do hon. members realize that five cents out of every dollar of the gross ordinary revenue of this province is spent on mental health and hospital service? As of October 31st, 1950, 27% of all full-time civil servants in Ontario were in the mental health service. The average number of patients in our mental hospitals exceeded the combined number in public hospitals, homes for incurables and convalescent hospitals. Four persons out of every one thousand of our population are now inmates in our mental hospitals. Our annual number of admissions is around 4,000. One person in every 22

in this province will at some time in his life be admitted to a mental hospital.

I am just wondering which four in this House that will happen to be?

AN hon. MEMBERS: Not on this side.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PHILLIPS: Those facts are startling, and what this government proposes to do is to establish a definite policy of research, a preventive mental health program, and rehabilitation, because we realize that in 1940 we were spending $5,000,000 on mental health and today we are spending almost $15,000,000; we have now about 19,000 patients in our hospitals and we have a staff of around 4,000.

In setting up a research program, I would like to give hon. members some information with regard to the general problems which are associated with it. The first of these problems is the training of a civil staff. The second is the development of facilities in the community to combat mental illness. The third is the research into the causes of mental illness, and how to prevent it. The fourth is the study of physical illness associated with mental disease. The fifth problem is the development of pathological services in the mental health service. And the last problem is the development of statistics to keep in touch with the situation at all times.

With respect to the field of prevention, about 1930 travelling mental health clinics were instituted, and just before the war they had seven of these. Due to the war this dropped to one, but today we have four which are travelling out of London, Hamilton, Kingston and Belleville

and since 1930 have served 70,000 people. Although these travelling clinics have done a very good job, we feel an even better job can be done by a community setup. At the present time we are trying out community setups with out-patients, with a team to look after this work, the team being made up of a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a sociologist and a nurse. There may be many of these on the same team, of course.

This government very recently authorized a grant to the new St. Catharines Hospital. Together with the old hospital, when they are through with construction, they will have in the neighborhood of 400 beds. We have authorized a grant of $150,000, a special grant to build 21 psychiatric beds in the hospital. I realize that this is an experiment. We are going to try out here a public hospital with, say, twenty-one beds, which is 5% of all the beds. We are going to have an out-patient department and service, and I know from the results they are getting at the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital out-patient department that this thing will be a success. We hope then to enlarge this and extend it to other hospitals in the larger centres throughout the province. We will have to find how many psychiatric beds we need and the percentage of psychiatric beds.

Whether a program is research or preventive, it must be carried on along with a university setup and, as you know, in Ontario we have the four universities this is most essential from the standpoint of postgraduate training, from the standpoint of the training of our medical students, our nurses, psychologists, sociologists and so on, and I might point out that 25 years ago a person received little

or no psychiatric training---that is, the medical students ---but today the professor has something to give, with the result that in the future the general practitioner will be at least a partially trained psychiatrist. This is undoubtedly going to be of great assistance.

I would like to say a few words on modern treatment. I do this in view of the fact that it is not so many years ago when a patient went into an Ontario Hospital, or a mental hospital, they did not receive any specific treatment. They got air and food and sedatives and what not, but they really did not get anything specific for their condition.

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): They do not yet.

MR. PHILLIPS: Of o r nineteen or twenty thousand patients, seventeen per cent. are over 65 years of age. Twenty-three per cent. are mental defectives. That makes up forty per cent. In the case of t is group it remains to be seen just what can be done for them in the future. However, we have a large group, almost fifty per cent.--- forty-eight per cent., to be exact---who are schizophrenics. Schizophrenics may start to show some symptoms in childhood. Their main symptoms appear right after puberty, between 15 and 30 years of age, say, and they get many of these split personality setups---they get depressions, they have hallucinations, delusions and so on. Most of them find their way to a mental hospital between the ages of 40 and 60.

Psychiatrists feel today that three out of four of these patients who receive modern treatment will recover sufficiently to leave hospital after three months. And remember, before this modern treatment, a person had about

a 30% chance of improving sufficiently to return home after eighteen months, and to think that we can get three out of four of them home within three months. Two out of three will remain permanent cures and we will not hear of them again. The third will likely have a relapse and require further treatment.

This treatment consists, really, of three things. Many years ago---in fact in 1928, which is not so long ago---Doctor Manfred Sakel, working in Vienna, discovered that a very deep unconsciousness could be induced by the injection of a large dose of insulin. This is now called insulin coma therapy and is for the mentally confused, depressed, having a lot of hallucinations of sight and hearing, and delusions of various kinds. They are given as many treatments as one every day for 60 days.

We come then to the emotionally upset patient, whose mind may be clear. This class reacts well to what is known as the "Electro-shock Therapy." All this "Electro-shock" means is that they put on two electrodes, one on each side of the forehead, and give the patient about a half an ampere at 150 to 200 volts for one-tenth of a second. This causes an immediate convulsion, but it does relieve the tension of the patient. A third method is what they call the sub-shock treatment, which, as a matter of fact, was called "shell shock" in the first war. This is exactly the same as the coma treatment, except that they get very much smaller doses. In the case of the deep insulin coma, they give as high as 600 and even up to 1000 units, and you probably know that if the average person with diabetes is given as much as 60 units a day, they are getting large doses.

Then, if none of these treatments helps the patient and especially if that patient is in the maniacal class, they then consider leucotomy, or lobectomy. This simply means that the surgeon makes a slit---he does not remove anything, as a lot of people think, -- he simply makes an opening above the two frontal lobes in the head, and he makes a slit through there on either side.

(Take D follows)

Each patient requiring that is brought from the Ontario Hospital, from any place in Ontario, to our Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. He is kept there for several weeks under observation, until Professor Stokes, and the surgeon decide that a leucotomy is the right treatment.

Then he receives the operation. He is kept in the Psychiatric Hospital for a period of at least three months, and sent back to his hospital for from one to two years, and a great number of these patients now are returning home and taking part in the regular home and community life.

Now, may I say that this government feels, in tackling this whole municipal health problem, that we have to enlist the support of all people of this province. We have to teach the people that mental illness is the same as a physical illness. There is no stigma whatever in being mentally ill, any more than one having pneumonia or appendicitis. In connection with these problems we have to have, what you might call a "united front"; you have the doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and the lay public all working together.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the last part of my remarks, and that is in connection with rehabilitation, and I would like to deal for a moment on rehabilitation, first, in mental health.

We are admitting around 4,000 patients a year. That number is composed of 3,000 new patients, and 1,000 re-admissions. I may say, in passing, that when a patient is discharged, he or she is sent home for a six-month probation period, and the parent or next of kin can send them back to the hospital without the

necessity of any papers being signed.

In order to assist these people when they go home, what we have started to do at London is this; we have our programme, which is headed by a Director, who has a graduate social worker, and also a graduate in theology, and on his staff has psychiatrists, three social workers, and three specially trained registered nurses. This staff go to the home of the patient, and they teach the relatives, and also the members of that immediate community, and if necessary they go to the industry where the patient worked before being confined, to prepare the way for the patient. Then, when the patient comes home, they make regular visits to that home and talk over these problems -- and remember that psycho-therapy here is just as important as any of the things which modern science has brought forth.

Now, at the end of last year we had 2,287 patients being rehabilitated, and we had 23 workers employed. We realize the shortage of personnel. We feel that we should have at least one trained worker for every 25 patients, and that would mean that once these people are trained, we need 70 instead of 23.

I would like at this time to pay tribute for a moment to what is known here in Toronto as "The Haven". The Haven was started by a group of public spirited women in 1878, made up of three homes, Oxley House, Lorimer Lodge and Ross Cottage, and the girls who form the patients in these homes in many cases have fairly high I. Q. The public spirited women are training these girls chiefly for domestic service, because that

is what they are best adapted for. They place them in different homes. The girls work in a person's home all day, and come back to the Haven at night.

Last year we gave the Haven a grant of $2500.00, and we also paid them a maintenance grant of $1.00 per day, which amounted to $13,376.00, which makes a total contribution from the province of $16,276.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word with regard to rehabilitation in general, and I think this is a very timely subject,

As you know there was a rehabilitation conference, which I feel was quite a success, just recently at the Royal York Hotel. The reason for the conference was that in Canada today we have 900,000 disabled people, and we are adding to that at a rate of -- I could not get an accurate figure on this -- but they say it is at least 15,000 a year. These people cover a very wide range of handicapped people caused by many different conditions, such as heart disease, arthritis, poliomyolitis, post-war injuries, and injuries in industry itself. Then, of course, there is the rehabilitation of our patients both from sanitoria and from our mental hospitals.

I would just like to give you my definition of "rehabilitation", and what it really incorporates or takes in:

> "Rehabilitation is the process of assisting the disabled to obtain the optimum physical, mental, social, economic and vocational adjustment and usefulness of which they are capable".

Now, if rehabilitation is going to be a success, it must be a coordinated programme taking in medical,

surgical, psychiatric, social and prosthetic services, and also professional training. Another thing which I think is probably as important as anything, is the arrangement with certain employees, in order to place these patients, and to keep a certain percentage of the jobs for these disabled people.

Now, for those who like to see socialized medicine -- or state medicine-- in this province, I would like to say this; we have three fields of medicine. First is the preventive. For some time, the preventive field has been pretty well under government control, and at government expense.

Then we come to the curative field. . . You might say "acute cases". Most of those are short, but some of them are not, but I feel these cases can be taken care of by various forms of insurance.

Then we come to the last, that is the group which requires rehabilitation. The scope is large. These are long-term patients; these are the patients who, in my opinion, have to receive aid from the federal, provincial and municipal governments, combined with volunteer help.

This programme has been started on a small scale, as a matter of fact, for many years. We are short of personnel. It has to be connected also with the universities, in order that we can get this trained personnel, because when you think of the tremendous field that rehabilitation covers -- and remember this also takes in geriatrics -- and we have to assist them all. Canada is getting older every day. We are getting more people .

over 65 or 70 years of age, and if the state is to look after preventive medicine, that in itself will be a terrific burden on any government.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried this afternoon to give this House an insight into the more important problems of the 13 divisions of my Department, and I would like to conclude with these words; that the Department of Health is the keystone in the structure of any government; it is the mainspring in the mechanism of government services.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, here.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to participate in the annual "throne debate" and to present to this legislature some of the problems which confront the nearly 50,000 constituents of Toronto-Beaches and suggest to the government some of the solutions which I believe exist to those problems.

This year, Mr.Speaker, we meet in an atmosphere which is vastly different from anything that we have experienced in other sessions. All of our deliberations are greatly affected by the impact which the international crisis has had upon our economy here in Canada. We are confronted with the spectacle of a tremendous clash between two different ideologies and our future cannot help but be profoundly affected by the outcome of such a clash.

As one of the younger members of the assembly I am vitally interested in this situation because if an open clash did come, I, and thousands of others of my age, would be among the first called upon to take up arms and to fight. As such, Mr.Speaker, young people today have a great "stake" in the decisions and actions of our governments for we are the ones who in the future must live through the conditions which result from the decisions which governments make today.

In an atmosphere in which greater and greater emphasis is being placed upon preparation for defense, it is not suprising to find that there are those among us who are eager to try and focus all of our attention upon the international situation in the hopes that we will not notice many of the pressing questions confronting us right here at home. Already we are hearing the cry that important social benefits must be "postponed" or suspended" or "delayed" in order to bolster up our national defences. It is my firm

belief that such an attitude is not only dangerous and unwise but that it will inflict unnecessary hardships upon many of the people of this province. All of us, I am sure, are anxious to play our part in strengthening the military defences of Canada but we must not allow this desire to prevent us from dealing with the equally important problems and pressing needs which confront us here at home. We must pursue both objects at the same time if we are to keep faith with the people who have elected us. We have the necessary resources to achieve both objects and we shall achieve them if we are prepared to take the necessary steps.

It is my firm and honest belief that war is not "just around the corner" but that on the contrary we are faced with 10 or 15 years of what we are at present experiencing, namely: international tensions and difficulties. Many of the leading statesmen have voiced this view and there are good grounds for the belief that for the next generation we shall be faced with what we have come to call the "cold war". In such a situation we must ask ourselves how we in Ontario can best contribute to the evading of war and the building of a permanent peace in the next 5 or 10 years.

I am deeply convinced that what we must do is to keep our own home economy as strong as is humanly possible. We must make our democracy function as it has never functioned before. We must demonstrate to all the world and to ourselves, that our system can provide the best possible way of life, for all the people and can adequately protect their living standards even during periods of international stress. This cannot be done by allowing ourselves to become so obsessed with the international crisis that we neglect the needs

of our people here in Ontario. Our greatest contribution to peace will be a sound, strong Ontario which can be used as an example of what our system can provide when it wants to do so! This can be done without endangering our defence efforts.

How best can we do this? We shall certainly not achieve this by allowing prices to continue their fantastic rise, nor by failing to build houses at a price people can afford to pay. We shall not achieve it by allowing rents to go sky-high or be neglecting to adequately provide for the maintenance of old age pensioners. We shall not achieve it by failing to provide inexpensive health services in the province nor by neglecting to provide for the education of all children regardless of their financial ability. No, Mr. Speaker, we shall not make a contribution to a strong, efficient country unless we are prepared to open our eyes to the fact that the problems I have just mentioned, and others I am about to mention, do exist and must be dealt with. They are problems which confront the people of this province in every day of their lives and they are demanding that this government take action upon them.

It is my intention to speak about several of these matters today and to ask the government to give us positive action that will produce results this year. During the previous year, I have spent many evenings canvassing the homes of my constituents, consulting with them, receiving their views upon these problems and their advice upon the action which they would like to see taken immediately. Today I would like to express to this legislature the opinions that many of my constituents have expressed to me. I cannot, of course, possibly cover all the subjects and some I must leave to be

dealt with on another day.

Upon the subject of high prices it is possible to speak with a great deal of feeling because we come face to face with the fantastic situation every time we enter a store. One cannot say too much about the needless hardships being inflicted upon the people by the present state of inflation. We take pride in speaking of our high standard of living but it seems rather that our standard is so high that very few people can live up to it any more. An article which in 1939 cost $1 now costs $1.72 and by the time this speech is given it will probably cost even more. An old age pension of $40 is only worth $29 due to high living costs. The drastic effects of high prices cannot be too strongly emphasized.

I realize of course, Mr. Speaker, that action in this field is largely a federal matter. We must protest at every opportunity; nevertheless I feel that I must speak upon this question for it is the number one domestic problem facing us today. The Liberal government at Ottawa still does not seem to have realized the drastic effect of high prices upon the income of ordinary people such as myself. Perhaps if cabinet ministers were forced to live upon the old age pension of $40. a month, it would be easier to convince them that action must be taken right now and not next month or next year. The living cost is at an all-time high and is climbing every day. Wages cannot possibly keep up with it and the purchasing power of the dollar falls week by week. The endless struggle to make income cover expenditures leaves little or nothing for a "Rainy day" and saving becomes a thing of the past. On every side I am struck by the difficulties which have resulted from inflation and because I am a person with

only an average income, I protest this disgraceful situation as strongly as it is possible to protest.

The C.C.F. party has consistently stated that price controls should never have been taken off after the war. We alone fought the battle for price controls but none would listen. The Liberals and Conservatives led the rush to remove these controls. Despite our protest they were abandoned and the people of this country have paid the price.

Mr. Speaker, price controls and subsidies should be imposed immediately, not some time in the future. What is needed is action right now. If the Federal government is not sufficiently aware of the necessity of this action, we as a legislature should unanimously demand that price controls and subsidies be introduced at once. Only in this way can we hope to bring prices under control and they must be brought under control; not only to give relief to the hard pressed public, but because nothing is more unstable or weak than a country in the throes of inflation. Controls and subsidies are favoured by 75% of the people of this country. Numerous bodies have put forward a demand for these measures and if they are not introduced, if inflation is allowed to continue the results will be greater and greater hardship upon the people of this province. The C.C.F. has fought and will continue to fight for the immediate introduction of price controls and subsidies in spite of the opposition of the Liberals and the Conservatives.

All of us are gratified to hear that the government is prepared to enter the field of rent control. We in the official opposition are particularly pleased because we have led the fight for price and rent controls since the end of the war. We are glad to see that the other parties are now

prepared to take our advice. Our one regret is that the action was not taken sooner for the present rent controls have been allowed to deteriorate into a state of near chaos. We shall watch the bill with great interest when it is introduced and we shall do our best to ensure that it is a sound, fair measure; because, Mr. Speaker, a fair rent control bill will hurt no one. It will certainly not be good enough, merely to assume rent controls as they now exist. Provisions must be made to bring all rented premises under the Act and to provide that a fair rent will be charged. It will be also necessary to revise existing rents for a few far too low and many are far too high. To merely freeze rents now is of no avail. By such an action we are "just locking the stable door", in the case of rents which are already far "out of line". To ensure that everyone will be treated justly a series of mediation boards should be established so that both tenant and landlord can come and present their case and be treated in an equitable manner. The important thing is that it be a fair law which adequately meets people's needs, and which covers all rental premises. Such a law will, I am sure, be acceptable to all the people.

Rent controls, however, Mr. Speaker, are but an outgrowth of an even more pressing problem, that of housing. This is one field in which the present Ontario government has completely failed the people of the province. The housing shortage, Mr. Speaker, is not just a problem, but has assumed the proportions of a national crisis. The need for houses at prices people can afford to pay is indescribably urgent. In my own constituency there are thousands of people who are "doubled" or "tripled" up in homes, who are living with

families in one or two rooms or in basement apartments. Such a situation if allowed to continue unchecked for the next 10 years cannot help but extract a tremendous price from the community.

No one can deny that more and more houses are needed. We have a backlogof 500,000 homes needed from the depression and war years. Every year the number of new families being formed is greater than the number of houses built with the result that we are falling even further behind. In 1947 some 87,000 houses were completed and in the same year there were 127,000 new families formed. The government has recently announced that it would bring in 75,000 immigrants. Perhaps we need more people but surely it is fantastic to encourage them to enter this province when we cannot even adequately house our own people. At the present rate we shall never solve the housing problem in my life-time. And as long as we have the housing shortage we shall have problems of rent control. One is a direct effect of the other.

What has this government done? Last year, Mr. Speaker, we passed a Housing Act and the government members took great pride in telling us what a wonderful bill it was and how they would soon have the housing question solved. Yet, Mr. Speaker, up to this date not one single, solitary, lonely house has been built in Toronto or its suburbs under this plan. Not one house; up to this date the Bill has been a complete and utter failure. All homes in the Toronto area have been built under the National Housing Act and not a single bit of low rental housing has been built under our Act of last year. Last session we were told great things about houses with low down payments and about low rental housing but nothing in these lines

has been forthcoming. Houses still cost as much as ever and the price is still rising. The down payments are about to climb to even greater heights by virtue of the recent announcement of the Ottawa Liberal government.

What must be done to build houses?

Firstly we must exert control and direction over all building materials so that they will be channelled into housing projects and not be used to build banks, hotels and other non-essential structures.

Secondly, we must inaugurate a government scheme of subsidized housing in order to build houses at a price that people can afford to pay. We think nothing of pouring millions of dollars into the subsidizing of education. Yet it is just as important to see that the population is well housed as it is to see that it is well educated. Nowhere in the world has any government even begun to solve the housing problem except where the government itself has introduced a subsidized plan. Canada is no exception. Houses today are far too expensive and all indications are that they will become even more expensive. Only by a government subsidized plan can we hope hope to meet the pressing need. It is true that this means we must spend money now but we shall receive our dividends in the years ahead. They will take the form of a well housed and happier population and in a minimization of many of the social questions which now confront us. Many of our present problems would begin to vanish if our population were well housed. Last year's Act contains this power.

The action of the Federal government in lowering the amount of mortgage loans is a retrograde step of the worst kind, and proves once again that the Liberals are no friend

of the ordinary man. The only effect of their action is to increase down payments from about $2000 to $3200 or more. This cannot help but cut down the number of houses being built. Thus, at the very time when we should be expanding our housing project, the Liberal party is contracting that programme. Of all the things to curtail, housing is the very last matter which should be restricted.

To this day both the Federal and Provincial governments have failed to provide adequate housing for the people, because they will not enter the field of government subsidization which is the only way in which the problem can properly be attacked. I plead with the government to take action at once, now, today!

Another matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the government is the great need in this province for an inexpensive hospitalization scheme. Like everything else, the cost of hospital services has soared to record heights. Hospitals are still running up large deficits and this will probably result in even further increases in hospital bills. Our group has continually asked for a government hospital scheme similar to that in effect in the province of Saskatchewan under which hospital coverage can be obtained for the sum of $10 per person or $30 per family per year. Such a scheme is urgently needed in this province. It will not impose any undue strain upon the public treasury, but it will lift an intolerable burden from the shoulders of many of our citizens.

There are many more subjects that I had hoped to cover today, Mr. Speaker, but most of them can perhaps be

dealt with more fully in the days that lie ahead. I have asked for action upon many of these matters for the last three years but to little or no avail. We in this group are continually insisting that there are large important questions that should occupy the attention of this and other governments. We have asked for a policy that will conserve our natural resources and will stop the previous practice of allowing them to be exploited by American interests. We have fought for a programme of real assistance to the farmer and for an adequate trade union act and other such laws to protect the industrial worker. We have spoused the cause of the small business man and advocated measures to protect him in his fight against the encroachments of large-scale organizations. We have demanded a low-cost government automobile insurance shheme that will give greater coverage at one-sixth of the price now being paid. We have asked for a policy which will make higher education available to all who have the ability to absorb it regardless of their financial ability to pay. We have advocated that the province assume more of the responsibilities of the municipalities so that part of the pressing load upon municipal taxpayers should be shifted to the entire population. We have fought for many years to obtain a "fair deal" for our senior citizens.

We shall continue to support and to fight for such progressive changes no matter who introduces them. It is an interesting spectacle, Mr. Speaker, to sit in a group such as ours and see our programme being introduced little by little over the years, by those who at one time opposed such measures. I suppose that we can take comfort in the fact that such changes might never have come about had it not been for the fact that the C.C.F. championed such policies at a

time when other parties thought them unacceptable. As such we have played a vital role in the development of social security in this country. Family allowances, old age pensions and health schemes are but a few examples.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to again urge upon the government that some concrete action be taken at this legislature upon the problems I have outlined to the House today, - Rent control, housing, health, education, pensions and others. The need for action is urgent. Delay will only result in greater hardships upon our people. Let us set as our goal the building of a strong, sound Ontario in which the good things of life will be available to all. We have the resources and the money to do the job. We can achieve these ends without endangering our preparations for defense. We shall be making a positive contribution to the cause of peace by building the type of country which can give dynamic leadership to other nations; added to this we shall be serving the best interests of the people of this province and that, after all, is our main duty as democratically elected representatives to this legislature.

(Take "F" follows)

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate may I as well as the other Members add my congratulations to you for the very splendid job you are doing and indeed to the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne for their very fine effort.

During the course of the next short while I would like to talk on a few very important things, especially pertaining to my Riding of Niagara Falls and naturally the first that comes to my mind in these days when so much trouble seems to lie ahead is consideration of civil defence, because of the fact there seems to be serious differences between the major forms of government and the municipalities concerning this important subject. There certainly is no reason why we should not go ahead and be prepared against an attack, which if it did come, would be very serious as far as Niagara Falls is concerned. Certainly all the Members must agree with me when I say that probably the two most vulnerable points of attack would be the Sault and Niagara Falls. I am sorry to admit that the United States are much more advanced in civil defence. In the City of New York the civil authorities are considering the spending of upwards of 450 million dollars for underground shelters alone. In the State of New Jersey, 480 defence committees have already been formed in almost 600 communities. The City of Chicago has completed a programme for sheltering raid victims at 200 assembly points. Minnesota has recruited 7,000 plane spotters; doctors from four different states have announced plans for mutual aid and exchange of plasma. In California, the Mayor of

Los Angeles has listed 17 precautionary measures to the citizens in case of a raid. The City of San Francisco has allocated One Hundred Thousand Dollars for civil defence. I believe the prime objective in all our preparations must be the safety of our people. To be effective, our organization must reach down the lines into everyone's life. Every person must be impressed with the necessity of wholehearted co-operation. I believe the greatest task of all is to educate the entire population as effective defence cannot be achieved on paper alone. I think the Government would be well advised to proclaim a Civil Defence Week in the Province of Ontario, which would sound a call of preparedness that should command the attention of every citizen of our province. Most of the cities in New York State have plans already fully co-ordinated with the State's programme and executive and administrative branches of their organizations have been set up with hard working personnel in key posts. There is need for the public to accept preparedness calmly but realistically. Obviously the best time to prepare for any emergency is as far ahead as it is possible and while we cannot be sure when a war emergency will occur locally, or indeed if it ever will, still there is ample evidence to indicate that such an event is at least possible. If we begin to get ready now we will be more likely to be well prepared when the need for action comes, if it does.

Simply having one Minister of the Government in charge of defence for the province and going around making speeches pertaining to this subject at a few of the Service Clubs, is certainly not sufficient. We should

take it out of the planning and conversation stage and give it a stiff dose of reality.

Ask any Londoner who took up defence and you will find that there is so much more to civil defence than simply traction, splints, plane-spotting and black out patrols and just having a nice neat evacuation plan isn't preparedness or efficiency. We must remember that when if the skies rain hell, it will be people who don't know how to turn off gas mains, take care of electric cables or find new water supplies, who will be called upon to do it. Who is being trained to care for the children and other suddenly crazed by shock? Who knows how to tell women how to make a fire out of nothing and to cook what for his bombed out family? It can't all be done centrally and maybe it will have to be done by everybody. We need dozens of alternate plans and lots of expert advice. -- These and thousands of other things by people who really know. Why not a real civilian defence plan and training right from the horse's mouth? It seems to me that it would be money well spent to import a team of six or a dozen seasoned London Civilian Defencemen who will train trainers in these and every other realistic phase of what to do if it does happen. If our Federal Government has not seem fit to be so practical about this why can't Ontario lead the way? I think this is good common sense. There are thousands of Londoners who by five frightful years of trial and error obtained a knowledge that we may sacrifice many lives for, if we fumble along with the energetic but inadequate eager beavers. It will always be an argument whether our Civilian Defence Organization should be raised to the status of a permanent department of city government

like the police, fire or public works department. New York State is heading toward some sort of official status for civilian defence and Governor Dewey has put strong emphasis on the need for complete and permanent organization at the community level. Magnificent work along this line is already being done by Niagara Falls New York volunteers and we in Niagara Falls, Ontario are stepping along as fast as possible with no guidance from either government. The job that confronts municipalities is a tremendous one, beyond the conception of all residents except those familiar with the over-all picture. Volunteers will always have to play a major roll in the work but the greater the number of such participants the more effective will be the programme. In New York State, Senator Bridges is presenting an Act establishing the New York State Defence Council, providing for State and local governmental powers during a defence emergency and it certainly covers the subject of defence in a very exhaustive manner. I have a copy of this Act and if the Minister would like to see it, I would be glad to give it to him.

Until wars are factually outlawed, civil defence must take its place along with military defence in any sound and well-rounded programme. Civil defence can be defined as the protection of the home front by civilian acting under civil authorities to minimize casualties and war damage and preserve maximum civilian support of the war effort.

Plans for civil defence must be made with full recognition of the importance of maximum economy in the use of the available supply of men, money and materials.

In the event of a war coming to our Country, all of the people, all of the facilities and all of the skills and energies of our Nation and indeed our Province, must be utilized to the fullest extent. To successfully carry out a programme like this will require the co-operation of every man, woman and child in this Province. The Federal Government cannot and I do not think, should operate the Provincial and local civilian defence systems with Federal employees. The Province is well established with inherent powers and accompanying responsibility and have clear qualifications to co-ordinate civil defence operations within its boundary and in emergency to direct them. Similarly, the cities, counties, and towns are best qualified to handle their own operating functions. But no municipality at the present time is able to finance such operations by themselves. It is my belief that the responsibility of the Federal Government is to establish a national civil defence plan with certain policies and to issue informational and educational material about these. The Federal Government should provide courses and facilities for schooling and training and provide co-ordination of inter-provincial operations and furnish some of the sssential equipment and advise the Province concerning the establishment of stock piles of medical and other supplies needed at the time of disaster. In matters of civil defence the Federal Government should deal directly with the Province, I mean by that, either with the Premier or, if he so delegates, with his civil defence director. I believe the responsibility of the

Provincial Government is to provide leadership, which they are not doing at the present time, and supervision in all planning for civil defence and must act and should act as a directing force of supporting operations in an emergency. The Province should be the key operating unit. It is the field army of civil defence. Its counties, or cities should be its divisions. When one or more divisions are hard hit, the remaining ones can be sent in for support over and above the capacities of local self-help and mutual aid. The responsibility of the city or county is to operate its civil defence system under appropriate ordinances under the guidance of the Province and make such mutual aid and other arrangements with neighbouring communities as are considered necessary.

Let me repeat that every person, every community has a part to play in the civil defence programme. Remoteness from places considered probable targets does not exempt any community from playing its part in the over-all programme, since evacuees' reception must be planned and a support programme organized. Our civil defence programme for this Province should be in constant readiness because for the first time in over 135 years, an enemy has the power to attack our cities in strong force and for the first time in our history, that attack may come suddenly with little or no warning. Granted a few minutes' warning, casualties could be reduced by over 50 per cent, through proper organization and training in civil defence. More important, civil defence could spell the difference between defeat with slavery for our people and victory and a war thrust upon us. The Premier

of our Province has the responsibility for civil defence operations in this Province and although his authority and responsibility in civil defence matters are not clearly established in Law, I think legislation should be enacted and enacted in this Session, to grant him the necessary powers. Certainly a full time Provincial Defence Director should be appointed on the Premier's staff to head the Provincial organization and acting for the Premier, he should have authority to direct provincial civilian defence operations,he could co-ordinate the civilian defence activities of this Province with those of the other Provinces and also with the appropriate representatives of a Federal Civil Defence Agency. It is also my belief that a full time local Civil Defence Director should be appointed in the vulnerable points in the important cities under the direction of the Mayor or other Chief Municipal Executive. He should be responsible for establishing and administering the local defence organization. He should co-ordinate and direct the local Civil Defence activities of public and private agencies or groups. He should formulate and negotiate mutual aid, plans and agreements and direct the development of civil defence programmes in accordance with the policies and plans set by the Federal and Provincial Governments. The local civil defence control should function as the command post from which all the various services of local civil defence could be directed and controlled in the event of attack. Naturally, some members in this House do not have as much concern as I do, concerning this subject, but, if they represented the Riding that I

have the honour to represent, they naturally would have this question very much at heart. We in centres like Niagara Falls should be able to receive and disseminate air raid warnings; we should be able to alert the various services to the impending attack. We would have to marshal and disperse all civil defence forces and of the utmost importance, would have to warn the public to take shelter and if an attack did take place, to quickly assess the nature and scope of the damage and then order into action the civil defence services. In case of an attack in the local force and mutual aid were inadequate to meet a disaster, through thorough organization with the Province, we would be able to call on the Provincial Defence Agency to dispatch into the disaster area additional mobile support units. Many to-day I know are of the firm belief that we should not spend much money along this line, but the old adage still holds good -- "why lock the door after the horse is stolen?". It shames me no end when I think how much further ahead New York State is in this regard than we are. They have already had dozens of fire trials; they are having lectures nightly in every school house. They are using the radio to the fullest extent and teaching the people what to do in case of an air attack. Taxi deivers are being signed up by the thousands to help evacuate the people if possible roads leading out of their cities are designated in case of an attack. Naturally, we in Niagara Falls, with the river on the east of us and you might say, the lake on the north and the south as well, we have only to go to the west in case of attack and then we only have a few bridges to get over

the Hydro and the Welland Canals. It is a serious subject as far as we are concerned, so I plead with this Government to bring in some legislation and this legislation must indeed be at each level of government. The Federal Government is responsible as well. There are so many things to consider pertaining to civil defence. We should have air raid warning services, shelter protection in some places; we should know how we are going to evacuate in case of an attack. We should have warden services organized to the fullest extent. A mutual and mobile support system must be set up as well as fire prevention bureaus, communications and water supplies is another important subject, also law enforcement, services, mass feeding and emergency housing and clothing. People should be taught how to defend themselves if a bomb attack is made. I realize the Government is doing something along this line but it is my firm belief they are not moving fast enough.

Much has been said in this House concerning the St. Lawrence Development. The United States at this time is showing much more interest than ever before and most of the senators are taking the point of view that there can no longer be any question whether the St. Lawrence power and Seaway Development is built. They consider it must be built for the Nation's safety. One Senator even went so far to say that if we do not find some sure way to replace our dwindling supply of iron ore, we cannot make steel and we must throw our national security out the window. The ore supply in the huge Messabi range in North Minnesota is nearing exhaustion and newly-discovered deposits in Labrador can fill the gap but he also added that the

St. Lawrence Seaway must be constructed before Labrador's ore can be shipped economically to the steel plants in Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana and Western Pensylvania which are now supplied by Mesabi. It is my belief that some of the senators are convinced that Canada would go ahead and build the seaway on its own if the United States does not act. That would mean that they would have to pay for it in the end because they would have to pay tolls to Canada forever for everything shipped through the waterway. Many big United States steel concerns have now switched over to support the project and some have even stated they might help Canada finance it. However, the Senate supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project are moving cautiously as usual, in mapping what they hope will be winning strategy in the Congress. Right now the interested senators are concerned with:

1. Drafting a bill to authorize the project. which President Truman says has a "new and special urgency".
2. Trying to figure the most advantageous time to introduce it and
3. Seeking to win, as sponsors, some of those Democratic and Republican senators who are presently regarded as lukewarm to the idea.

The latter point is very important. Both proponents and opponents of the evelopment are keenly aware that the proper pressure can tip a large number of on-the-fence senators either way.

Seaway supporters make no bones of the fact that they hope the administration will exert its full influence in whipping into line those who presently feel that the issue, as far as they are concerned, is academic.

These are the senators who hold the balance of power when and if the bill comes to a vote in the Senate.

You can be sure, in the months to come, that those for the seaway -- and those against -- are going to put forth every ounce of persuasion they have to swing votes.

The shape of the bill to be introduced in the Senate is fairly well defined at this point. It will differ but slightly from that which died in the last Congress. It is understood that one of the principal points now under discussion is whether the bill will contain an assurance that New England will receive a "fair share" of the power to be developed in the international rapids section of the river. Once before the Senate, what would its chances be? That's the big question. One Senate observer, whose record has proved him to be an impartial estimator of the seaway situation in other Congresses, was willing -- providing his name wasn't mentioned -- to make this guess; that out of the 96 senators, 56 could be classified as either strong for the project or "open to reason" 31 against and nine doubtful.

If this lineup is reasonably accurate, it becomes apparent that those "open to reason" are going to be subjected to a lot of persuasive talk, both pro and con.

The seaway forces are showing a new vigor and deciveness.

Some people have asked - "what is the Great Lakes - St.Lawrence Seaway and Power Project?" It is simply a joint effort by the United States and Canada to develop the boundless natural resources of the Great Lakes basin to provide the middle west with a deep water outlet to the Atlantic Ocean and to harness the torrential flow of the St. Lawrence River to produce water power. To build the Seaway, it would be necessary only to build a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan to deepen the channels and canals linking Lakes Huron, Erie and Ontario to improve the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, New York and Montreal, Quebec. Engineering plans call for reconstruction of canals and locks already built by Canada to the St. Lawrence River and for construction of a main navigation and power dam across the River at Barnhart Island between Messina, New York and Cornwall, Ontario and a small controlled dam further up the River. With these improvements a deep waterway extending 2,400 miles from Duluth, Minnesota to the Atlantic would be provided. By increasing the country's supply of transportation and electric power, the completion of this project would greatly strengthen our productive measures and thus strengthon our whole defence effort. As the situation now stands, we face shortages both in transportation and in power production. The St. Lawrence Project offers the first and most efficient means of averting shortages of this type, in the tributary areas of the Great Lakes. Those who are opposed to the St. Lawrence project say that it would impede our defence effort because 4 or 5 years would be required for its completion and because the project would divert men and materials

needed for building planes, guns and tanks. In answer to this we only have to realize it takes almost this length of time to build a battleship. The St. Lawrence Project would provide one of the largest single blocks of electric power on the Continent, at a time when serious thought is being given to curtailment of civilian consumption of electricity to conserve power, it is the worst kind of folly to say that the St. Lawrence Porject would cause the diversion of men and materials for more useful purposes. The planes, guns and tanks we need cannot be built without the tremendous expansion of our facilities for producing electric power. As we need the power and must obtain it from some source, from any source, the St. Lawrence Power Project is an economical measure of the first magnitude. It is the cheapest source of power in America and it would certainly absorb less skilled labour than an equivalent steam plant. The St. Lawrence Development would be the second largest source of power in the world, but in terms of installed capacity and in terms of available annual electric energy being exceeded in size only by the Grand Coulee. The United States certainly could use the power because the power actually generated on the St. Lawrence could be distributed throughout an area within a three hundred mile radius of Messina, New York, thus making it possible to supply New York City, the Buffalo Industrial Area and a part of New England. However, by shifting loads over existing contemplated transmission lines, the St. Lawrence Power could be made available in an emergency throughout an area bounded by Chicago on the west, Washington District

of Columbia on the south and Boston on the north. Some of the opponents to the St. Lawrence contend that it would be more economical to produce the electric energy they need by building steam power plants than by harnessing the flow of the St. Lawrence River. Certainly at the price of coal to-day and even when it was much lower in recent years, water power developed by publicly-owned multiple-use of Hydro Electric projects in the United States such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Boulder Dam, it still is the cheapest power developed in the States. According to one New York State Power Authority, the cost of power generated at the proposed dam on the St. Lawrence River would be less than two mills per kilowatt hour including all fixed charges and operating costs. The delivered cost including all transmission expenses would be approximately 2.55 mills. However, power from steam electric plants in New York State would be over 6 mills not including any transmission expenses. This Power Authority has gone on to show that the St. Lawrence Water Power would cost not quite half as much as steam generated power. It is my firm belief Mr. Speaker, that if any two men can convince the United States Senate and the key figures in the United States Government that the St. Lawrence Power Development is a necessity, certainly Mr. Howe of the Federal Government and Mr. Bob Saunders, our Chairman of our own H.E.P.C. are those two men. Both possess tremendous driving force and, if I might use the vernacular expression - are spark plugs when it comes to getting something done and eliminating red tape in regard to vital projects. I know of 2 or 3 recent incidents,

and I don't wish to waste the time of the House citing them at the present time, where Mr. Howe and Mr. Saunders have accomplished what some Hydro Engineers thought impossible. To me, Mr. Speaker, and I know I express the feelings of all the members of the House that the delay of the St. Lawrence Project by the U.S. Government would be absolute folly and an absolute sin. The St. Lawrence is a precious resource of the United States and Canada and is now being wasted. It is a God-given water supply of unexcelled potentialities.

Now may I pay my respects, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Saunders and the Hydro Commission and to the Federal Government as well for the new Falls Project, which is now starting in operation for construction in the Niagara District. I also want to say to the Minister of Labour, who, in the capacity of Chairman of the Parks Commission, went down to Washington to see that the scenic beauty of the Falls would be protected when this project was completed and I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying a word of appreciation to Mr. Richard Hearn, Chief Engineer and General Manager of Hydro who I think is accomplishing a wonderful job on behalf of the Hydro of our Province. In my estimation, the three greatest Hydro Engineers of the last 50 years have been the late Mr. Harry Acres, Mr. Thomas Hogg and Mr. Richard Hearn and I don't mind boasting that all three of these gentlemen are from Niagara Falls. Naturally we in Niagara Falls District are very happy concerning the new development. Much talk has taken place about whether the new Power development would be injurious to the view of Niagara Falls.

The power versus the glory of Niagara Falls has been an issue almost since the day when Father Hennipin reported in 1678: "betwixt the Lake Ontario and Erie, there is a vast and prodigious column of water which falls down after a surprising and astonishing manner, inasmuch that the universe does not afford a parallel".

As the 17th Century turned into the 18th an enterprising French family named Joincairs dug a sluiceway using the cataract's power for a saw-mill. But the French colonial force had to have a full report on it, and fears were expressed that Niagara's natural beauty was marred.

Later, Charles Dickens warned that if anyone wanted to see Niagara Falls before its beauty was ruined, he had better hurry. The English novelist foresaw a day when the greedy Yankees would turn the cataract into "another smokey Manchester".

Around the turn of this century, when the first electric light gleamed in Buffalo's Niagara square, the pessimists again cried that the beauty of the Falls was doomed.

In 1950, a few gloomy prophets were again convinced the Niagara may become a trickle. They are afraid the U.S.-Canadian treaty on Niagara's diversion for power purposes, if ratified by the United States Senate, will make Father Hennepin's "vast and prodigious column of water" little more than a pile of rocks.

But the crepe-hanging predictions, like those of the French colonials and Charles Dickens, will evidently be confounded again by the Niagara Miracle, with some assistance from our engineering experts. There is solid testimony before

the Senate foreign relations committee that proposals for the cataract would add to rather than lessen its beauty.

The two top experts in their field for both the Federal Power Commission and the U.S. Corps of Engineers testified that the treaty will be the best thing that could happen to guarantee Niagara's continued reign as the scenic marvel of all time. Despite the fact that the proposed development of Falls power generating facilities will nearly triple U.S. power output at the cataract and substantially increase Canadian yield, treaty provisions have been worked out to increase the enjoyment of Niagara's sightseers.

I would point out that what has worried the critics of the treaty is that the pact reverses the old formula on diverting the water for power purposes. Under the old policy, a certain fixed quantity of water was allowed each country and the rest went for scenery. Under the new formula, the flow of water allowed for scenic purposes is fixed and that for power is flexible. All above certain fixed "scenic" amounts -- 100,000 cubic feet a second during the daylight hours, 50,000 cubic feet at night and the non-tourist season, -- is allocated to the power producers.

The critics think what's left over may not be sufficient to be an eye-filling spectacle. But Mr. E. Robert de Luccia, the Chief of the Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that sometimes tourists have had to look at the Falls when less than 100,000 cubic feet - guaranteed them under the treaty -- was spilling over.

In August, September and October of 1949, the flow over the Falls was as low as 88,500 cubic feet a second. When the flow is unusually heavy over the cataract, the scenic spectacle can be marred from two standpoints -- the mist, which increases in volume with the heavier flow, obscures the view; the heavy pounding caused by excessive flow "notches" the Falls at a greater rate; that is, the cataract is subject to greater erosion.

In 1947 construction of a submerged weir jutting out from the Canadian side just above the Falls was completed at a cost of $785,446. Before its construction, the flow over the American Falls had dropped to less than 5 per cent of the total flow over the cataract. After completion, the flow over the American Falls was nearly doubled to about 9 per cent. At present, there is concern over the fact that almost 90 per cent of the flow over the Canadian Falls is concentrated over the central part of the horseshoe containing only about half the total crest length.

But the solution to this problem already is known through the work of the special International Niagara Board appointed by the two governments in 1926 to determine how the scenic beauty of the Falls could best be maintained. The Board made its report in 1929.

Its recommendations included construction of the now-completed submerged weir above the Falls and the building of other remedial works. The recommendations of this Board not yet acted upon, include $1,050,000 worth of "artificial cascades" to spread out the flow on the United States side, of the horseshoe and a $700,000 project

of boulder removal and submerged weir construction to expand the flow on the Canadian side of the horse-shoe. These recommendations, undoubtedly, will be adopted by the International Joint Commission, if the treaty goes into effect, as an effective means for keeping Niagara Falls in a condition to which in Father Hennepin's words "the universe does not afford a parallel".

The United States Senate's prompt ratification of the Niagara Treaty opens the way for one of the most significant American-Canadian co-operative efforts of the century. The Senate took just seven minutes to ratify this Treaty, which previously had been approved by the Parliament of Canada. Soon after President Truman submitted the treaty, several senators expressed strong opposition to it; they were going to make an all-out fight against ratification. For instance, the Chairman, Tom Connally of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared that he was "not for anything of this kind". Senator Alexander Wiley, ranking Republican on the committee, denounced it as a "stab in the back" for the St. Lawrence Seaway scheme and he would oppose it to the bitter end. But the war in Korea has swept away all opposition; the treaty was ratified as a measure of national defence.

Now I want to say a word or two to the Chairman of the Parks Commission, concerning the undesirable conditions at the Rainbow Bridge area insofar as it affects privately-operated and taxpaying business. Each year private business in this region is showing a gradual decrease in return with the resultant decrease in the ability

to meet taxation or may I say, to create enough business to become satisfactorily assessable by taxing authorities. This condition had its birth when expropriation by government creating an increasing field of opportunity for competitive government-operated enterprises. Anyone studying activities in this area and applying the partiality extended to the Niagara Parks Commission in an Act passed in this assembly a few years ago, cannot help but recognize that the Government under the guise of giving Provincial services at no cost to the taxpayer is doing an unhealthy job of eliminating the opportunities of the taxpayer. The Rainbow Bridge area allotted by the Government to private enterprise is allowed to carry on its business activities only at the supervisory discretion of the Niagara Parks Commission. Private enterprise cannot even apply normal business methods to announce its location or its wares by sign advertising and so forth but it reflects against its non-taxpaying government-controlled competitors.

(PAGE F-21 FOLLOWS)

To the south of the area the Parks Commission erected the strategically-placed Princess Elizabeth building, which not only screens off the purchasing visitors or the public moving southward in its view of the Falls but also operates a gainful enterprise positively and grossly competitive with the private and taxpaying enterprises of the Rainbow Bridge business area. Had this building remained as originally intended, as a service centre and information department for visitors, all would have enjoyed its allocation, in spite of the fact that the visitors' view of the Falls is obscured when approaching the River Road from the Clifton Hill business area.

Is it not ironical that one department of government leases a right for the private and taxpaying businessman anxious to serve his community and the visitor towards general community and provincial betterment; while another department of government does everything possible to prevent him from gainful enterprise and taxpaying possibilities?

The anxiety of private and taxpaying enterprise in this area is not without justification, for the government, always expressively complacent, controls the Niagara Frontier unrestrictedly, giving only as an explanation to the public-at-large the fact "it does not cost the taxpayer a dime"; yet never giving that vital fact that private enterprise has suffered a serious and progressive elimination from gainful activities in this area.

Added to the above is the problem of car parking. Though minor areas are available for visitors, etc., within easy reach of private enterprise, the vast majority must move into the restricted confines of the Park Commission -

an excellent enticement for them to remain there and enjoy the shopping facilities, etc., without so much as a suggestion that private business is prohibited from gainful activities therein. While all other minor areas, namely, Falls Avenue and Clifton Avenue have automatic restriction as to parking privileges.

Though I have dealt with this data purely from a small and immediate area, the encroaching danger is prevalent and rather widespread. It is time the people of this country realized that this is an unfortunate government trend under the guise of public service without cost to the taxpayer.

Surely little deduction is necessary to see the writing on the wall which illustrates the tendencies towards nationalization of industrial endeavour and privately-owned and operated enterprise.

Niagara Falls and vicinity is severely suffering from this trend; its international frontier is controlled by the Niagara Parks Commission; immediately adjacent and running parallel to this is the H.E.P.C. and criss-crossing the area in all directions is the Department of Highways; all working presumably in the public interest but progressively sealing-off areas of highly desirable industrial possibilities for free enterprise and taxpaying private business.

I would like now to mention the new golf course erected by the Park Commission. I think in the course of two or three years, it will be one of the finest golf courses in the province but certainly the clubhouse erected on the course is stupidity itself. A lot of money has been spent in the building of this clubhouse and it is beautiful to a point to behold, but, when one considers that the course

will probably have at various times two to four hundred players, with only 75 lockers and 4 showers, certainly somebody was away out of line in the planning of this building. I would also like to urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to give serious consideration to enlarging the locker capacity and allowing people to rent lockers during the playing season. This course, in my estimation, was built for the people of the province and second consideration the people of Niagara Falls, New York who will be over in droves and I think the people on this side of the River should receive prime consideration.

I want to urge the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to give serious consideration to eliminating the gasoline tax paid by municipalities on equipment used within the confines of its boundaries. Last year, Niagara Falls paid almost $6000 and the year before, almost $7000. Such a service as this will be of great assistance to municipalities if they would not have to pay this tax.

Now I would like to deal with the subject of the licensing of pedlars and hawkers. Section 410 of the Municipal Act, R.S. . 1 195 was amended in 1948 by the addition of Sections 4 and 5 of subsection (a) of Section 1 to the effect that a licence was not required by hawkers and pedlars, i if the goods, wares or merchandise were hawked, peddled or sold by a person who pays business tax in the municipality or by his employee or by his agent or if the goods, wares or merchandise were hawked, peddled or sold by an agent, grower, producer or manufacturer, acting on behalf of a dealer who pays business tax in the municipality in respect to premises for the sale of such goods. At the time this amendment was under consideration, wide protest was made by the various

municipalities throughout the province, indicating that there was a very definite loophole being established and offering the possibility of collusion on the part of individuals who might see fit to try and avoid the licence and thereby the control of the municipality affected; though, however, the protest was apparently filed too late and the amendment was enacted, this should be repealed.

I would like to say a few words at this time concerning advance polls. In this connection, the section providing for advance polls should definitely be widened so as to provide that any qualified person, that is, qualified on the voters' list, who advises it is necessary to be absent from the city on the day of polling, should have the right to vote at the advance poll. There is no reason why a railway man, who advises it is necessary to be out of the city on the day of polling, should have any more right to do so at the advance poll than any other person who might find it necessary in the course of their livelihood to be absent from the municipality. The provision, of course, for taking an oath as to the truth of the statement, should be retained. This matter has been protested for years, but no action has been taken.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member (Mr. Houck), please? I just want to get some information. We are working on something along that line, and I would like to get some information from the hon. member (Mr. Houck).

My idea is you would have to have your advance poll about four days in advance, that is if there were a great many people going to take advantage of this opportunity, so you could check off your list and have it ready for the

election day.

Has the hon. member (Mr. Houck) given that some thought? If he has, I wish he would give me some information, because we are working on this problem and that is the point which has been bothering us. If a great number of people voted on the advance poll immediately, how would we get to know they would not vote again on election day?

MR. HOUCK: I am glad to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) say the government is giving this consideration. We have a Committee on Elections and Procedure, and perhaps that could be discussed in that Committee. I think the four days is a good suggestion, because most people -- the same as the railroad men --

MR. DUNBAR; Well, a little longer than the railroad men. There would be a greater number.

IR. HOUCK; These people are away perhaps a week or ten days and they really want to get in to vote.

IR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. HOUCK: Another matter which deserves serious consideration is tax exemption. You all know that this is a wide field, but the feeling is definite and rapidly growing, that there should be no exemptions, particularly on provincial and federal property located throughtout the provinces and the Dominion. In very frequent instances there is direct competition on the part of the major governments with established, legitimate industry and it is unfair that they be subsidized in order to effect this competition and too, the financial problems of the municipalities as fo to-day have reached such gigantic proportions that every source of revenue needs to be canvassed.

I would also like to call to your attention the cost of education. As you are all fully aware and no doubt have seen numerous press articles of late dealing with the matter, eeucational costs are rising by leaps and boundsl. I suppose it is no more peculiar to Boards of Education that it is to any other administrative bodies, that costs are increasing but nevertheless the net cost of education, even after subsidies, is achieving tremendous proportions and constitutes an extremely large slice of the over-all expenditures of the municipalities and all too frequently results in an increased mill rate which would otherwise not have been necessary. Either the government should assume all educational costs or there should be some other methods of establishing grants so that municipalities would be treated more equitably. Even in my own riding, a condition exists where on one side of Drummond Road, located in the city of Niagara Falls, we receive 25 cents in subsidy or grant for every dollar expended, while across the road in the township of Stamford, they receive 75 cents out of every dollar expended and suburban areas to-day, factually, are just as urban as the city itself.

Another matter for serious consideration is that of hospital costs. Here again, the condition exists where the cost of administering and operating these institutions has reached a point where with the exhorbitant increase in rates, a person is unable to pay. The institutions are bound to get into financial difficulties, in fact the greater majority have.

This is another instance where either the whole cost of hospitalization should be assumed by the major government or definitely more assistance in the way of per bed or per patient grants should be made. Municipalities are not in a

position to contribute more themselves because of their limited taxation fields.

I was surprised to hear the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) say the other day that the United States was having a lot of trouble with gambling at night harness racing. I know from my own experience at Batavia and Hamburg, both places which are only 30 to 40 miles from Buffalo, have practically six weeks each, during each year for night racing and their meetings are highly successful. I think the Premier should give serious consideration to allowing night harness racing in the province of Ontario and certainly when he represents a riding such as Lindsay, where many fine trotting horses are bred, he should show at least some encouragement to these farmers. Most standard bred horses, trotters or pacers and are bred by farmers and not wealthy millionaires and I think, if my figures are fairly accurate, you would find 10,000 trotting horses to 1,000 running horses in our province. It is an industry that should be encouraged and not discouraged. I believe when the Racing Commission was set up, it was done in good faith, but certainly the Commission itself has gone about it in a very arrogant manner. In the first place, they stepped right into the I.C.R.A. offices and demanded that they be allowed to take them over within 24 hours notice. The I.C.R.A. had established a very fine record but I realize there was some difficulty with the owners of horses and I will admit, I was in favour of the Racing Commission, but, I am greatly disappointed in its operation.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What about hound racing?

MR. HOUCK: The I.C.R.A. was one of the greatest

governing bodies in our country; their rulings had been tested in every way and through all the courts and their rulings were always upheld; they never made a ruling they had to take back and they never had to rescind one ruling, that they had made. The official status as far as officers of the I.C.R.A. was never doubted. Colonel McLaughlin, one of the finest breeders of running horses this country has ever known, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in this line of work.

The I.C.R.A. had been in existence for over 40 years and their rulings have been accepted by all racing organizations all over the world and had been copied by a lot of other clubs too. They had agreements and reciprocal agreements with all other racing organizations and our own I.C.R.A. was looked upon as one of the finest in the North American Continent. They had connections with the F.B.I. the Pinkerton people and a complete copy of all counterfeits, from the other tracks and were doing their best to keep racing clean. I think the Racing Commission is carrying that on to some extent.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): To a greater extent. I may say they are doing so to a greater extent than the other people are.

MR. HOUCK: I am glad to hear that. I do not think the hon. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Kennedy) and I rather doubt, if the Premier (Mr. Frost was in favour of establishing this Racing Commission. When one realizes that an organization of this kind handles over $40,000,000. of the population a year one can realize how important it is. The I.C.R.A had key men appointed and these men had worked a long time and became very efficient in their various duties. They also had 5 young men who had been trained over the course of the last

five years to setp in and take any of these positions providing one of the older men had become sick or died during his tenure of office in his position. Practically all the key personnel of the I.C.R.A have been discharged by the new Racing Commission.

MR. FROST: I do not think they were ever employees, were they?

MR. HOUCK: They were employees of the I.C.R.A.

MR. FROST: But they were not discharged by us, I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Hourck) of that.

MR. HOUCK: It was my understanding theye were discharged, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost) by the Racing Commission.

MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. HOUCK: Th I know the Chairman of the Commission himself made the statement last summer that it would take him over 50 years to become entirely acquainted with everything there was to know about horse racing.

MR. FROST; Well, with me it would take probably 100 years.

MR. HOUCK: I doubt if the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) himself knows the calibre of some men this Racing Commission has hired. Some men whose character could be very much doubted and who are now holding key positions in our great racind industry. Certainly an experience of last summer where the jockeys defied the Commission, showed just how weak they were compared to a year or so ago when the jockeys defied the I.C.R.A. at the Dufferin Track and were told by the I.C.R.A. if they did not ride, they would not only lose their licence to ride in this province, but, that they would never have the right to in any other place, which was recognized as an authentic racing commission.

So I say to you, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost) your Racing Commission is doing a fair job, up to a certain point.

MR. FROST: Then may I inform my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) that the tracks, the breeders and the public have all stated and have come to say that there is a great improvement in conditions under the Racing Commission, that it is very much better. Is that not what my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) gets?

MR. HOUCK: It is a big job.

MR. FROST: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) is a director of a track. Are you not a director at Stamford Park?

MR. HOUCK: No, I am not a director, No, indeed not. If I were a director of a race track, I would be driving a big Cadillac, and have my chauffeur meet me out in front here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOUCK: I know of at least 17 different rulings last year given by the new Racing Commission and records will show that at least 14 of these were rescinded, some before 24 hours had elapsed, but, much damage has been done because of the publicity given the various people.

MR. FROST: Where did the hon. member (Mr. Houck) get that information?

MR. HOUCK: I can get that for you.

MR. FROST: You had better send Mr. Heffering come around and see me. He runs around with some of your political friends. Better send him around to see me. Like a lot of other people, I am learning a lot about the racing business.

MR. HOUCK: There is a lot to learn To really learn the racing business, you would have to hire a Philadelphia lawyer.

MR. FROST: Do you think he is any better than a Bay

Street lawyer who owns a farm?

MR. HOUCK; He denied being a Bay Street lawyer. He mentioned some other street -- Queen Street was it?

MR. JOLLIFFE: A Richmond Street lawyer.

MR. HOUCK: It is my understanding and the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) can correct me if I am wrong, that every track has to pay $400. a day to run races, to this new Racing Commission and the trotters have to pay $200 a day. I think Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost) perhaps it was a step in the right direction, but, you really have a hot potato on your hands and it is going to take a Philadelphia lawyer to bring it on a high plain, where it belongs.

I had hoped I would have time to say something about highways, but, I feel I have taken up too much time already, but, I do want to say this in closing that to me it is very important that all members of this House consider that peace is more than a word; it is more than a spot of ink on a piece of paper or sound on our lips. It is a conception from which all Christian people may be fortified when and if the supreme challenge is ever to be met. Peace is everything that makes life worth living. Peace is God on both sides of the table at a conference. It is good will in action. It is world-wide neighbourliness, co-operation and team work; it means patience, keeping our tempers above party and petty irritations. It is having the courage and humility to admit our mistakes and take the blame when we are wrong. It is international courtesy as well as national courtesy and it should be good sportsmanship in all our affairs. Peace is tact and tact has been defined as the ability to pull the stinger out of the bee without getting stung. It is vision. It is using the

golden rule as a measuring stick in solving our problems. It is mighty faith and it is the goodness and greatness of man. Peace is a thing of the heart as well as the head. It is top level thinking, feeling and acting. It is rising above tanks, planes and atom bombs as a way of settling disputes; Peace to me is a way of living. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be done with this name calling, with selfish motives, with vilification and with jockeying for position and with the pursuit of personal advantages. Let us be worthy of our greatness and the crisis that is upon us. We proclaim that we, as Canadians, citizens, are ready to stand up and be counted on the side of freedom and justice. We are ready to do so even if the consequence is war. We know that war is terrible but we believe that is not so terrible as appeasement, not so terrible as cowardice. We are prepared to face the consequence of courageous actions whatever they may be, but, we are not prepared to condone a policy of expediency or of weakness. We are ready to accept an institutional life of mere survival or to accept extinction if need be, rather than to continue to prosper temporarily under a policy of weakness which cannot but end in the moral and material destruction of this great nation. This should be our stand, Mr. Speaker. We invite others, citizens and educational institutions alike to take their stand with us, and now!

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: What "stand" does the hon. member refer to? I am a little mystified on that.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): The hon. member (Mr. Houck) was dealing with the human race.

(Take "G" follows)

Hon. J.W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in committee (Mr. Patrick in the chair).

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

UNCLAIMED ARTICLES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; House in committee on Bill No. 43,"An Act to amend the Unclaimed Articles Act", Mr. Porter.

On section 1.

MR. CAMPBELL CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman , I have suggested to the Law Clerks, and now I would like to suggest to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) that in view of the scientific processes now going on, it will only be a year or two before we have some new process, perhaps a radio-activated propellant, or something of that nature, and while we are tidying up this Act, why not go on and say, in section 1, besides , "being left for repairing or cleaning or dyeing", to add a clause so that by one omnibus clause, we can tidy up the whole Act, and not come back again when some new process is developed.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point the hon. member (Mr. Calder) has made, but the difficulty,

of course, is this; this Act provides for the procedure for dealing with goods which are owned by someone other than those who have possession of them, and it is a very serious matter to give the right to a company which takes in a variety of goods for certain types of processing -- not their own goods, but those of the customers -- and if those goods remain unclaimed for a certain length of time, this gives the company the right to dispose of them -- to sell them, or get rid of them in some manner. It is a very extreme power to give to any person.

I think that, from time to time, if some new type of process is established, or some line of goods is dealt with in this sort of way, it would be a very simple matter at that time to bring in a further amendment.

If we attempt to be too general in any of these things, it might be somewhat difficult to define a sufficiently generous omnibus clause, which would, at the same time, be sufficiently restricted. The whole Act has been limited very definitely to define, as accurately as possible, the sort of goods that can be dealt with in this way.

My feeling is we should not go any further than this at the present time, until some situation arises where we find that this type of procedure might reasonably apply to some new type of process, or new type of goods. Apparently, at the present time, with this change, it will fill the reasonable needs of the industry, and I would be very hesitant to, in general, broaden these very wide powers.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 43 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Ninth Order.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend The Department of Education Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 44 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Tenth Order.

THE SCHOOL SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, House in committee on Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend The School Sites Act", Mr. Porter.

On Section 1.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Is this amendment based on any particular problem before the Department?

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): The problem which gave rise to this was the growth of urban areas in townships surrounding some of the larger municipalities, where this Act would, of course, apply, and every time a new school site is decided upon, which infringes upon The School Sites Act, they will have to go through this elaborate procedure, that is, of going before a judge, having a hearing, and getting a certificate. It was considered the Act was really obsolete, in view of the present-day conditions, and instead of limiting the area to a larger distance around some of the sites in certain municipalities, we thought it would

be better to repeal the whole statute.

Section 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 45 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Eleventh Order.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order; House in committee on Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend The Public Service Act", Mr. Welsh.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive approved.

Bill No. 48 reported.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, this was a Bill in which one of the hon. members opposite raised some question as to the difference between the explanatory note and the section and I presume the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is making some amendment to it. We will let it stand.

Bill No. 49 stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I might say, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's of Welfare's (Mr. Goodfellow) wife has been quite ill, which necessitated his absence yesterday and the fact that he has found it difficult to be here today. We will allow orders standing in his name to remain open.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Fifteenth Order.

THE PLANNING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 53, "An Act to Amend the Planning Act", Mr. Griesinger.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) could tell us if his department, under Section 4, in the past year has ever acted to preserve a certain area from undesirable land use?

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Yes, we have.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Is that on Snake River?

MR. DENNISON: Could you give us some instances?

MR. GRIESINGER: No, but I could give you some tomorrow.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) is there enough in this new section to do the job that a provincial planning department genuinely interested in the best land use from the standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number in any municipality should have?

MR. GRIESINGER: I think Atikokan is one where we stepped in and preserved some rights there.

MR. DENNISON: I was privileged, as you were, to visit a number of these Northern Ontario sites of towns being erected in connection with the establishment of a new pulp or paper mill and we admired greatly the planning. The planning was good on the townsites, and as I looked at these beautiful townsites I thought what a great thing it would be if, in some of the other unorganized districts, and even in some of the organized districts, if the department in a friendly way went in and gave a little assistance. Section 390 of The Municipal Act does not give the municipality all the power it needs to properly prevent undesirable land use. I have in mind many, many instances where, in residential areas all through this province, undesirable things are set up such as junk yards and dumping grounds and things of that kind. As we pass along our provincial highways we see in many cases within sight of a provincial highway a whole hillside littered with paper and junk and old metal and every conceivable thing you can think of, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) would be very happy if the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr.

Griesinger) would put into this Act sufficient powers so he could step in in cases like that and clean up the highways.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Would that be democratic, do you think, to take a man's property?

MR. DENNISON: I would not go as far as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has suggested. I would not go that far but I would suggest that you tell the man, -- someone from the department might call and tell the man he is breaking the law, that the people of Ontario would like to have a clean-up in this province. Land should be cleared up around our cities and anywhere in the province where land is being put to an undesirable use close to residences. We know these things have to be established somewhere and perhaps the department could give some assistance to find the best place for that sort of thing. But they should not be in places where the general public have to pass over.

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I might enlighten the hon. member (Mr. Dennison), at Red Lake Road which the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) passed two years ago, the department stepped in there and planned the whole community, laid out the industrial sites and residential sites on the King's highway where it crossed the Canadian National Railway, and there is the whole community, the whole townsite planned by the Department of Planning and Development.

MR. DENNISON: Well, I suggest that the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) seriously consider ways and means of giving himself more power and the necessary machinery to do that job elsewhere.

Sections 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 53 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Sixteenth Order.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend the Mining Act", Mr. Gemmell.

Sections 1 to 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 54 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 17.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventeenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 58, "An Act to amend the Training Schools Act", Mr. Foote.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was up for second reading, I believe, I asked a question about the first word of the subsection. That section reads as follows: "Subject as in this Act may otherwise be provided". I think that we could quite well change that to, "Except as in this Act may otherwise be provided". I know "subject" is an old form and appears in a great number of Statutes, but the mere fact that it is an old form of English is no reason for retaining it in our Statutes when we are bringing them up to date. It is confusing here, "Subject" is confusing.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): This being a question of the drafting of the Bill, may I say a word about that, if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker? The draftsmen ahve gone into that matter and they say in the first place this wording has always been in the Act and in the second place

they say it means exactly the same, it has the same effect, the same legal effect as the words the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) has suggested. It may be that the hon. member's (Mr. Grummett) words are in a literary way more exact, I would not like to say it is or is not, but as far as the legal effect of it is concerned, they say it is exactly the same meaning and I agree with that myself, and in view of the fact that these are the words that have always been in the section, I see no reason for changing these particular words.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that the legal meaning of the word is the same as "except", but we must remember that these Acts are being read by a great number of municipal clerks and officials who are not legally trained, and we should do the --

MR. PORTER: Surely, there is no question in any one's mind as to what that means? It has the same legal effect. What is the objection to the word?

MR. GRUMMETT: Clarification. It ought to be changed now.

MR. PORTER: Clarify what? Is there any possible confusion as to the meaning of these words?

MR. GRUMMETT: There may be.

MR. PORTER: I would like to know what it is, I am afraid I have not discovered how it improves the law in that construction of it.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 58 reported.

(Take "I" follows)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighteenth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend the Change of Name Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 71 reported.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineteenth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend the Boards of Education Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 72 reported.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend the Continuation School Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind reverting, there is a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter).

What was the occasion, or why was it required to make this law retroactive to January 1951? Was there some special case that required to have it made retroactive?

MR. PORTER: Well, it would correspond with the present terms, at any rate, in the schools. I could not give the hon. member (Mr. Millard) the information as to what the special case might have been.p I could get that information.

MR. MILLARD: The question is, does it adversely affect some group somewhere, or what?

MR. PORTER: No, it does not adversely affect

anybody . You will probably find that.....

MR. MILLARD: Well, is it made to help somebody?

MR. PORTER: I would think so. I would think it would be made to legalize something somebody is doing already.

MR. MILLARD: Well, I would like to know why we have departed from normal procedure of having it come into force when passed. Why is it retroactive? I do not like the retroactive feature.

MR. PORTER: If the hon. member (Mr. Millard) would like to have this information before we pass this Bill through committee, I will have it held over.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to have that done.

MR. PORTER: Yes.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST(Prime Minister): Hold that Bill, then.

Bill No. 73 stands.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order, House in committee on Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act", Mr. Scott.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): On Section 4, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) that he seems to be laying for himself a rather cumbersome procedure here. Surely there are only about 12 to 14 railways at most affected, and instead of advertising in every county and district in which such lands may lie, why not just write a registered letter to the railway company and say: "we are going to tax your land". You

could do that for a couple of dollars. It seems an extraordinary process when you only want to reach a dozen corporations, to advertise all over Ontario.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): That will give a little patronage to weekly papers.

MR. CALDER: I never thought of that.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): That never entered your mind.

MR. CALDER: There are a lot of papers up in Peterborough County.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is a dreadful thing to say about weekly papers. Shame on you.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): You would not like to save a little money?

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): What, in the Lands and Forest Department?

Sections 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 67 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole House begs to report nine Bills without amendment, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to; report adopted.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I

should like to refer back to Orders of the Day and make a statement, or a comment, relative to an article that appeared in today's "Telegram", on page 2 of the Blue Streak Edition.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to comment in connection with this article, either on the person who made the statement, who happens to be Reeve Harry Simpson of East York, or on the cause in which he was engaged, that is in connection with the hearings presently before the Municipal Board with reference to the application for the amalgamation of certain municipalities. I do not want to say anything about that at all, or to mention the issues there. What I am concerned about is the fact that the Reeve in the article states his belief that if there is amalgamation, liquor licences would be issued in that area, which I understand is now a local option area. I believe that East York is a local option area. The Reeve says:

> "I believe if we are amalgamated that there will be immediately 10 or 12 or maybe more outlets for liquor".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should make it plain to any area affected by any amalgamation proceedings in Ontario that areas which are local option areas -- that is, "dry" areas within the meaning of the Liquor Control Act-- and which are amalgamated with other municipalities which are not local option municipalities, the standing of that municipality so amalgamated, or any portion of it amalgamated, and that absolute respect will be paid to the local option by-laws in force.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): By statute or as a matter of policy?

MR. FROST: I think that it is positive by statute, I will say this, if it is not positive by statute, then it willbe positive by policy.

I want now to say to my hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Chartrand), there are certain areas of the County of Carleton and Townships adjoining Ottawa which have recently been amalgamated with that city. I want to say that if those municipalities or portions of municipalities so amalgamated are local option areas, under no circumstance will any license of any kind be issued in those municipalities. I want to make that positive and plain. I think I am quite safe in saying that there is no area in Ontario where amalgamation has taken place where that has not been respected, and that is also true of the city of Toronto.

(Take J follows)

Parts of the city of Toronto years ago were local option in the days where they were in other municipalities. For instance, I think I am right in saying that the old town of North Toronto has local option in its day. No license will be issued in that area until such times as the people in that area repeal those local option by-laws by the due processes and fulfill other requirements required by The Liquor Control Act. Now, I think that makes the matter plain. My understanding is---I have not looked up the statute---that the statute specifically provides for that; but, if the statute does not specifically provided for for it, then I can give this undertaking to this House that under no circumstances will any licenses be issued without a specific vote in accordance with the terms of The Liquor Control Act in those areas. I think that makes the matter absolutely plain. In other words, if a locality is local option by the votes of its people then, by no form of amalgamation can that community be taken out of local option without the specific votes of the people with all of the safeguards that there are in the Liquor Control Act concerning the percentage requirement.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Might I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) a question?

Do I take it from what you have said that the Bill standing in my name then would be acceptable because that is the principle in the Bill, to provide that where there are dry areas now, or where there are no licences, no licences will be issued unless the people have the opportunity of voting on the question?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think that is the meaning of the Act already. I have not read the

Bill of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) but I may say that what I have said now is the policy of the government and, insofar as I am aware, it is the policy of previous governments and administrations. I know of no case where a license has been issued in an area which was, previous to amalgamation or annexation, local option. That is the policy, and I will say to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that if his Bill is brought in to correct something which is lacking in the Act, as it is, then we will certainly remedy the Act.

That is the policy and that is the intention and that is the understanding of everybody here, as far as I know.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) aware that there are already in existence certain types or licenses---at least one in the Township of East York? I mean if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows that, then he might, perhaps, understand the point the Reeve was obviously making.

MR. FROST: It may be that East York is not local option; I do not know.

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): There are two outlets.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What the Reeve was obviously concerned with was a different type of license.

MR. FROST: No. I would say that the same undertaking applies to that as well. In other words, I want to make this plain. I see the point of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that if East York is not local option and is a place having less than 50,000 population, the fact that that place is joined to a place which has

50,000 popul tion, the same policy will apply, a d that there will be no extensions of licenses in that area without a vote of the people. Now, I thi k that makes it plain.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I move the adjournment of the House.

Before adjourning I might say that tomorrow we meet at two o'clock and we will proceed with the government orders.

I may say this, Mr. Speaker, that if I get the opportunity calling a Bill of a private member and discussing that Bill, if we have time to do it, I would like to do that. It will then, perhaps, take the pressure off Wednesdays. Perhaps we can clear up some of these items in periods such as we have had today, where we have half an hour or so. I would like to clear up private members' Bills.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) might permit one other question. Some hon. members of the House have shown some interest in the possibility of night sessions. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said earlier in the Session, that we might have them, but I think he hoped to avoid the necessity for them. [illegible]

I take it there is no thought of a night session next week. I am not arguing for or against it. I know that some hon. members would appreciate knowing in advance if there were to be any such possibility. I suggest we have made pretty good progress to date.

MR. FROST: I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have made pretty good progress and I, frankly, want to avoid night sessions, if I can.

Mr. Speaker, I do that for very obvious reasons. I think that if we can avoid night sessions it is better for our members. Perhaps the public does not understand the hon. members put in very long days here dealing with committee matters, and what not, and that our situation is not the same as it might be, for instance, at Ottawa. The hon. members here of necessity have to attend committee meetings and then they have to attend the sittings of the Legislature, and in most cases it means starting early and going out early in the day. The fact is---and I know the hon.member for York East (Miss MacPhail) will agree with me in this---that the accommodation for hon. members around here is not very good. The fact is that a day is altogether too long. My hon. friend and I were discussing the influenza epidemic the other day. When people start working at 9 o'clock in the morning, work throughout the day and try to clean things up, then stay here until 11 o'clock at night, they become fit subjects for influenza. I am counselling the hon. members to just go to bed early and not run round all night. Go to bed early and rest.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will say, I think, it is a very wise precaution to keep away from influenza and allied troubles.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, next week there is any necessity for night sessions. I think if we work together and keep our work, up we can, perhaps, avoid that. I am hopeful of avoiding, at least, many night sittings

during this Session. We are now two weeks advanced into this present Session. We have done, I think, very well. I think that by pursuing that course we can get through our business with despatch and, at the same time, give every one an opportunity of addressing himself to the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.11 of the clock p. m.

- - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 16, 1951, et seq.

0

Volume XII

Friday, February 16, 1951.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XII

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16th, 1950

And the House having met.

MR. SPEAKER PRESENTING PETITIONS.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. G.T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Is there an explanation of the contents of the Bill?

MR. GORDON: This amendment will require a municipal council, on petition of three quarters of the occupiers of the shops affected in a municipality, to provide for a full day's closing of that class shop, in each week.

At the present time, the by-law only provides for one half day, that is, from 12:30 o'clock on, and this amendment will mean the shop will be closed for a full day, making it a five-day week for that class of business, if petitioned by three-quarters of the occupiers.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR.J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) please explain?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, this Bill recommends one change in the principle, where the county levy a sum of money on urban and rural municipalities alike, that they be asked in this Bill to spend or have spent within the urban municipality a minimum of 25% of the amount of money paid by the urban municipality.

This also corrects a little omission last year, where we did not provide for compensation, where the Minister might ask that a tree, stand or building, or anything of that nature might be moved. It was in the Act formerly, but last year it was omitted, and we are amending the Act this year to add a provision for compensation.

It also provides for the payment of a subsidy, where a city makes a grant to do work on an adjacent road in a township. This has been asked for by many municipalities, and it extends the same rights on development roads, as King's Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question or two to the hon. Member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), based on an article in this morning's Globe & Mail, having to do with a case in the area in the County of Perth, relative to building Hydro lines.

The heading reads:

" One hundred and fifty farmers block Hydro. Police threaten to read the riot Act."

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first instance in regard to this matter, and I believe that the time has come - and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will appreciate this - when there should be an airing of this matter on the floor of the Legislature.

I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) if the Government is aware of the difficulties in this matter, and if so, I believe he should give the House the underlying factors which have contributed to this particular dilemma.

HON. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, let me speak generally about the difficulties of high tension transmission in the Province of Ontario, leading up to answering the question by the hon. Member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver).

A high tension is generally a steel tower or a twin-pole line. This provides a line which is necessary to meet the conditions in Western Ontario, and have matters run on schedule, and it is put through in the winter time so that we can have it ready to meet conditions in the Spring.

First, let me say that it has been the policy of the Commission, where we are securing an easement, as in this case, or even purchasing sufficient land for a right-of-way, to interview the farmer first,

which is done by a representative of the Properties Department. We have been meticulous in carrying this out, as far as it is humanly possible to do it. Of course, as in other things, the human factor enters into it, both from the point of view of the Commission's representative, and the man with whom they are dealing. They point out to them the necessity of the line, what the rights of the owners of the properties are, and what the tariff or the compensation for the use of the line or easement will be, and also assure them if there is any damage done to a fence, or the crops, or anything else, the Commission will compensate them adequately for damage done where the easement is required.

They also emphasize to the land owner his rights, which are that if he is not satisfied with the settlement offered, he can call in the official valuator, and have the matter adjusted by him. Then, there is the final appeal to the Municipal Board.

In all cases, it is made plain and definite to the land owner that as far as the Commission is concerned, we are endeavoring to seek a proper settlement with the property owner.

This Commissioner is conscious of the fact that a high tension line put through, is for the definite advantage of the larger centres, and the property owners should be compensated for any inconvenience to which they might be put. The property owner, it is true, may get an indirect benefit in that the power may be transmitted back to him, but he gets no direct value.

It is one of the most difficult problems the Commission has to contend with, that is, to arrange with property owners for these high tension lines, but until we get some better way of transmitting high-tnesion power, we do not know of any other way to do it, other than the way we are doing it now.

When we project a line through a new area, aerial photographs are taken of the localities through which the line must come. We cannot "snake" a high-tension line around corners, and that sort of thing. As far as the Commission is concerned, in projecting their line, it is done in such a way as to cause the least disadvantage to any given area.

That is speaking generally.

In this particular case, it is not an emergency line; it is running on schedule, to get the line through for early use. The Commission was probably a little more careful than usual, because there was a resistance, when interviewing the farmers and telling them what our position was, and what the right of the owner of the land was.

In this case, our Chairman and our right-of-way man met these farmers -- not in their own office, but on the ground -- and discussed with them the importance of this, and pointed out to them that whatever the final adjustment was, it would be accepted by the Commission without any hesitancy whatever. So it is not a question of a Commission trying to get a line put through in such a way as to save any money.

Again may I emphasize that whatever the Municipal

Board decides is a proper valuation for these farms, will be gladly paid by the Commission. And I will take the responsibility of going a step further, and saying that if the Commission can in any way assist this group of farmers, in order to have them present their case, we will be very glad to do it, either by way of engineering, or advice, or anything else. I think I should perhaps go still a step further, because, as I have already said, this Commission has been conscious of the difficulties which the farmers have experienced with these high tension lines.

Prior to 1946, the price paid for a steel tower -- and I am speaking from memory -- was $50.00, and about one half of that for a twin-pole line. We felt in 1946 that was not adequate under existing conditions. Mr. Speaker and hon. Members, for the first time in the history of the Commission, the Government recognized that these three of four strands of wire passing over a farm property created a limitation; for instance, you could not grow trees above a certain height, or erect buildings.

And after 1946, we paid the farmer 80 cents a rod for that limited use that we would place on his property, so the farmer got paid, after 1946, whatever the tower was worth, or the twin-pole line, plus the use of his farm.

A study was made last Fall, and we did not feel it was sufficient to pay the owner that amount, and new rates were introduced which materially increased the payments to the farmers for either the twin-pole

or the steel tower line, and also for the inconvenience caused by going over their property. It was materially increased, and where there was a value placed on that agricultural land by us, for instance, of $100. an acre-- which the farmers themselves agreed upon -- the farmer often received for the twin-pole and for the use of the line as high as $88.00 an acre for that property. It varied, slightly, according to the number of twin-poles used. But we have offered a settlement for as high as $88.00 per acre, on a valuation of $100.00 an acre.

The farmer still has the use of his land under all these wires. It is quite true there is a definite inconvenience in having to work around a twin-pole line, but not nearly as much as if he had to work around a steel tower.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton CEntre): Is that an annual payment?

MR. CHALLIES: You cannot pay $80.00 an acre annually for a $100.00 acre of land.

The last time we made inquiries, over 6% of the farmers had already signed on the basis of the increased compensation.

I hope I have answered the question by the hon. Member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver).

MR. OLIVER: I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will not mind my asking another supplementary question, and that is what is the general practice, and what was the particular practice in regard to these things going through standing timber, that is, bush land?

That seems to be one of the main points.

The other question -- and I will not pursue it further -- is this;the farmers claim that last January the Commission promised to review their cases and make whatever improvement in the situation they could, but they -- the farmers -- have not heard anything from the Commission. Has the Commission given the review, and decided they cannot go any further in meeting the farmers, in this regard?

MR. CHALLIES: The farmers were assured they would be paid at the increased price, but a few of them said, "We have the Hydro on run, let us 'stick' them for so much".

MR OLIVER: One hundred and fifty of them?

MR. CHALLIES: Oh no. I do not know how many.

Let me emphasize again that I do not think there is any hard feeling between the local farmers and the Commission and its employees. They are standing on their rights, and we have encouraged them to go to their highest Board to have their rights established, and then we will pay up. If we can assist anyway in arriving at what is right, the Commission will be only too glad to do it.

MR. MILLARD: How about the timber land?

MR. CHALLIES: That question is naturally a difficult one, because "what is the value of timber?".

The final decision is made by the Municipal Board, and on the basis of what they think is fair, as decided by the Municipal Board, the Commission will pay gladly.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HOO. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers here to question 100, No. 8, No. 6, No. 5, No. 4, No. 3, No. 83 and No. 85. It sounds almost like a Bingo Game.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Going backwards, as usual.

HON. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The Annual Report of the Department of Reform Institutions for the year ended March 31st, 1950, Part I, Industrial Farms and Common Jails.

(2) The Annual Report of the Department of Reformed Institutions, Part II, Training Schools.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have some further answers here. I always like to accommodate the hon. Members. I have here the answer to question No. 103, and question No. 81, standing in the name of the hon. Member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis), in connection with an accident to a plane last August 30th.

I notice that attached to this is a Report from the Department of Transport. This Report is too lenghty for printing in the Journal. It might be that the hon. Member (Mr. Ellis) will make it an order for return. In the meantime, I will table the answer.

MR. SPEAKER; Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker,

these answers pour in from all sides. I have here answer to question No. 80, which I will also table.

MR. EAMON PARK (Doversourt): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) tell me when I am going to get the answer to my question of last year?

MR. FROST: I will certainly look that up for you.

Third readings.

First Order.

THE UNCLAIMED ARTICLES ACT

CLERK of the HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 43, "An Act to Amend the Unclaimed Articles Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 43.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order No. 2.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 44, "An Act to Amend The Department of Education Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 44.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE SCHOOL SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order: Third reading of Bill No. 45,"An Act to Amend the School Sites Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 45, "An Act to Amend the School Sites Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of the Bill No. 48, "An Act to Amend The Public Service Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 48.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Fifth Order.

THE PLANNING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 53, "An Act to Amend The Planning Act",

Mr. Griesinger.

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 53, "An Act the Amend The Planning Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE MINING ACT.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 6, third reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to Amend the Mining Act", Mr. Gemmell.

HON. W.S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to Amend the Mining Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order, third reading of Bill No. 58, "An Act to Amend The Training Schools Act", Mr. Foote.

HON. J.W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 58, "An Act to Amend the Training Schools Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER; Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 8th Order.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order; third reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to Amend The Change of Name Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to Amend the Change of Name Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order, third reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to Amend the Boards of Education Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to Amend the Board of Education Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 10th Order.

THE RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order, third reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to Amend the Railway Fire Charge Act", Mr . Scott.

HON. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to Amend the Railway Fire Charge Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Private Bills.

Order No. 11.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 11; second reading of Bill No. 1, intituled "An Act Respecting the City of Niagara Falls," Mr. Houck.

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 1.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 12; second reading of Bill No. 4, intituled "An Act Respecting Wycliffe College," Mr. Murdoch.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex, South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 4.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

GENERAL TRUST OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 13; second reading of Bill No. 8, intituled "An Act Respecting General Trust of Canada," Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, in the absence of Mr. Chartrand, to move second reading of Bill No. 8.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 14.

BROCKVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 14; second reading of Bill No. 28, intituled, "An Act Respecting the Brockville General Hospital," Mr. Reynolds.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex, South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Reynolds, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 28,

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 15.

BARCLAYS TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 15; second reading of Bill No. 3, intituled, "An Act Respecting Barclays Trust Company of Canada," Mr. Blackwell.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 3.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to go ahead with the second readings of Bills today but I am somewhat plagued with casualties. The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), both sitting along side each other, apparently have given each other a touch of the flu, so I am held up in connection with the principle items in second readings that we were going ahead with this afternoon.

Perhaps, however, I can go ahead with Order

No. 51. I think there is to be an explanation made.

Order No. 51.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 51; second reading of Bill No. 46, intituled "An Act to Amend The Vocational Education Act," Mr. Porter.

Hon DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as the House will recall, came up a few days ago and certain questions were raised in reference to it. This Bill has the effect of repealing Part 3 of The Vocational Education Act. The Vocational Education Act appears in The Revised Statutes as Chapter 413. As I stated, when this Bill was before the House before, in view of the practice which is now pretty well universally established and is being adopted, when either high schools or vocational schools are being considered in an area which covers more than one municipality the procedure set out in The High Schools Act is followed and applied. It is a procedure which generally fits the cases which arise in the province.

At the time that The Vocational Education Act was first passed Part 3 was designed with a specific instance in mind, because up to that time Vocational Schools were generally built in a municipality and no more than one municipality was concerned with the project; but there were certain municipalities close to the city of Toronto -- I believe Mimico, New Toronto and another -- which were contemplating a school to be supported by more than one municipality. This part of The Vocational Education Act was designed to meet that

case.

I think that if the hon. members would refer to certain sections of that Act -- for instance, section 27 of The Vocational Education Act, which is found in Part 3, provides for the sharing of capital costs by the participating municipalities. Section 28 provides for the sharing of maintenance costs by these municipalities. In both these sections the basis of distribution is that of population and assessment, which is defined in section 27 (4). This basis of distribution of school costs is not used in any other school situation in the province today. Since the time that this Act was passed -- and as I said the other day this Act has never actually been made use of -- there is not one instance in the province where any school proceeded under this part of the Act.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Has there been any attempt to use it?

Hon DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Outside of that one situation, in which apparently they did consider using it, in that case and abandoned their attempts and decided not to proceed under this Act, and they never did. But, what I say now is that in view of the procedure which has now become generally applicable which applies to Vocational Schools as well as High Schools for the establishing of districts covering more than one municipality, sometimes parts of different municipalities, the procedure is gradually being improved as best we can when various problems are met. From year to year we find it necessary to bring in amendments of

one kind and another to try to make that procedure fit a very difficult and complicated situation which exists in some districts and we think that in view of the fact that this particular procedure is a little bit out of line with the general one, and it has never been used, it is about time we repealed it.

That is the reason I am advancing this Bill and I hope that that explanation will satisfy the hon. members.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee (Mr. Patrick in the Chair).

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Bill No. 49, intituled, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I wish to move an amendment to section 1, the amendment to read as it is now on the new Bill which each member has before him.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) saying that hon. members have an amended Bill?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes; a new Bill, an amended Bill, reprinted.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now you have made it conform with

the explanatory notes.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): I am not just clear yet on this situation. It reads:

> "... moneys received from the sale or lease of the land shall be applied only to the retirement of the debts unless approval of the department is given..."

What I am not just clear on now is that supposing they have been pledged to the retirement of such debts the way I interpret the Act is that you would still have to get the approval of the department to make any expenditure. Should that be? Once the debts are met on the property should the municipality be free to dispose of the balance?

MR. DUNBAR: They are.

MR. ROBINSON: It does not say that.

MR. DUNBAR: Some of the townships around Toronto have sold the property in excess of what they have purchased it for and they wish to come to me and say "instead of keeping this money in an account in which we place it ..." supposing it is to retire the debenture and the debenture is to cover 15 years, instead of keeping that excess amount in the account I can say to them that would be allright. Supposing you want to buy 25 acres of land, what is the sense of issuing another debenture for these 25 acres of land when you have the money in the account with which to purchase the land.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. member from Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) has a point with which the hon.

Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has not dealt. The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) is pointing out, as I understand him, that after the retirement of all debts and all charges which might be contemplated by this subsection no money could be spent from that special account without the consent of the department.

Hon. MR. DUNBAR: That is not right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is what it says.

Hon. MR. DUNBAR: No; that is not what it says. If they do not wish to use the balance of money that is there to put in the general account they come to the department under this Act. They can say "we do not want to put this in the general account; we would like to purchase another piece of land for industrial purposes." I can say "quite alright"; but even though they have the moneys there of a sufficient amount, all we are interested in is the amount to clear the debenture or the expenditure. Over and above that I am not interested at all. But if that money is still in the account sufficient to pay the debentures and the debentures are not issued only say each year a certain amount and there is, say, $10,000, and they wish to purchase another piece of land for industrial purposes, I say "all right," if I feel like it "you can take the money out of this account and purchase this other land and when you sell the other land put it back in the account to retire the debentures." It is just to give the municipalities a little leeway, that is all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The explanation of the hon. Minister

of Public Welfare (Mr. Dunbar) is very acceptable to me. I would be prepared to support his explanation, but that is not what the Bill says.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): May I just explain, as I understand this amendment, and I am sure if I do not succeed the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will continue.

I think if the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) reads the first part of this subsection it will be found that this outlines the type of case where this section applies:

"Where land has been acquired under the Industrial Sites Act..... or under a by-law passed under this paragraph, and any debt is outstanding in respect of the acquisition of the land..." That is a condition which must prevail before this section comes into effect at all; so that, if there is no debt outstanding, if all the debt is paid off, then the Minister has no concern in the matter. It is only when the debt is outstanding, and so long as the debt is outstanding, that the operative part of this section comes into play. As long as that is outstanding -- and there may be some surplus moneys which the municipality wants to use for some other purposes -- as long as that debt is outstanding then it must have the approval of the Minister.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am sorry to be so stubborn about this. I agree with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) up to a point.

The preliminary words in the subsection are very important. I cannot share his conclusion. If

Attorney General (Mr. Porter) will just follow me very closely, if the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) will give me his attention for a minute, may I suggest to him that first of all the land is acquired and in the event that at any time a debt is outstanding in respect to the acquisition of that land and the money is received from the sale or lease of that land then a certain result must follow and that result is that the moneys so received must be paid into a special account. Mr. Chairman, it is paid into a special account, having satisfied those conditions precedent. It is in the special account. Once your special account is established the section goes on to provide, I say, in effect, thereafter, that the money in that special account shall not be applied except in liquidation of the debt, or as may be permitted by the department. I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) will agree with me, if he gives this a little further thought, that if the land is acquired under The Industrial Sites Act and if subsequently some of it is sold or leased at a time when there is yet money owing, as is stated in the subsection and you have your special account established this section thereafter bars the expenditure of money out of that special account except in liquidation of the moneys owing, or by the leave of the department. As it stands, I suggest to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) the money is frozen in that special account for the next 100 years and cannot be expended except in payment of debts which might be paid off in the next 15 years, or with the leave of the department.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

I am afraid I still think the hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) is right.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, I suppose I could state my intention more clearly if I were a lawyer, but the only money necessary to place in this special account is the money required to clear the debt. The municipality can use the money as they wish -----. that amount of money which is in this special account --- and the municipality, if they feel they can purchase any piece of land, I reiterate what I said before, they may use this money, to purchase this land. I have never found any difficulty dealing with the municipalities, but all the money that is required to be placed in this special account is to retire the debentures against that industrial site.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We are not questioning the good faith of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). I think this is a technical problem.

MR. FROST: Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) an amendment to propose?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, because unfortunately I did not receive this until a moment ago and I think it is a technical thing.

MR. FROST: Let it stand until Monday.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has said and most certainly the intent he has is good, but in the light of today's circumstances when there is so much debate about economy in the municipality, I would suggest it might be set out more clearly.

MR. GRUMMETT: I was wondering if there is any reason for continuing the reference to the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1937, instead of referring to our Revised Statutes, 1950? That reference has been made in other Bills.

MR. DUNBAR: That was the Industrial Standards Act.

MR. THORNBERRY: Mr. Chairman, might it not be better if it were worded---

MR. JOLLIFFE: The reason I would prefer not to submit an amendment is, I think the problem is a technical one and requires a little thought from a draftsman's point of view.

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Chairman, I think all hon. Members are quite clear on the intent of this, It is not to take away any local autonomy from the municipality at all but to see that the amount of money expended or contracted for is secure and then, after that, it is up to the Department to give permission to expend some of the money that is in that account for that purpose if they feel a municipality is reliable, and it is a good site for purchasing and industry is going there. I think that is good business.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I feel that this new Bill, at least this reprinted Bill, does meet fairly the situation. Before, it stated that all moneys received from the sale of land whether there were debentures issued against it or not would go into this special fund and I think those on this side of the House and I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) himself

felt that was not the desirable thing to do. Now you are correcting it so that only on those properties against which debentures have been issued do you require the fund put into a special account and I understand that the procedure during that time would be that the Treasurer of the municipality would only be allowed to withdraw from the proceeds which have been set aside into this special account, the amount required to offset debentures falling due in that particular year. Under the circumstances it would seem that the municipalities are well protected in that account and I believe that is the intent. I quite agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that it does not say so here, but from an accounting viewpoint and a practical viewpoint it seems to me it is quite in order.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, if I might say just a word, while the Bill has been cleared up considerably at least, the explanatory note, the effect remains, that the latter part of the amended section still deprives a municipality of the right of any windfall that may come its way. While I agree with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), he is a very fine fellow to get along with and we do not have a great deal of trouble with him in the municipalities although he does make wild statements at times, I still think the control outlined here is an infringement of local autonomy. He still say we cannot use this money unless we have the approval of his Department and while that approval is alright if you can get it from the hon.

Minister (Mr. Dunbar) himself, but there are some departments that do not want to approve too often in too many cases. I think the section could be cleared up to carry out the intent the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has stated it is for, to retire the debentures against the property and once that is done I maintain that the municipalities should have the right to spend the money within reasonable limit to their own advantage and this B ill does not allow that.

MR. DUNBAR: Of course, you have never operated under the Industrial Sited Act. I quite agree with what you say and that is what I am trying to do. After the amount sufficient to retire the debenture or any expenses incurred in that way is provided, the municipality can do as they wish with the balance, but during the time the money is there in the special account, as the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) has stated, they may wish to purchase other land, and why should we put them to the expense of issuing another debenture when we can give them permission to use that money to purchase other land for industrial purposes. With things going ahead as they are this is really to assist the municipalities around Toronto industrially. Things seem to be going in leaps and bounds.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I think if the wording was instead of "all moneys received from the sale or lease of such land shall be paid into

a special account", it should be "sufficient moneys received from the sale or lease of such land shall be paid into a special account". I think it should be "sufficient moneys" to retire the original debentures, then it would have a surplus to dispose of as a municipality felt wise and just. As it is now, it says "all moneys". As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has stated it could remain frozen for 100 years unless you issue an order.

MR. DUNBAR: The law clerk suggested that we add at the end of the section, "until such debts have been retired".

MR. THORNBERRY: That holds the surplus perhaps 10 or 15 years.

MR. DUNBAR: No, I must say I do not agree with this at all but the law clerks agree. It is not my intention to hold one dollar more than is sufficient to pay the debentures and the expenses incurred, not one dollar. That is the way I want it drawn up. I want it so that the Board or the Department while the money is there, can give the municipality permission to use it, that is what I am trying to do. This would not be satisfactory at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) about the use of the word "sufficient" should be considered. It may seem like a small point but if we are arguing about it, you could not very well produce the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) as a witness as to what the word meant.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I feel very much in favour of the suggestion. It may be possible that only about two years might be left and you sell a piece of property at $15,000.00 against which there may be only $1,000.00 or $2,000.00 debentures. It would not seem correct to put into the account $15,000.00 when it only requires $2,000.00 to satisfy the debentures there. I think the word "sufficient" is a very excellent suggestion.

MR. DUNBAR: Where shall we put the word "sufficient"? "Sufficient monies" instead of "all monies."

MR. JOLLIFFE: As I said before, it is getting a little too technical. The word "sufficient" alone is not enough, you have to rewrite the closing sentence. I do not think we can redraft this clause.

MR. ROBINSON: I suggest you refer it back and have your expert check it.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, we seem to be going very slowly on this, could we not agree to have it stand over until Monday until the legal minds get their heads together?

MR. NIXON: May we not have the answer to the other question about reference to the Statutes of 1937?

MR. PORTER: The Industrial Sites Act was repealed prior to the Revised Statutes, that is why that reference is made. It was repealed last year.

MR. FROST: We will adjourn the debate on the Bill.

Bill No. 49 stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 42.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 73, an "Act to Amend The Continuation Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I believe this was the one where I had a question to be answered.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Yes, I think it was Section 3 that the hon. Member (Mr. Millard) mentioned. The reason for that is to be found in a reference to Section 6 of The Continuation Schools Act. Section 6 of the main Act, Subsection 2, deals with fees charged by Boards in certain cases. As the hon. Member (Mr. Millard) is aware, there are certain cases where pupils in one area may happen to be living closer to a school over the border, than to the school in their area, or in some cases, where there are courses of study in a school in an adjacent district which are not carried on in a district where they happen to reside. In these cases arrangements can be made for paying fees from one place to another, to have the pupils go to a school which are not within the districts.

MR. MILLARD: Etobicoke pays fees to Weston, for instance?

MR. PORTER: Yes, that is a sort of situation

and in this Act it only applies to Continuation Schools but when we come to pay grants on these fees that are paid, then, our system of grants is based upon the callendar year, starting from the first of January and for that reason it was deemed advisable to say in this Act that this Act was to be deemed to have come into force on the first of January, 1951, so there will be no question arising as to how the grants are to be applied to these pupils who go to a neighbouring district to get certain courses of study which are referred to in this amendment. That was the main purpose of referring it back to the first of January.

MR. MILLARD: So there will not be part of a year?

MR. PORTER: Yes, in other words, they will get more money, at least, that is what we hope.

BILL No. 73 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 43.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 43rd Order, Housing Committee on Bill No. 74 "An Act to Amend The Public Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the hon. Member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) it will be recalled he asked a question with respect to the new principle in Section 1 about a school board issuing debentures to start a superannuation fund. May we now have an answer?

MR. PORTER: Well, perhaps the hon. Member had better wait until the Section is called, the Bill has not

been called.

MR. CALDER: May I repeat?

MR. PORTER: I do not think it is necessary to ask the hon. Member (Mr. Calder) to repeat all the words, I think I understand him very clearly. This provision is similar to the provision in the Municipal Act whereby a municipality may issue debentures for various purposes including this, that where they set up a superannuation fund and some capital is required to put that fund into a proper initial position whatever that may be and in order to provide that capital, debentures have to be issued and municipalities may do that, insofar as it affects their own employees. This merely gives the same right with the same conditions with respect to the Public School Board and I think the hon. Member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) had suggested, he had in mind that perhaps we were doing something here which was a new departure in this sort of thing but it is something that is merely carrying on the established practice with the established boards and municipalities when they are dealing with their own employees. If we do not do this, of course, it would be quite impossible in some cases to give an adequate pension scheme.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 74 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 44.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 44th Order, Housing Committee

on Bill No. 75, "An Act to Amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 75 reported.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

Hon LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 45.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty fifth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend the Fire Departments Act", Mr. Porter.

On section 1.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo, North): Mr. Chairman, before we deal with section 1, I wonder why it is necessary to refer to this Bill coming into force in 1952.

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, the reason is there are contracts in existance today in a number of municipalities which run up to that time, and the Fire-fighters Association were satisfied that they should continue to carry out the contracts they had already entered into. Therefore, the change should not be made until that date.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, may I hope the government takes a somewhat similar view on the commitments which municipalities have made, and in any further legislation, if municipal finances are going to be adversely affected, that it also becomes effective in 1952.

I think this is a sound practice, and I would like to be sure it will be repeated.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 76 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Forty-sixth Order.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-Sixth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend The Housing Development Act", Mr. Griesinger.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 77 Reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 47.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty seventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act", Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I do not like to ask a question when the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) is not here, but perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows the answer. What has been done up to now about indigent patients in mental hospitals?

MR. FROST: I will hold the Bill over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That may not be necessary. Perhaps we might get an answer from the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) in his estimates.

MR. FROST: We will hold the Bill over. It is alright.

Bill No. 78 stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 48.

THE SANITORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty eighth Order, The House

in committee on Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend The Sanitoria For Consumptives Act", Mr. Phillips.

MR. FROST: If there is any question about this Bill, I will hold it over also.

On Section 1.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Perhaps the hon. member for York, West (Mr. Millard) could have an answer to his question. It was a good point, and I was wondering if the House might have the answer, as to the practical meaning of "contacts".

Mr. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) was giving thought to the matter, and as to how it could be clarified.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): He is on his way in now.

MR. CALDER: For the information of the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips), Mr. Chairman, the point under discussion was if we could not have a definition of the word "contact" in tubercular cases. That is in connection with the powers of the medical Officer of Health. It will be recalled the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) was going to try and work out some useful meaning or substitute for the word "contact".

Hon. MacKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the only definition which we can give for a "contact" is as follows:

> "contact can be defined as a person who is or who has been closely associated in the home, at work, or elsewhere, with a person who had or has active pulmonary

tuberculosis".

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that no matter where we go, whether it is to a show, or to visit friends in a tubercular sanitarium, we are certainly, in a degree, "contacts", but we do not consider that, in the eyes of the law, as a "contact", but it is to mean anyone who has been associated closely with a person having active tuberculosis.

MR. MILLARD: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) say if there is any way it could be added to the explanatory note, or is there a definition section of the Act, into which this could be put?

(D-5 follows)

The definition he has given, I think, clarifies the word "contact" so there will be no misunderstanding, along the line I described the other day, and all I want is the definition we have here to be given to the word "contact" in the amendment.

MR. PHILLIPS: May I say that there are only a very few persons who will not submit to these examinations in the province today, as a matter of fact. Anyone who is told they may have tuberculosis, or is suspect in any way, is always too glad to go and have an X-ray examination. We have facilities today in every part of Ontario where they can secure X-rays free of charge at one of our travelling chest clinics, and there is only the very, very odd person you will find where you have to use compulsion for that examination.

I think the word "contact" can be left to the discretion of the medical officer of health, who in turn has to get permission from one of our inspectors of our department.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 79 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Perhaps we could revert to Order No. 47.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 47th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend the Mental Hospitals Act," Mr. Phillips.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The question I wanted to put to the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) was this; what has been the practise up to

the present time? Who has paid the bills when it has been necessary to send these people to public hospitals?

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) referring to indigent patients?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: It says in the Act that paying patients will pay their own bills, while the bills for indidgent patients have to be paid. That is what we are really trying to set up in this amendment, that is, to get a standard of all these cases.

In the past some of these have been paid for the municipalities, but in the last five years any of these Bills which have come to our Department, have been paid by the Department of Health. We want to be able to get our regulations where we will standardize this, because in the past, it has not been uniform. Some of them have been paid by the municipalities, and some by the government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then, as I understand it, up to the moment, the practise has not been consistent.

MR. PHILLIPS: That is right.

MR. FROST: It will be, from now on.

MR. PHILLIPS: When you are dealing with patients in mental hospitals, they are entirely different to those in the public hospitals, because they are long-stay patients. As a matter of fact, a great number of them have lost their identity with any municipality, and we feel we need something uniform.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 78 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes---Mr. Speaker i the Chair.

R. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report seven Bills without amendments, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that on Monday it may be necessary for us to go ahead with the Throne debate. The purpose is obvious. On the order paper, o this page, we have from 50 to 56, involving Bills of considerable importance, with which the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) are concerned, and I think in all fairness to the hon. members of the House, when proceeding with these Bills we should have the hon. Ministers here.

They will want to give explanations, and if they are not present due to illness, obviously that could not be done.

That leaves us with order 55, in connection with the Fair Employment Practises. I think the Bill is not printed, although it may be up on Monday, but that would not afford the hon. members an opportunity of studying the Bill, and preparing themselves on it, which I think is desirable.

It may be possible on Monday to work in a Billor two introduced by private members. If we proceed with

the Throne debate, and have any extra time, we may proceed with one or two private Bills. I notice here a Bill in connection with Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay, but the hon. member concerned with that Bill, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell) is ill, and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) may not be here on Monday, and there are two orders standing in his name.

This brings us down to the final Order, No. 33, in the name of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Isley).

We will do the best we can to proceed for a full afternoon, but I would ask the hon. members to be ready to go ahead with the Throne debate, and if we can work in a private Bill or two, we will do that to fill in.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.27 of the clock p. m.

- - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 19, 1951, et seq.

0

Volume XIII

Monday, February 19, 1951.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XIII

Monday, February 19, 1951

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. G.I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robinson, 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.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I would draw attention to a report which appeared in the Toronto Telegram of Saturday, February 17, page 7. I think I will read the report, Mr. Speaker, because however accurate or inaccurate it may be it speaks for itself. It is dated from Ottawa, February 17;

> "The proposed Federal contributory plan to provide a $40. monthly old-age pension to everyone in Canada 70 and over has run into a constitutional snag which is expected to result in no action being taken this session. The latest obstacle is the statement by Premier Duplessis that the proposed amendment to the British North America Act which has been submitted to all ten

provinces, is not acceptable to Quebec.

With the Federal Government preparing a new type of amendment to try to meet the objections of the Quebec premier and other provinces -- Ontario and Nova Scotia, which are not completely in accord with the first draft -- doubt is growing that the constitutional hurdle will be cleared in time to permit passage of legislation at the current session.

AIMED AT 1952

There is no official target date for a contributory pensions plan to come into effect, but Jan. 1, 1952, has often been mentioned. If legislation isn't put through this session, that will mean a delay of at least six months.

The Dominion Government hasn't the power under the constitution to administer a contributory pensions plan. A condition which was offered was that all 10 provinces agree to an amendment giving Ottawa that authority.

The Federal Government proposed an amendment to Section 95 of the BNA Act to secure for itself constitutional rights as to contributory pensions.

THREE APPROVED

Three of the provinces have given

unqualified support to the Dominion's proposal: Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and, recently, British Columbia. Others are still studying the matter.

Quebec is the only province that has rejected outright the type of amendment proposed by Ottawa. The Quebec premier told his legislature this week he wants an amendment that will stand as a distinct section of the BNA Act, and not as part of Section 95, which defines joint legislative powers of the Federal Government and the provinces.

In view of the position taken by the Quebec premier, a Federal Government source said today it would be the "height of optimism" to suggest the constitutional problem will be settled in time for the pensions legislation to be passed this session."

(Page A-4

Now, Mr. Speaker, as this is a question which has been for some time of great interest to the hon. members of this House and to the people of Ontario, I think it is proper to say now that if the report is accurate in suggesting the Federal legislation is not likely to be passed this year, it would be very disquieting I think to all hon. members of this House and certainly to large numbers of the people of this province. What I suggest at the moment is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should indicate just how far this report may be described as an accurate report, what basis he thinks there is for lack of optimism about the possibility of legislation this year and what has been the attitude of the government of Ontario to the proposal made by the Federal government. I think the matter is in need of some clarification even though a partial explanation was given at Ottawa at the beginning of the 1951 session of the House of Commons when, I believe, the correspondence with the provinces was tabled. However, I think it would be very welcome, Mr. Speaker, to the House and to the public if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were to make a statement at this time as to the attitude of Ontario and his own estimate of the prospect outlined in Saturday's report.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was good enough to mention to me before the House convened the question he had in mind which I think is wholly a proper one for him to ask. Therefore, I have come here armed with some documents in relation to this

matter.

Mr. Speaker, concerning the report in the Toronto Evening Telegram of Saturday, I saw that report. I have not seen any letters Mr. Duplessis has written in this matter and I am not, of course, familiar with the position he has taken other than the fact that Mr. Duplessis in his letter feels that the section should be a separate section and in that I concur. I will give you the particulars of the letter which we ourselves wrote on this purely technical matter. I am indebted to the Press Gallery for a reference last week to Mr. Duplessis' statement. The government in Quebec as I understand it have introduced a Pension Bill which is designed to empower the Quebec government to write an agreement with the central authority concerning old-age pensions. Under this plan pensions would be paid to persons 65 to 70 after a means test, half by the province and the other half by the Federal authority. Old-age pensions to persons 70 or over would be paid entirely by the Federal government without a means test. That is in the report. I have not seen the Bill, nor have I seen Mr. Duplessis' letter but I know it is in regard to the same agreement and the same understanding that we have. There is no difference there.

Now, at the first part of this dispatch, it says:

> "Mr. Duplessis today reiterated the Federal government's proposed constitutional amendment to make possible an old-age pension plan was unacceptable

to Quebec but he said he had learned from the Minister of Justice, Mr. Garson, yesterday that a new amendment formula was being sent to the province".

There is nothing there to indicate that Mr. Duplessis nor the Quebec government, was taking a position opposed to what we have discussed and what was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne here. May I refer to the letter which was tabled in Ottawa and which was sent from here under date of January 23 and I will give you the reasons for it. Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the government here, and I have no doubt the desire of every hon. member of this House that legislation permitting the Federal government to pay old-age pensions without a means test at 70 and over and permitting the province, in partnership with the Dominion, to pay old-age pensions to needy persons between 65 and 70 should be made effective at the earliest possible moment and, in any event, should be in effect not later than January 1, 1952. I think, Mr. Speaker, that everyone here will agree with that. That is our positive objective, we want to see this enforced not later than January 1, 1952 and if it can be put into force earlier than that, then we are in favour of it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I hope that satisfies the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). This involves these things, (a) a constitutional amendment which is an amendment to the British North America Act. May I

digress to say this, that the necessity of that amendment is dependent to an extent by what means the Federal government desires to raise money. If they raise money the same as family allowances, I think the hon. member on my left (Mr.Porter) and myself feel that an amendment really is not necessary. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree if it is raised in that manner for the Federal government,it is quite proper that they should ask for power to put into effect such a law and to raise something in the neighbourhood of one quarter of a billion dollars. If they want an amendment to that effect we are perfectly prepared to agree. Secondly, it requires legislation by the Federal government. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree that it is very difficult for us to draw legislation of an omnibus nature till we know what the Federal government legislation is gpomg tp be¾

MR. JOLLIFFE: Apparently Mr. Duplessis is trying to do that.

MR. FROST: Yes, but I have not had the opportunity of reading that legislation but my understanding is that it is more of a declaration concurred in by all sides of the House authorizing the government to go ahead with the arrangement.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): There are not many sides to that house.

MR. FROST: However, as I say, I have not read that and we have not followed that practice here. There is a difference between what they may do in the Quebec

legislature and what we may do here, there are different traditions and in following that method there it is certainly a very constitutional method to follow there. We have not done that. For instance, the government may contemplate entering into an agreement with the Federal government in regard to taxation. Usually, what is done, is that negotiations take place, and then the matter comes back here for ratification or otherwise. In Quebec, their position is different and their method is different.

The third thing that is needed is, of course, legislation by the provinces. We stand ready to carry out our end of the arrangement without delay. We are not only prepared to immediately give the Federal government the full power to implement universal pensions at 70 and over but we shall avail ourselves of the option of paying old-age pensios to needy persons between 65 and 69. That legislation will be submitted to this House.

(Page A-9 follows)

Our correspondence with the Minister of Justice, hon. Mr. Garson, is merely as to the form of a constitutional amendment. We want to be sure it carries out our intention. Obviously, the jurisdiction is concurrent as the hon. members will see. In other words, both Parliament here and in Ottawa have jurisdiction to deal with the matter. The reason is obvious. Some of the Provinces may desire, as we do, to pay pensions to needy persons between 65 and 69 inclusive. Previously we could rid ourselves of constitutional power if we were to enter into that field and that is our hope and intention. Some Provinces are paying supplementary allowances over 70 and they may want to continue, which I might say to the hon. members of this House, create a great difficulty for this reason, that in paying universal pensions there is no necessity of keeping up the expensive machinery for a means test and, therefore, it vanishes and the picture is that the Provinces that are presently paying supplementary allowances are faced with the dilemma of keeping up that machinery or taking some other course. Under the Act, obviously some of them may want to continue and in that case they would have to have constitutional power to carry on that type of work and, therefore, would not want to rid themselves constitutionally of power to do that. My letter to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Garson, was merely on this point. I have in addition 'phoned Mr. Garson to underline and emphasize our suggestions as to the amendment only pertinent as to form. As we know, other Provincial Govern-

ments may want to do differently.

I shall read the letter to Mr. Garson and then table it and I think it covers the point particularly. I said "January 23rd," I see this is January 24th:

"Dear Mr. Garson:

Thank you for your letter of the 2nd instant with reference to constitutional amendments and enclosing draft amendments.

Concerning the amendment relating to Old-Age Pensions, the amendment you propose is as follows:

> '(2) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to Old-Age Pensions.'

I have no hesitation in saying that this Government is in favor of an amendment giving power to the Federal Parliament to deal with the matter of Old-Age Pensions. We regard this as very important and urgent and hope that there will be no delay in the enactment of an amendment. We are in hopes that it will be possible to have this matter settled so that necessary legislation can be brought forward at the coming Session of Parliament. We shall stand ready to implement our portion of the arrangement, and we are hopeful that it will be possible to deal with this matter at the coming Session of the Legislature, which convenes on February 1st.

Our legislation, of course, must necessarily follow yours. Therefore, the early action of Parliament in this matter would be most helpful to us.

In commenting on the amendment which you have submitted, I have the following comments, which come after a consultation with the Attorney-General:

You suggest that this amendment be added as subsection (2), section 95. The heading of section 95 is 'Agriculture and Immigration', which might make it inappropriate to have this place in this section. We suggest that it might be better to provide a new section, possibly to be called 95 (a)."

Mr. Speaker, I gather that was the point hon. Mr. Duplessis raised and I am quite sure it is the point that hon. Mr. MacDonald, the Premier and Attorney General of Nova Scotia raised.

"At the present time, I believe, conceded that legislation in relation to Old-age Pensions is within the exclusive power of Provincial Legislatures under 'Property and Civil Rights in the Province'. As I understand the matter, it is now proposed that the Federal Government should be given jurisdiction concurrent with the provinces in relation to Old-age Pensions. It is apparent that the

provinces will need such jurisdiction in the proposed arrangements, as they will participate in pensions between sixty-five and sixty-nine inclusive, and probably in other ways. If the amendment is passed in its present form might it not substract from the field of property and civil rights and place the power to deal with Old-age Pensions exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada? This I do not think is intended. The jurisdiction is to be concurrent.

(Page A-13 follows)

I therefore advance the suggestion that the best solution would be to follow the principle contained in section 95 which authorizes legislation by both legislatures and parliament in relation to agriculture and immigration. If this principle were adopted as to old-age pensions, the section might appear somewhat as follows:

> 'in each province the legislature may make laws in respect to old-age pensions and it is hereby declared that the parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to old-age pensions in all or any of the provinces, but no law passed by the parliament of Canada in relation to this subject shall affect the operation of any law in respect to old-age pensions passed by a provincial legislature.'"

Now, that wording, Mr. Speaker, follows the wording of section 95 as it is presently drawn giving concurrent jurisdiction.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Except in the closing words.

MR. FROST: In any event, as I explained to Mr. Garson:

> "You might give consideration to the above. May I repeat that in principle we are in agreement. It is only the form of the amendment with which we are now concerned. The present proposal is that the Federal government shall

make universal pensions to persons 70 and over, but it is quite understood that the Federal and Provincial government will remain in partnership in connection with pensions below that age, and perhaps in other matters relating to pensions. Therefore, I think that the amendment should be clear that the jurisdiction is concurrent."

That is the tenor of the letter. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to Mr. Garson by telephone and I have pointed out to him, as is made apparent from this letter, the suggestion we are making as to amendment is in no way dogmatic, it is only for the purposes of making sure that in passing an amendment we would not deprive ourselves of the right to deal with pensions in any other phase, other than the phase the Federal government ha in paying from 70 and over.

Mr. Speaker, may I say, as I said in my letter to Mr. Garson, we are hopeful it would be possible to bring the matter up at this session of the Legislature. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have not settled on which course should be followed on that point. We have two options.

TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

First, of asking the Legislature, before it prorogues, for powers which are pretty much omnibus powers, enabling us to do the things which we contemplate. That, Mr. Speaker, is asking for a large blank cheque from the Legislature; we realize that.

The second option would be to call a Special Session of the Legislature when the agreement is consummated. I think the latter is probably the better parliamentary practice. I think the hon. Members will confirm that.

On the other hand, it may appear to be better to ask for what I might say, for purposes of brevity, are "omnibus powers" subject to confirmation by the Legislature, as soon as we can.

What course the Government will recommend, I shall advice the House a little later on. We are giving consideration to the problem. Frankly, we hope the form of the constitutional amendment will be agreed upon, and that an address shall be directed from the Parliament of Canada to the Parliament at Westminster, - which they must do, under the present amending arrangement to the Act - authorizing this amendment to be passed without delay, and we hope the Federal Government will introduce its legislation which would enable us to introduce ours. That was the subject matter of a conversation between hon. Mr. Garson and myself this morning. He is giving the matter further consideration, and the course this Legislature will follow will be dependent upon the circumstances. But I certainly give this to the House, without any reservation whatever - to go back to the opening statement I made a few moments ago - that we

are anxious this legislation become effective as soon as possible; that old-age pensions be paid without any means test to all of t se persons 70 and over as soon as possible, certainly not later than January 1st, 1952; and that we should ourselves pass legislation enabling the payment of old-age pensions with a means test to needy persons between 65 and 69 inclusive, or up to 70 years of age, at which time the Federal Government takes over. We are anxious that should be the case, and I can only reiterate that we are anxious to have the increase. The principal reason with the impact of the high cost of living, our senior citizens generally are findings things pretty difficult. That is true particularly of those who have saved up for pension plans, such as School Teachers, Railroaders, industrial people, clergymen, and others.

The other day I had a conversation with a man who had worked for years for an insurance company, who told me that at 70 years of age, under present conditions, he could not live on the pension he had worked for all the days of his business life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very tough arrangement. I cannot think of anything which would alleviate that difficulty more than the payment of the old-age pension without a means test at 70. I think that is of national importance, and we are completely and totally in favour of it, and hope we can introduce that legislation at the earliest possible moment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Now, mr. Speaker, I have the answer here to question 32.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think we might at this time clear off the third readings.

Order No. 1.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE; First Order, third reading of Bill No. 73, "An Act to Amend the Continuation Scholls Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 73.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 74, "An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 74.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to Amend the Teachers Superannuation Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 75.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 76, "An Act to Amend The Fire Departments Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 76.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No; 5.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 77, "An Act to Amend the Housing Development Act", Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 77.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Sixth Order.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to Amend the Mental Hospitals Act", Mr. Phillips.

HON. J... FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 78.

Motion agreed; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No 7th.

THE SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; third reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to Amend the Sanatoria for Consumptives Act", Mr. Phillips.

HON. G.W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, I beg to move third reading of Bill. No 79.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):. Order No. 35.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-Fifth Order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

HON. G.W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, May I, as others have done, extend to you and to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, my sincere compliments and congratulations upon the services you have rendered to this House.

I am mindful at the beginning of my speech of the request of the Honourable leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) so persuasively put forward, that the Members of this Government cast aside their usual reticence and speak frankly and freely, as I hope among friends.

I do not know what response he will receive from those Ministers who are full of years and wisdom, and who have learned the undoubted value of restraint and discretion. However, personally, I have a great deal of respect and affection for the Honourable leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and as far as possible, will attempt to meet his wishes in this respect.

In this same connection, I am not forgetful of the advice given to me two years ago by my favourite Member of the York triumvirate, the hon. Member from York East (Miss Macphail), when she urged upon me the necessity of curbing the virtue of frankness which her Leader now extolls. The hon. Member from York East (Miss Macphail) has had, as we all know, a long,

varied and distinguished political career. She was the first woman to be elected to the House of Commons and to the Ontario Legislature. Now that my hon. friends have put forward the rumour of a forthcoming election and it is my thought that at the conclusion of the life of this Legislature, whenever it may be, that it would be a most fitting tribute to her ability and remarkable public service, if there could be added to her list of honourable "firsts",- this Government speaks a good deal about the value of "firsts" - "the distinction of being the first woman member of t e C.C.F. Party to be appointed to the Senate of Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I may say that we are reserving a fes seats there for some of us in this Government who are getting a little on in years, like myself, but there will be always be room for one more.

Such a step would enhance the value of that august body and, incidentally, our chances of winning the Riding of East York.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FOOTE: Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Liberal group, (Mr. Oliver), could, in spite of his dislike for Hansard in its present form, send a marked copy of today's proceedings containing my suggestion to the Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, along with his expressed personal approval of the proposal I have expressed.

I think that is one very useful thing the Liberal Party in Ontario could do.

SOME hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. FOOTE: Several references have been made to the newly-elected Leader of the Liberal Party in Ontario. (Mr. Thompson.). I do not know him personally, but I will say, as a Presbyterian, that the name of his father is a proud and honoured one in the history of our Church in Canada. He was, I understand, for fitty years, the Minister of St. Andrews Church in Hastings, Ontario, and has left behind him a record of Christian service which is still spoken of as an inspiration to young men entering upon ordination, in our Church.

Of Mr. Walter Thompson, I must say, with such a stock behind him, there must be much good in him, and I hope that unless it is predestined to be otherwise, he will in time make his peculiar contribution to this Legislature.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FOOTE: In the Presbyterian Church, the doctrine is spoken of in the shorter catechism, to which reference was made by the Hon. Member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), stresses strongly the doctrine of predestination, but what the effect of that will be upon the chances of the newly-elected of the Liberal Party is I suppose Problematical.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh. oh.

MR. FOOTE: I would like at this time to quote from one of his many speeches, filled as you are aware, with such infinite and bewildering variety. This is from opus 55, and begins with a reticence which I am sure will stagger the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

He is like John the Baptist, asking of his audience "What came ye out for to see?", and the answer is, "To these meetings -45 of them - they came not to see Thompson,",

and he goes on to speak of the two Hon. Members from Brant (Mr. Nixon) and Grey South (Mr. Oliver) who, in his absence, are holding the fort in this Legislature.

He says "They were the men who held us together in the days when we had very little faith in ourselves".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FOOTE: Perhaps like our own party at Ottawa.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FOOTE: "Their loyalty and help has made me proud", he says, "not only of them, but of the Party to which I belong."

I think that before this Session ends, the Hon. Leaders of all political groups, should not leave it to the "back benchers", but should write into the records of this House an appreciation of the Hon. Member who for six years has led the Liberal Party in Ontario, and who, as far as I can see, in this House, or out of it, has never let them down in any way.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear. hear.

MR. FOOTE: Personally, as a newcomer, I have learned much from him (Mr. Oliver) and have come to admire his vigour and fairness in speech, his independence and breadth of thought and outlook, his unfailing courtesy and kindliness particularly to young men in the service, like myself, and to all those who cross swords with him.

I say that whatever changes may come about in the fortunes of the Liberal Party, I am confident that this Hon. Member (Mr. Oliver) with a total of twenty-five years of honourable and distinguished service behind him, will still be

an invaluable influence in his Party and in the affairs of this Province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I hesitate now to move from such a pleasant atmosphere into a subject such as the liquor question, upon which there is such a violent disagreement, and sometimes signs of bitterness in this House.

May I say to the hon. Members of the Opposition and the Liberal groups, who make something of a specialty of this subject, that while I may not always agree with their opinions, nevertheless, I respect their sincerity and the moral earnestness which prompts their utterances. It is my hope today that what I have to say may be regarded as constructive in intention and, in a way, a response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Jolliffe) invitation to be honest and frank about the affairs with which I was entrusted, and in which we have a great measure of responsibility.

May I begin with a quotation which I know will please all the hon. Members opposite, and which is taken from the comments of Sir Richard Cartwright on the Scott Act of 1877. Perhaps I should leave out the preface, because it is not very flattering to us, and you will admit a great many changes have taken place in the past seventy-five years.

But, as a preface, speaking of the Party to which I have the honour to belong, he says:

> " In Ontario, as in most other places, the rowdy elements are usually Conservative. The Liberal Party in Ontario derived its support from the respectable middle classes and from

the solid agricultural population."

I will say in regard to the reference to my own group that we all know how times have changed.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): What did he say about us?

MR. FOOTE: He was not a prophet.

And now that you appear convinced of his soundness of judgment, I want to repeat a question put to him by a reporter.

" Are not the evils of intemperance so great as to warrant almost anything to suppress them? " His reply has a profundity about it which can teach us much and confirmed the opinions I already held. Here is what he says:

" I have myself seen so much misery arising from intemperance and so many promising careers ruined from the same cause, that I am loathe to say anything in disparagement of genuine temperance workers. Moreover, I think all fair minded men must admit that they have done much good work in regulating the traffic in liquor and seeking to abolish drinking customs; but, I doubt very much the wisdom of attempting to enforce prohibition by law. Such enactments will never be successfully enforced, unless there is quite an overwhelming majority of the residents of any given section in favour of then. Where such a statement of opinion

exists, legal penalties are hardly necessary. Like many good causes, too, temperance has been doubly abused, partly by the undue interference with men's individual liberty, in itself a grave evil, and next, by the somewhat serious mistake of making a sort of shibboleth of adherence to the cause of temperance a substitute for other and quite as important qualifications in public life. Not a few of the greatest scoundrels I have known, and my experience has been extensive, have been very ardent temperance advocates, and their acceptance of extreme temperance dogmas has been held to justify preferring them for places of trust and responsibility to men infinitely their superiors in all other respects. Briefly, their action in many cases may be described as zeal without knowledge." This is important.

" They have got to learn the difficult lesson for many earnest philanthropists to realize that moral reforms, to be lasting or valuable, must come from within and not from legal enactments. I speak thus" -- 75 years ago --"because the agitation for temperance legislation has been, nd very likely will continue to be a disquieting factor in Canadian politics and but rarely to good purpose."

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

MR. J. H. TEMPLE (High Park): May I ask the hon. Secretary (Mr. Foote) if he does not think that temperance education is a good thing?

MR. FOOTE: Yes, I do.

MR. TEMPLE: According to this statement, you do not want to see it, though.

MR. FOOTE: A very good thing, and I do wantto see it, and if thehon. member (Mr. Temple) will wait until I finish my speech, I think he will find that I have something constructive to say. I am not trying to say everything in one minute.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: You will remember last year, in deference to those in opposition who had something to say, I sat here all the time and said very little about this subject.

MR. TEMPLE: That is right.

MR. FOOTE: I know that the time is short, and again I did not like to introduce anything that I had to say in an atmosphere---an unfavorable one---that was created for me by hon. opposition members, no matter how sincere they may be, and I think today that I would ask your good offices in allowing me to continue to state my case, at least.

Surely no truer prophecy has ever been made. I am sure the majority in this House would agree with that great Canadian statesman, Sir Richard Cartwright.. I am equally sure, and I know it from personal knowledge, that there are members in two of the Opposition groups who would disagree.

I quote from one who had a great reputation in those days as a temperance worker, and I quote not to make a case, but because the statements impressed me as being right and true. This quotation is from a statement by Mr. White, Member for Cardwell, in the House of Commons, in which he said:

> "If I believe it possible by the adoption of the Scott Act to stop the use of intoxicating liquors, I would heartily support it. I am a total abstainer and to the extent of my personal influence and example, I do what I can to enforce that principle. I am as deeply impressed with the evils of intemperence as the most ardent of those who are supporting this Amendment. I have always supported the adoption of local option laws, but a careful study, extending over thirty years, convinced me that the drinking habits of the people cannot be prevented by the passing of a by-law prohibiting the retailing of intoxicating liquors. The failure of such laws in the past has tended to injure the temperance movement."

And again you have this [illegible]:

> "Nothing but an overwhelming temperance sentiment will enable the law to be enforced and it is in this conviction that I vote for the amendment-----"

That is, the amendment to the Scott Act,---

"-----now proposed."

These opinions dating back about 75 years show that for many years, the question of liquor control has been

contentious. Indeed, if you study the history of legislation, you can go back before 2,000 B. C. in the Code of Hammurabi of Babylon and say that the same issue was before the people and honest men were trying to solve it. Admirable men of all parties have held widely divergent views as to its solution.

But they show more than that. They reveal a depth of insight into the problem that is today being highlighted by the extensive research into the problem of alcoholism. These men were a long way ahead of their time in sensing that alcoholism was a disease with deep underlying causes which could not be cured by restrictive legislation.

And remember that when we speak of "legislation," that it has nothing, or very little, to do, as I see it, with the problems of alcoholism, which is a medical problem, as my hon. friend the Minister for Health (Mr. Phillips) has stated. Alcoholism is something that should be treated in the medical field and not in the legislative field.

When we go on to the question of drinkers, either light, medium, heavy, or whatever they are, then there is a place for legislation, and an obligation that we intend to accept. What I want to speak about, however, is this great need in the field of alcoholism in itself. You will remember that the American authorities state that one in twenty of chronic drinkers is an alcoholic, and you will remember the statement, too, of my hon. friend the Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), that one in twenty-two people in this country will in time go into a mental institution for treatment. There is some connection between the two. These people seventy-five years ago would not have been shocked, as many of you will be, by the statement of the Executive Director of the National (U. S. A.) Committee

on Alcoholism, a woman who is working closely with such scientists as Doctor Haggard and Doctor Jellinek of Yale University, and whose statement may come as a shock to people who do not want to study the problem. She says:

> "Science has ruled out alcohol as the cause of alcoholism."

That is a statement which needs, to my mind, some qualification, and understanding, but at the same time it comes from one who is the head of this great U. S. A. Committee. Again she says:

> "It is a misstatement to label alcoholism as a condition caused solely by alcohol,"

which is nearer to the truth. No complete agreement has been arrived at among researchers as to the causes of alcoholism but there are three factors which by themselves and in combination are important fields of investigation.

One is physiological; one is psychological; and the third, environmental.

Three authorities are quoted in support of this statement. These are people who are studying this problem. Doctor James Smith is Director of Research, New York University, Bellevue Medical Centre, who says:

> "Our laboratory and clinicial studies of alcoholism during the past several years have convinced us that alcoholism is a metabolic disease---in our opinion the alcoholic brings to life's problems an unusual and deficient physical constitution."

One phase of this research has undoubtedly to do with the physiological. The inbalance of the glands which control inner secretion upsets the metabolism of the body. The

alcohooic, from this viewpoint, is one who has a definite disease brought about as a result of his imperfect equipment, I have no doubt, in the physical sense, for meeting life.

The second authority is Doctor James Wall writing in the Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol:

> "The psychiatric literature of the past few years has stressed more and more the fact that compulsive drinking is a symptom and a result of personality disorder."

Now, there are two things you have got to cope with in the alcoholic, a personality disorder and, possibly with that, a physiological weakness. The environmental side is given a good deal of study, and I quote from Professor Williams, who is Director of Biochemical Institute, University of Texas, in a State where two summers ago the Yale Summer School was held. He gives his opinion that,---

> "Environmental factors are potent and indispensable for bringing about alcoholism---but they do not do so unless the person involved possesses the type of metabolic individuality which predisposes towards addiction."

In the field of research sponsored by the Ontario government at Queen's University and the University of Toronto, all these possible causes are being investigated and a cure to them is being sought.

This research will find practical application in the clinics and hospital being opened in Toronto and Kingston and in the new Treatment centre at Mimico.

There has been a good deal of criticism of the government in this field of research, education and rehabil-

itation, because of the slowness with which we move. It was in May 1949 that I went down to assist the Chief Commissioner in this work, but I do not think that we have been slow or negligent in tackling these problems. I remember on my frist trip to Yale University when I spoke with the Director, he said to me: "Go slowly with this business." He said: "We have been down to California and called in 5 experts, and they have said: 'Here is a budget of a million dollars or two million if you want it, for setting up this field of research and rehabilitation.'", and he said to them: "We do not want the million dollars, what we want to do is to start and build up something that studies your problem and faces it."

You have got to experiment in this field. Most important of all, you have to build up personnel from the people who are interested in it. It is not just a case of giving a job to so many people, this is a case of getting people who are keen about this who have the proper viewpoint in their approach. And I know this is true. In our own work in getting ready for this centre, we have realized that people are influenced by a great many things. They can come in for treatment, whether it is medical on the physiological side, or psychiatric, but they have to go out into life and live. They have to go back to their homes, and sometimes you have a record of a broken home, and you have got to tackle that; you have to find out what that man is working at, whether he is happy in that job or fitted for it. Some people have had a breakdown in this respect, simply because they had more ambition than capabilities, and they have to be counselled to fit their life in sensibly with what they are able to do.

You have to get men to do that, and we have been training at the Liquor Control Board, before this Centre began at all, one man in the field of rehabilitation. We have obtained the man who had the best record for placements in the D. V. A., and we have sent him in to find out all he can about the whole problem, to study it, and he is working now at the head of that department at Mimico to train other people and to carry on this work with social scientists in the homes and to bring them together to find what is wrong and to build them up, and in the places where these people work. We have had hundreds of conferences in this field with a great many people and I think you will see in the future that the industrial lists of Canada realizing the seriousness of this problem and are ready to give some time to it. I think the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) would bear me out in this statement.

This centre at Mimico should prove an illuminating illustration to the critics of the government who place their hopes in restricting outlets. When a man who is an alcoholic is sent to prison for two years, he is subject to complete prohibition. His source of alcohol is completely shut off. Yet, unless his disease is treated on the three levels outlined, he will come out an alcoholic and go on drinking to excess.

It is true that if he were to be discharged into a world where no alcohol existed---or could be made---he would necessarily cease to drink ---but no such world exists on the North American continent or any other continent--- and even if all the bars and taverns were closed he would still have plenty of access to alcohol through Government

Liquor Stores and Brewery Warehouses---which outlets would be accepted by most drys as about the minimum which it would be possible to secure in the face of public opinion as it exists today.

So, his cure is not contingent on reducing the number of outlets in Ontario---and I say that most sincerely. You cut down the number of outlets you have, and you have not solved the problem for this man.

MR. TEMPLE: It would decrease consumption.

MR. FOOTE: Perhaps, for a time, you would, but if you can give him the best treatment that science can provide in its present stage of knowledge on all the sides I have mentioned---send him out with some help in his home and his work, then you have done a great deal more for that man than simply following the old field of temperance, which is pretty well abandoned today, of merely cutting out his sources and ignoring the underlying causes of the disease. I know there are other sides and other views that will come out, but I am convinced that that is true from what I have learned from the men and women who have spent years in building up their knowledge.

In addition to these facilities which have been set up in Ontario, as the result of the studies of our Research Branch---this Government has held several special courses at Yale University for teachers, nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists and clergymen. We are planning a similar school in the University of Toronto and are preparing a setup for information centres in Ontario cities and towns where the most complete and scientific information will be available in readable and understandable terms for all who wish to receive it, along with information as to where

the disease may be treated. In this work we shall have the support of clergy, teachers, Alcoholic Annonymous and other interested bodies.

One of the professional temperance workers in this city has said to me: "What do you do every day but talk about this?" Well, I am telling you some of the things that we have done. When I mentioned the school at Yale, he said: "Yes, you go down there and talk and talk, and you have a holiday." I will tell you what came out of it in my own Department. When I came back and took over here, I remembered there had been people from the Department of Reform Institutions at Yale---there was a psychologist, a psychiatrist, superintendents and several others---and on their own initiative they came in to me with a complete plan for setting up this centre for treatment at Mimico. That is one of the things which comes out of this kind of work that we are doing, and a great many professional temperance people turn up their noses at it.

A clergyman from my own home town went to this school, and he came back and told me that he had gone there thinking that he knew all the answers. He said: "I came back knowing that I did not, but what I have got is a constructive approach to it." And I know other clergymen who have gone there and who have come back and become leading people---key people---in the temperance movement in their own communities, and who are doing work that is very much worth while.

To some of those people who question the value of what has been done in this short time, let me say that in my travels in Great Britain and in Europe to study this question, I have not seen anything faintly approaching what

we have accomplished. Since then we have had a visit from Mr. Berenmark of the Swedish Liquor Commission, who had been studying our plans for rehabilitation and had been very much impressed with them. We have had two visits from Doctor Ross, representing the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta. Doctor Ros was so much impressed that he came back again and sat in with our Committee of psychiatrists, psychologists, superintendents and our consulting experts to study this, and he expressed the ho e that in Alberta they will bring in some system comparable to what we have established here.

It seems to me that in view of what we have accomplished we should not be subjected to such violent criticism as we have been from outside the House or inside of it. I am sorry my friend the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) is not here today, because he made some comments on this the other day in which he spoke of us as having a "program of sales promotion."

MR. TEMPLE: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: With all due deference to him, I think he put the case a little more strongly than he should have, to say the least.

MR. TEMPLE: He did not put it strongly enough.

MR. FOOTE: Well, just you wait a minute until I get through with our side of it and then you can present yours.

MR. TEMPLE: I intend to.

MR. FOOTE: This gentleman ignored the fact that the Federal Government last year took about $60,000,000 from this province in excise and malt duties and they did not assume one bit of , moral responsibility or financial, or any other, for the programs that we have under-

taken. Moreover, when they were asked to send a representative to the conference in Sweden on traffic and alcohol, they shipped it along to us and we sent not only our own director but the doctor from the University of Toronto who had been working with him and, in return for the help we got from Yale, we assisted in sending one of their men, because their budget could not afford it.

This is a big field. There are people who are drawing a great deal of money out of this thing besides the Province of Ontario and I will say---and I will not be contradicted on this---that we are the first ones who have accepted any responsibility in this connection.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: The Federal Government simply sits on that $60,000,000 and we get back from it not one nickel. You in the Opposition cannot ignore what this government has done in a constructive way.

I have spoken to over one hundred groups in the last year in the church, some of them big groups made up of town councillors, magistrates and ministers, workers and all sorts of people, and I have put our position to them and they have said: "You are doing a good job. Keep it up."

I have said nothing about legislation, restrictive or otherwise, because I believe that the alcoholic will be affected very little by legislation. He has a disease and he needs treatment, and as research continues, that treatment will be forthcoming, but there is another class of drinkers who must be controlled either by their own sense of responsibility or by some form of legal compulsion. We had a Bill before the House the other day which had

many virtues in it and which was agreed upon in principle by all hon. members of this House who voted for it.

The criticism was---and it seems to me to be in familiar words---"You have not gone far enough." They criticized what was left out. But we will stand on the record of what we do, and I assure hon. members that in the field of legislation with regard to the control of other than alcoholics, the government is not finished at all. We will be guided by many groups who come to us from the temperance movement---and, believe me, we have had a good deal of help from the present head of that movement in Ontario, the Rev. Albert Johnson, who, I think, is one of the best men who has held that position, and I have spoken to his predecessors about it. We have men like Doctor Little, who is editor-in-chief of publications for the United Church in for a great many conferences and indeed last Summer when Doctor Little along with his colleague Mr. Stephenson started a summer camp for alcoholics at Honey Harbour, he got support from this government. In the beginning he was given a grant, we paid the first deficit, and my own director came to me in the last days of that camp and said: "There is still a deficit of $8,000 but I do not suppose there is a chance of getting anything more?", and I said: "Why not? I will call the Premier." And I did call the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and told him what was wanted and he said to come up and discuss it and we spent two or three hours talking about these problems. As a result of the attitude put forth, the Government of Ontario paid $16,000 towards that one small project, because we were approachable and were interested in it.

I have spoken about an important field of legisla-

tion with regard to traffic and alcohol. Our own director has been appointed secretary of the World Conference on this subject. In 1952 I think, with the support of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) who is very much interested in that subject, the World Conference will be brought to Ontario and that we will make that possible by our grants.

In this field of study a great deal has been done; in the University of Toronto in establishing tests, in consultation with Federal authorities about amendments to the Criminal Code, and as a result of the deliberations that have taken place, I think that we have a better chance of getting this whole problem on a Dominion-wide level, to say the least, and eventually on a world level. Out of this Conference, out of our study and our recommendations I think that much will come in this very necessary field. I agree with my hon. friend the member for High Park (Mr. Temple) that we should have much more stringent penalties for people---non-alcoholics---who drink, and who then go out and drive cars and virtually commit murder on the road, and I would be with him and I think that in the Federal field much could be covered.

I think we should look very fully into the advisability of having compulsory tests given to drivers to determine the amount of alcohol in the blood. In this field of legislation we are doing something. You will say again we are studying it, but we are studying it on the highest level and we are doing what the other provinces and the Federal people turned down flat, and I think that out of it much good will come.

I think there will be changes in our present legis-

lation in times to come, but there is just one more field that I wanted to mention which has possibilities and that is---and I suppose this will draw disagreement again---the field of self-regulation of industry. In the Old Country when I went to see those who were interested in this study from a governmental point of view, they said to me: "You go and see the Chairman of the London Board," of what they call, I think, the Licensed Victualers Corporation. Alderman Dyer is at the head of that corporation and has been for 17 years. You would be amazed at the way they have gone about the regulation of the industry from within.

In this work I have tried to get around and to know the people who are doing it, and I have no desire to repudiate my good friends who are in the hotel business, just to try to make myself popular with those who would give them no place at all in our industry. I will tell hon. members this, that there are, among our hotelkeepers, mighty fine men and women--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: ---who are trying to do a job. By going out and talking to them instead of damning them as people who are not worth anything to the community, I feel that if we respect them for the prossibilities they have in providing homes for people, shelter and food and all the rest of it, if we feel that they have some good in them, we can go and talk to them and tell them what is wrong. Our inspection branch has got to be trained to do this in order to know more about the problem. I believe that much good will come of it. I recall one of our own hotel-keepers who came into the office and who laid down a report

that he had got from a private firm of investigators, and he said: "I am trying to do what is right. Here is the slip for it," and there were many things in that report that were not complimentary to him or his establishment. He has changed his system. There some hotel keepers here who have added greatly to their payroll in order to put on extra men to control the behaviour of people in their establishment, and I feel that a great deal more can be done within the industry, and I would advise---if I might do so here---those who are purveyors of alcoholic beverages in industry, to remember that public opinion in the long run is what will set the legislation and that unless they can be intelligent and constructive in their approach, that the time may come when this part of their business will go, and I think that they can be a great deal of help, and I believe that they will.

I am coming now to probably the least popular part of an unpopular address and I certainly appreciate the manner in which it has been received, and the courtesy that I have been accorded. I feel that we need to say something more in defence of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario . My hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) has spoken of these increasing outlets. Since May 1949 when I went down to the Liquor Board, we have had nine hundred and thirteen applications for licenses. There has been a lot of talk about the number of licenses which have been granted, so remember that, 913 applications. According to the law, each one is advertised twice, so you have 1826 times that this question of licenses has come before the public of Ontario. Then with regard to each one of

these license---and there is nothing wrong with it at all ---the temperance people have had an organized opposition. In every case there is a routine opposition, and they have a perfect right to do it, but it means there is a great deal of publicity through the advertising and from this organized opposition, and the public hears "913" and they get the idea from some statements that are made in an irresponsible manner that this license board does nothing but sit down there and push license out or even urge them upon the people. "913." Now, what did they actually do with them. 698---700 all but two---were turned down flat, and you do not see any headlines in the paper: "Liquor License Board refuses 700 licenses"---not at all. You hear that "913 were applied for."

MR. TEMPLE: Are you suggesting they should open more?

MR. FOOTE: Just a moment, now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FOOTE: If you will just wait until I finish, I will deal with your questions. We have, after these 698 were rejected, a balance of 215. 49 of those 215 already have licensed premises and they are not new places on Yonge Street or any place else, they are places which already have certain types of licences. Of the balance of 166 licenses, 80 were granted to non-commercial enterprises, 52 to veterans clubs, 6 to labour clubs, and 22 to social and other non-profit organizations, which leaves, since 1949, licenses which were granted to the number of 86.

Now I will say this, that if this Legislature constituted the Licence Board of Ontario and these 913

applications had come before them, I will venture to say that more licenses would have been granted and not fewer. But if we are going to have a sense of proportion, let us not talk about the numbers that were applied for, the numbers that were advertised, the numbers that were opposed, but let us accept the fact that the vast majority of them were turned down, that the Licence Board instead of being generous with them was mighty tough.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I have imposed upon your good nature, and I hope you will not think I have brought this subject forward in any flippant or light way. I have come to realize the seriousness of it, probably more than most people because I have worked more with it. I know that there is a constructive approach that we can make, and that we are making in the light of past experience and no amount of money has been refused to carry on that work.

I know that outside of the field of alcoholism there is need for legislation, if it comes forward constructively on the basis of what we have learned from the people who are interested and indeed from hon. members of this House.

When the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) introduced his Bill, if I remember correctly the idea was that places that were "wet" in theory but "dry" in practice would be able to have a vote before any action was taken. Now I may say in that regard that I have discussed the matter at great length and I think he is right about that, and that it is a very reasonable proposition which is being considered by the government

at the present time. I felt that what he had to say about it has been very constructive, as others have been in this way, but I will tell you this much, that I thought of it first myself.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page C-19 follows)

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I detect at this Session a note of happiness in Government ranks--or I might say relief in Government ranks--that the problems which faced us at this time last year are no longer present. I refer to the problem of unemployment which I know last year disturbed the Hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) a good deal.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): We solved that one alright.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I watched his face downstairs in the committee room as this deputation of young people appealed to him to provide work, and I know he was worried and I know further, Mr. Speaker, that he did not have the answer, and I would like to suggest that this Government still has not the answer. Times are good at the present time, yes, times are good and as the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) has said: "They are getting better", but why are they getting better? I am sure the cause of this progress in our economic prosperity today is a cause which we as citizens in Canada surely must deprecate, because in my opinion there are two causes; first, the inflation, the deliberate or otherwise inflation of our currency at Ottawa. Our currency has been inflated to a point never before reached in Canadian history. Canada, with a normal industrial production of $4 billion during the depression years, our production has increased to $9½ billion in terms of

the 1939 dollar, but the amount of active bank deposits and the total dollars and cents in circulation has been boosted from $1 billion, 800 million in 1938 to $4 billion, 422 million in 1949. In other words, we have inflated our dollar bill by four times while our production has barely doubled.

Bruce Hutchinson said in a recent article in MacLean's magazine:

> "Not satisfied with this--"

not satisfied with having reduced or having devalued the Canadian dollar down to 58 cents,--

> "--the Government last Spring pumped an additional $200 million into the currency, which--"

as he put it,--

> "--was achieved by bank borrowing out of thin air"

Another reason for this buoyant employment situation is world conditions, and over that also the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has had no control, and today has no control.

Last June sometime--and I am sure every hon. member of the House must have received this letter too--we got a letter from the Canadian Peace Association, Miss Mary Jennison, Secretary, 49 Walker Avenue, Toronto, and we were asked to sign a petition to ban the atom bomb, to prevent a war we were warned was just around the corner. Now it happened that I delayed answering that letter a few days, and in the meantime the war started in Korea. So I sent

this letter back to the Peace Congress at that time and said:

> "May I suggest that Rev. J.G. Endicott's statements that Russia wants peace, and that we should ban the atom bomb have become rather ludicrous in view of a brazen Russian-sponsored agression in Korea, in the last few days. It is to be hoped that those who have made themselves mouthpieces for Russian Foreign Policy, based as it is on a nation determined to remain armed to the teeth herself while promoting phoney proposals abroad, will now take immediate steps to speak against this criminal invasion of South Korea. Nothing would have a more retarding effect on Russian aggression right now than a strong denunciation of her aggression by your peace congress."

I sent that letter to Miss Jennison. I still have not had a reply, but I did not notice any denunciation of Russian aggression yet by these people who were shouting peace and who were attempting to get us to ban the atom bomb at a time when Stalin was preparing to urge his satellites to further aggression.

I noticed in this morning's paper that Mr. Gerhart Eisler, who was about to be tried in the United States of America as a spy and who escaped to Eastern Germany and

became head of the propaganda section of the Government there under the auspices of the Communist Party, is now condemned by the newspaper of that Party in Eastern Germany for having attacked Stalin in statements back in 1927 and 1928, and in statements again in 1937, and has signed a "confession". These things apparently are extracted from everyone who is guilty of deviation from the party line in that country, and Mr. Eisler signed a "confession", which in Eastern European countries today means he has signed his death warrant.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that surely people in Ontario see that in countries in Eastern Europe dominated by Russia today, the local people in those countries who brought about Russian domination, who assisted in the overthrow of their own Government, have themselves been one by one liquidated by the new government as soon as it became formally established. Therefore I sincerely and honestly say that those who today are expressing the Russian line on this peace question, I think they would do more for the cause of peace if they came out honestly and denounced aggression, even though it be Russian aggression, and take their chances, because if Russia happens to win--and one man who asked me to sign the peace petition suggested to me that it would be better if we had world-wide victory by Russia than to have a world-wide war at the present time, with which I could not agree--if we were to permit Russia and international communism to gain a victory over the whole world, in this Chamber I know the people who would

suffer first, would be the people in this group right here. Perhaps the people across the aisle would suffer too. Perhaps some of you would be wakened up by the secret police at four o'clock in the morning and taken away. I do not know whether the Liberals would suffer. In some European countries the Liberals seem to get on the band wagon somehow. They are in the middle and they do not suffer.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: But I would like to say that I was reading Edward Fitzgerald's translation of that famous poem, The Rubaiyat by Omar Khayyam, the other night, and I came across a little verse which I thought might contain good advice to certain members of the Peace Congress and those who express Russian policy in Canada and in Ontario. With apologies to Edward Fitzgerald, I would like to read:

"And those who would for Stalin's
victory here prepare,
And those who hope in Soviet
expansion there to share,
A DP from the tower of darkness
cries,
Fools!!!.....for your reward is
neither here nor there."

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): I would rather have the Fitzgerald version.

MR. DENNISON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about health. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the other day, I think honestly and sincerely, announced

the establishment of a cancer research clinic in connection with the Wellesley Hospital. He also announced that this Legislature would be asked for provide $2 million for that cancer research and treatment centre. I believe the Hon. Premier (Mr. Forst) is sincere when he realizes the terrible destruction, the high death rate caused by cancer in this Province and the generally inadequate facilities to deal with it.

As usual in statements made before the Orders of the Day, the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) drew a considerable number of headlines in the press. In the Globe and Mail next morning, there appeared a headline:

"Two Million Dollar Cancer Centre"

and a complete statement of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). It made me think, Mr. Speaker, of the headlines we had last year, also following a before-the-Orders of the Day announcement of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). Those headlines read:

"Pay-Like-Rent Housing Wins Approval

Bond Builders to Prevent Buyer Losses"

(Take "D" follows)

Now, that was in the Globe and Mail.

In the Daily Star we have, "The $5,800 home, $580. down, Frost low-cost plan", in the inside section, "$5,800. home, $580 down". It then goes on to say, "or may be all paid as rent, Frost low-cost plan". In other words, there is a possibility that there may not be anything down under the Frost low-cost plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the regrettable thing about this thing is that last year we did not get housing by headlines and this year I am wondering if we are going to get health by headlines. It will require on the part of the government a little more than headlines. Last year in Ontario some 6000 people died from cancer. Next to heart disease, cancer kills more people than any other disease in Ontario, and what is more startling about cancer is that 50% of the patients who inaugurate treatments or who go for treatments, 50% of these patients have had cancer for six months before they come in to present themselves for treatment. I think the one question that cancer patients must have asked themselves in fighting this dread disease which takes so much money and such a long time in most cases is this, "Will the Ontario treatment centre be free?". They must have wondered if the treatment would be free as it is in Saskatchewan. That is a question they must have asked themselves and I am sure the people of this province would have welcomed even more an announcement that this cancer treatment centre would be free as it has been in the province of Saskatchewan since 1944. In 1944, the late Deputy Minister of Health in Ontario, Dr. B.T. McGhie, urged that cancer treatment in Ontario should also be free.

The hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Phillips) speaking the other day presented the problems of his department in regard to public health under three headings, one, preventive; two, curative and three, rehabilitation. He implied that the province had responsibility under preventive and under rehabilitation, but had no responsibility under number two, curative, or at least he said that he felt that hospital insurance could take care of number two. He implied that if the province were to assume responsibility under number two the cost would be prohibitive. Now, Mr. Speaker, the customers are paying for the cost anyway, the idea of these hospital plans is that a shared cost is a reduced cost, and we must not be carried away by the propaganda that has been freely distributed in this country by the American Medical Associations to the effect that the health plan in Great Britain is costing more than before the health plan was inaugurated. That is not true. Last May, there was a report made in the United States of Americy by Dr. Michael M. Davis who was in charge of research in medical economics. This report is published from Washington, and he made the statement that the health plan in Great Britain was costing people $21.00 per person per year and giving complete coverage whereas in the United States of America under the hit and miss plan they were paying $62.00 per person per year and only getting partial coverage. Therefore, we must not be afraid that the health plan is going to cost a lot of money. It will actually cost less money than we are paying today if we had a genuine health plan in this province.

Now, just let us deal with the supposition that these insurance plans are taking care of the situation. They are doing nothing of the kind. In Ontario if we take the people covered by Blue Cross, by Cumba, by Associated Medical Services and by other groups taking care of hospital plans, we get a total of 1,528,000 in a hospital plan and approximately 350,000 people under medical and surgical plans. Thr est of our people are not being taken care of at the present time.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) has stepped up the construction of hospital beds in the province by grants, there is no doubt about that, last year we had 9,310 nwe hospital beds in general hospitals, but the population of Ontario is growing to such an extent each year that it takes 1,000 of these beds just to look after the increase in the population. The big problem today in constructing hospitals is the fact that the federal government will only give $1000. per bed, the province will give $1000. per bed, but the cost of building a hospital which used to cost only $3,500 per bed at the end of the war has now increased to $10,000 per bed. That is the cost of building a hospital today, and who is responsible for it? The present fiscal policy of the Federal government in blowing the lid off price ceilings and permitting prices to rise out of line has resulted in this situation we face today. If the Federal government were to take their responsibility seriously they should increase their hospital grants by three times, because costs of building hospitals have increased three times due to their tinkering with the price structure and upsetting the price structure by premature removal of controls.

The same problem faces municipalities. Municipalities by statute in the province of Ontario have to put up $4.00 a day for indigent patients. The hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) announced, I believe, in his speech that the government grant for indigent patients had increased 400% in the last 4 years and the municipal grant had only increased 70%. Well, Mr. Speaker, the government previously were paying in the neighbourhood of 75¢ a patient at the end of the war, and a 400% increase on 75¢ a patient just brings you up to $3.00 a patient, but the municipalities are required to pay up to $4.00 a patient.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); In the picture, you know, our per diem grant, is not extended only to indigent beds, we have extended that to all public ward beds and that makes quite a difference. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when we talked this matter over 7 years ago, at that time, as the hon. Member (Mr. Dennison) says, the amount being paid I think was 60¢ per day per indigent patient. There was no grant for public ward beds at all. We afterwards increased that to 75¢ a day. That increase was at the insistance of the hospitals who claimed 75¢ a day was totally inadequate and we felt it was totally inadequate and we changed over and gave a grant for every public ward bed. That runs as high as $2.40 a day for every public ward bed. Now, if you were in most hospitals I should imagine to translate into indigency the grants we make to public ward beds you will find we are paying our share of indigency but the hospitals' total "shot" for indigency.There is no doubt about that. I think we could show the hon. Member (Mr. Dennison) the figures that he

would find that we are really paying under the new grant system the total cost of indigency and the municipal contributions to the hospital were really double on top of that. We changed our grant to that.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, that is true, but the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) must remember that back in October, 1943, Dr. Vivan, the then Minister of Health, promised the hospitals of this province that hewas going to underwrite before the end of another year the entire cost of indigent patients and general ward care as well.

MR. FROST: I think we have done that, I think the hon. Member (Mr. Dennison) will agree we really have done that.

MR. DENNISON: I am very sure that Dr. Vivian gave the municipalities to understand that this underwriting would relieve them also of their share, which is now $4.00 per person per day.

And now as to the public health units which have been organized in this Province: I know the former Minister of Health (Mr. Kelly) had considerable difficulty in staffing these public health units, but I would like to point out that one-third of Ontario is still not covered by a public health unit, by full-time medical officer of health, and this matter of public health in the case of an epidemic and for civil defence is very, very necessary. I would urge upon the Government to see that as soon as possible public health units are staffed by a full-time medical officer of health and the usual assistants required. In an area of 50,000 people, he should have five or six public health nurses to assist him.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) has outlined the mental health clinics or mental hygiene clinics and has suggested that in the near future he is hoping that further mental hospital construction may be unnecessary if we set up these clinics staffed by a doctor who will have psychiatric training, a psychologist, a nurse and a sociologist, and they will carry on educational, diagnostic and treatment service. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) is very, very optimistic if he thinks at the present time Ontario is in any position to set up mental hygiene clinics in time to prevent the additional building of more mental hospitals. Again we come back to the old-age question, "Where will the doctors, the personnel for these clinics come from?" Certainly our present training facilities are inadequate and are not going to turn them out. At the present time there is a bursary available in the federal health grant for anyone who, after taking a medical course, will take a course in psychiatry or public health. The bursaries are quite generous, they pay $200. per month for single status and $250. per month for married status, but very few young men in Ontario, after they graduate from medical school, take advantage of these bursaries. Very, very few go ahead and accept this offer. This year there will be only five students in the University of Toronto Medical School who will graduate in psychiatry, and the question naturally arises as to how many generations we are going to wait for these mental hygiene clinics to do the job.

The biggest problem facing anyone in Ontario today is the shortage of doctors. The number of doctors in Canada

has not increased enough to matter in the last 40 years. In 1911 we had 970 people to each physician, dotay we have one physician for 963 people. On November 26, 1946, I complained to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) about that condition and he told me in a letter that he was having difficulty getting doctors, staff for his health units. He said he was hopeful that the condition would right itself. That was in 1946. The Government has taken no steps to right the condition since. Dr. Victor Johnson, National Chairman of the General Practitioners Section of the Canadian Medical Association, speaking in Moncton recently said that more doctors are urgently needed. He said that hospitals were being built and no staff available to operate them. I understand that in North Bay a hospital is being built and not enough money is left in the fund to provide beds and necessary accommodation. The Federal Minister of Health, Mr. Martin, speaking in Toronto a few days ago said, "In the past six years Canada has only graduated 786 dentists."

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

I have checked this with the Canadian Dental Association today, and they claim that they graduated 952 dentists. Now, hon. Mr. Martin, with retirements and death, has whittled this number down to a net increase of only 113 or, if the Dental Association's figures are correct -- and I guess they are -- we could have a net increase of 175 dentists.

But, in the meantime, our population has grown in the past six years by 1,700,000 people, so that the increase in dentists is certainly completely inadequate to care for the people needing their services.

That figure is almost unbelievable when you consider that in 1922 we graduated from Toronto University alone 327 dentists, whereas in the past six years we graduated in the whole of Canada only 131 per year.

Now, the Toronto School of Dentistry was able to care for 80 students when we had two million people in the Province of Ontario. Today, the same School of Dentistry is attempting to graduate twice that number of students. They graduated 168 last year.

So Ontario badly needs a new dental college.

I again quote from hon. Mr. Kelly's letter to me, dealing with dentistry. He said:

> "Do you think it humanly possible to get any more students into the colleges where they teach medicine and dentistry? I did try my hardest to get others in, but the answer was

'No room'. Only one young man was I able to get in, and that was because of a special war record."

There is the hon. Minister of Health unable himself to get students into the dental schools in Ontario. The situation is serious. Obviously we need a new dental school in Ontario.

And we are having the same trouble with doctors. Over the past half century the number of rural students who were financially able to become doctors has greatly dwindled year by year, and these are the ones who become the general practitioners serving "Old Man Ontario".

The Dental Association has made a suggestion that in order to get dentists into rural areas, the province or the municipalities set up dental offices, with a workshop ready to go to work, so the dental graduates can get out and practice for three years without cost, to give them a start in the rural areas. The Association believes that may result in a good many staying in the rural areas, if they have practised there for three years.

In Manitoba, and at least one other province, they give young doctors a bursary, if they guarantee to practise in a rural area designated by the Minister of Health for a period of two, three or four years.

I would suggest that the Province of Ontario experiment with this plan, and give, say, $500.00 a year to rural medical students who will agree to go back to their home areas and practise there.

Something has to be done about this, and I would also suggest that the medical school, which I believe is being started in Ottawa, should be completed as soon as possible, and another medical school started in Hamilton.

Then, too, this problem of the shortage of doctors and dentists will affect our whole civil defence effort. In the last war we were told by an inspector of the Toronto fire department that the Toronto fire department could only handle ten fires at one time, and that was not second, third or fourth alarm fires, but just average, ordinary fires. We were also told at that time that one aeroplane could start as many as 850 separate fires, and at that time even with two thousand trained men--and it took a whole year to train these men, four hours one night a week--they were only able to handle thirty separate fires at one time.

If that situation is bad in connection with fires, it is equally bad in connection with hospital facilities. In case of an enemy attack on this side, we would need at least four times these facilities which we have available today, and we have for the past six years, since the war, "fiddled" away valuable time training no more doctors than usual, no more dentists than usual, no more nurses than usual, and we have not enough now to take care of civilian needs, let alone taking care of the services should there be an emergency.

In the last war, 25% of the dentists of Canada

were taken into the army to look after the servicing of 1,000,000 service personnel, leaving the remainder of 75% to look after 13,000,000 people at home.

That was far from adequate, and in those days as I recall, it was necessary to make a dental appointment three or four months in advance, to get dental needs taken care of.

The "Noronic" fire in the City of Toronto last fall has shown the complete inadequacy of our fire fighting services, and our health services in this City, and if we should be faced with a reduction of 25% in our necessary services, as we would be immediately, in case of war, and for the duration, you can imagine the difficulties we would have here.

The Federal Government sometime ago promised great things in regard to health services. I have a clipping here from the Toronto Daily Star, in 1948, outlining the promises made by Rt. hon. Mr. King--it is dated the 14th of May, 1948. He promised $30,000,000 for health. He was going to give Ontario $4,336,000 for hospitals, if we put up dollar for dollar. He was going to give us $1,000,000 for cancer, if we put up dollar for dollar. He was going to give us $1,000,000 for mental health, and there was no stipulation annexed to that. He was going to give $740,000 for tuberculosis; he was going to give $1,400,000 to strengthen the general public health services.

Now, what has happened? Parliament passed the Bill for $30,000,000 immediately. There were no questions

asked. Then the Government proceeded to fence the grants around with so much red tape, and so many Orders-in-Council that the trouble started.

The C.C.F. National Leader, after the plan had been in operation for one year, asked the Government what had been spent. That was on the 8th of April of the following year. Three weeks later hon. Mr. Martin said he would have the answer "the next day" -- April 28th. April 28th passed, and still no answer. On April 29th the Government was again asked, and the Rt. hon. Prime Minister said he would have the answer "by three o'clock that afternoon; that these grants had been well administered".

On April 30th, the Parliament was dissolved, and still no answer from the Liberal Government as to w where this $30,000,000 disappeared.

A week later the C.C.F. Leader again asked the question, and he was again promised the answer, after Parliament was dissolved, bu the answer was not forthcoming. In the meantime, as you know, we had an election, and it may be that some of the hon. members of this House of the Liberal group took some part in that election. They went up and down the country telling about the $30,000,000 the Federal Government had given to promote health services, across this country. Finally, after the election was fought -- and I did not think at the time it was cause for great rejoicing for the Liberal Leader to win an election that way -- but when the election was fought and won, Parliament was again called,

and again Mr. Coldwell asked for an answer, and the answer was given on October 3rd, that only seven and one half million dollars of the $30,000,000 had been actually spent on health.

Then, looking back on the Liberal promises -- away back to 1919 -- promises of health insurance were floating around at election time, but after the election very little was heard of them, and apparently that still holds good today.

We are engaged in this Province on a special health survey. I believe the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) spoke to me about this the other day. They had surveyed certain portion of the people of Ontario, representing the average families, but of what avail is a survey if we do not have a plan of action when the survey is finished?

The United States Government proposed a complete health insurance and a hospitalization and doctor plan for the United States of America. The medical profession was opposed to it. In Canada, our Federal Government is still "stalling"; they promised a plan many years ago, but we are still waiting for the plan. In the meantime, I say that Ontario, and the hon. Minister of Health of this Province (Mr. Phillips),--a Province with a population of four and one-half million,-- of which at least three million have no coverage at all -- should take the responsibility of setting up something in Ontario.

Back in 1943 and 1944 Doctor Vivian, the then Minister of Health, promised that Ontario would soon have a complete health insurance programme. He was not satisfied with a mere municipal programme, and in case the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) -- whom I am sorry is not in his place at the present time -- is not aware of these promises, I have a whole sheaf of them. Doctor Vivian was only repeating, I suggest, the promises of the Conservative Party at the election. Point No. 11 of the famous 22 points promised that:

> " Medical and dental and other health protection will be available to all".

That was not just the existing services, but an entirely nes service was promised, and Doctor Vivian enlarged on that time after time. In September, 1943, he said that he was going to begin:

> " Low-cost sickness insurance to provide every citizen of the Province with protection so that every citizen of the Province should be able to obtain medical and surgical care, and hospitalization."

In November of that year, speaking in Guelph, he outlined the Ontario Government's plan to:

> " make dental and medical care available to every resident of Ontario".

In December of that year we find this headline:

> " Underwriting the general ward care will end deficits for all time to come in the hospitals."

Again, on December 24th, we find:

" A plan experimental area for a free hospital scheme."

Not the one we have suggested, prepaid, but a "free scheme", he said.

Again, on December 18th:

"Hospital insurance Bill is going to come up next Session, Health Minister says".

Again, that came at the time the Federal Plan was suggested, and perhaps I should remind the Liberals of this Federal plan. On the 2nd of March, 1944, the Federal Government proposed a plan whereby single people should pay $12.00 a year, and married people $24.00 a year, and we would have a complete plan. Doctor Vivian discussed that Federal plan, but he said he had one which was much better, and which was more effective than the Federal Plan, and was only waiting to bring it into effect.

In June, 1944, he said the plan would include dental care, and we would get the whole thing free.

On the 14th of March, 1945, "plans for health services for Ontario were prepared", so the hon. Minister at that time told the Legislature.

And so on. We had health by headlines for a whole year, but unfortunately little to show for it today.

I would suggest, therefore, to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) that he take one leaf out of Doctor Vivian's promises. We are not going to ask for a complete plan over the whole Province, all at once, as was suggested, but we would suggest that he take one area in the Province of Ontario, consisting of perhaps four or five counties,

and set up in that area a model hospital plan. The growth of these private plans show that a hospital plan is very necessary. He should bring the number of beds up to about seven per thousand in order to make it work, and in the center of the area he would have to have one hospital fitted for more advanced surgery, X-rays, and so forth. But set it up, because nothing has helped Western Canada more than this municipal health plan which, in the Province of Saskatchewan, has merged into a complete hospital plan.

In these western provinces where every man and his wife gets protection for $10.00 each, and children $5.00 each, with a total of $30.00 per family.

In Saskatchewan a survey was made some years ago, and they found that in the areas which have had the plan for some years, the infant death rate was 14 points below the average for Canada of 54 deaths per one thousand.

And the sickness rate was two fifths of the accepted average for Canada, and three times as many people saw their doctors in their own offices, as was the case before the plan went into effect. And what is more important, the cost of the plan was only 44% of what it had cost previously.

Now, what are the arguments against such a plan? I would like to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that the Gallup Poll survey shows that 70% of the people want such a plan, and nothing would make this Government more popular with what is usually referred to as "Old Man Ontario" than to do something about the health of "Old Man Ontario", and give him the security that when he needs hospital care, hospital care will be available, whether he can pay for it or not.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Hydro. Hydro has become a one billion dollar enterprise in the Province of Ontario. Hydro today is the largest single enterprise in the Province of Ontario. The hon. Member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) told us the other day that 864,000 horsepower is now delivered out of over 2,567,000 horsepower of new development launched.

During the last year I have drawn the attention of the Government to our annual consumption of Hydro which, at that time, was increasing at the rate of 82,000 horsepower per year.

I have just received the Hydro Report the other day for 1949, and in this 1949 Report, we are told that the consumption for 1949 -- that is, the total available capacity generated and purchased -- was 108,000 horsepower. For 1948 it was 132,000, and I noticed in a news item the other day Mr. Saunders says that this year Hydro expects that the increase in consumption will reach 250,000 horsepower, and no doubt, in 1950, -- although I have not the figures, the consumption will be much higher than it was in 1949. Therefore, we are facing a period now, thanks to certain international events and to stepped-up industrial production in this Province, where we will have to have an increasing hydro production.

But one of the most important things which is taking place in connection with Hydro today, however, is the conversion of the frequency of approximately 772,000 customers, from 25 cycles to 60 cycles.

The frequency conversion is going to cost, according to the estimates of Stone & Webster, $191,000,000 as of March, 1947, but the savings due to frequenty conversion in the period of conversion, and in the 18 years following, will amount to $187,000,000, so that the frequency conversion will save for the tax-payers of Ontario everything it cost them in money at the present time, and it was estimated that in time the Hydro frequency conversion will pay for itself in savings.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

MR. DENNISON: For that reason I think we have to make frequency conversion work and make it efficient. I was sorry the Government did not accept the suggestion of the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association of some time ago, when they suggested that we could save ourselves $18,000,000 with this frequency conversion if we charged the industrial consumer "a little more". They said that these industrial consumers were the ones who would benefit by $55,000,000 in the 18-20 years following conversion, and they believed they should be charged more than the $18,000,000 we were charging them for conversion. In other words, they were paying $18,000,000 and getting back $55,000,000 in savings, and it was going to cost the Hydro $64,000,000 to convert them. So I am sure it would have been a help in the whole conversion scheme if a little more had been charged to the industrial consumers as suggested by this Association.

I notice that the new Liberal Leader (Mr. Thompson) in the Province of Ontario says that he is opposed to this conversion now, although in March 1948 every Liberal in the House supported conversion, and I would agree with them they were sensible in supporting conversion, but their Leader is not so sure.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Is my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) sure he is correctly quoting them -- that he is opposed to conversion rather than as to the methods involved?

MR. DENNISON: Well, I hope he is not opposed to conversion, but he said that the programme was inept -- well, that means foolish, unwise.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: In the way it was being carried out.

MR. DENNISON: And costly.

MR. OLIVER: Yes. You would agree with that yourself, would you not?

MR. DENNISON: Well, I agree that the way it is carried out, it is not too efficient.

MR. OLIVER: No. Then we are all in the one camp now.

MR. DENNISON: But I hope that the Leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Thompson) is not going to stop the programme, because I think Ontario needs this programme to be completed as soon as possible and as efficiently as possible. I notice also the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thompson) is going to fire the Chairman of the Hydro just as soon as he can get his hands on him.

MR. OLIVER: Elusive fellow.

MR. DENNISON: And he is making no bones about it.

SOME hon. MEMBER: He will still get a superannuation.

MR. DENNISON: I was wondering when I heard the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) speak and express such praise for him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: And when a liberal can put a man right next to the hon. C.D. Howe, that means --

AN hon. MEMBER: That he is a nice guy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON:-- that that particular liberal is not going to fire him, I hope.

MR. MACLEOD: Did you not write a letter to the Star praising him too?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Then why did you say it?

MR. DENNISON: I disagree very, very strongly with the suggestion that any government should come into power, or any political leader in this province should come into power and threaten that he would repeat the debacle that was caused to the civil service of this province by the hon. Mitchell Hepburn when he came to power --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: -- by the wholesale dismissal of old-time civil servants and the hiring of new party people who in many cases were not experienced and not capable of doing the job.

So I say that conversion must be accomplished soon and must be efficient. Now the average rural customer in the 25 cycle area now is looking forward to this conversion, but a farmer who purchased a half a horse power motor a few years ago --

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): A half what?

MR. DENNISON: A half a horse power motor a few years ago, had to pay --

MR. PORTER: I never heard of a half a horse.

MR. DENNISON: --If he purchased this motor for 25 cycle it cost him about $25.00 more than a 60 cycle motor.

AN hon. MEMBER: I do not know why that should be a surprise to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) -- or is it the Attorney General who took objection?

AN hon. MEMBER: The Attorney General.

MR. DENNISON: Is it the Attorney General? A farmer who purchased a one horse power motor a few years ago was penalized also, for today the difference has increased between the 25 cycle and the 60 cycle price, so that I know the savings we will achieve through 60 cycle conversion are going to be greater today than they were a few years ago, but the question I think the hon. Minister of Hydro (Mr. Challies) in this House should tell us is: "Will these savings be great enough to offset the increased costs which undoubtedly will result at the present?" Will they be great enough?

When conversion was planned we were informed by no less an authority than Stone & Webster, page 56, that the cost per customer would be $54.20 in 1942 and run upwards to $64.20 in 1963. Now, a farmer today looking forward to saving--a farmer today purchasing a half a horse power motor can look forward to saving $33.00 at 60 cycle.

Hon. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister Without Portfolio): Make it one-fourth, it will be quicker that way.

MR. DENNISON: Well, purchasing a one horsepower motor he could look forward to a saving of $65. as between 25 and 60 cycle.

Now, the question we have to ask is, is this conversion being operated efficiently?

AN hon. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. DENNISON: Last Session and the Session before I asked a question on the Order Paper. I asked the Government how was the Comstock Company paid, and I was given a "run-around" - answer. I was told they were paid on a cost-plus-fee basis, but there was no basis laid down as to how fees were paid. Therefore, I would like to set before the House, some remarks of a constituent of the hon. member for York, East (Miss MacPhail). He came to see me about the conversion of his premises, and he had certain advice to give the Hydro on the matter. I asked him if he would give me a memo of the situation, and he did, and I think it is important that hon. members of the House be informed of this, because as this man said, Mr. Saunders in his letter of May 10th, 1950, said:

> "also let me add that we at the Hydro would welcome any suggestion for improvements in service, either in connection with frequency change-over or of hydro generally".

The improvements this person has to offer are as follows:

First, he would stop the contract, or he would dismiss the contract of the Comstock Company and he would do the work by the Hydro itself.

MR. CHALLIES: Did he send that into the Commission or did he just send it to you?

MR. DENNISON: Well, I do not know whether he sent this to the Commission or not. Second, he suggested that all domestic change-over be done by Hydro employees; and, third, he would suggest that factories be changed

over by their own conversion technicians, if that were possible.

MR. CHALLIES: They can do that now.

MR. DENNISON: I believe that has already been done. And, fourth, that he would check all the personnel employed by Comstock to see if they were capable of doing the work.

But, he gives this experience that he had in the change-over on his own premises. He said:

> "The following actual details outline the inefficient and costly manner in which this operation is being carried out in Ontario to the accompaniment of much publicity by Chairman Saunders and self-back slapping by other officials concerned."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: He said:

> "The first episode consisted of the collection data on the 'Frequency Sensitive' equipment owned by the consumer."

That was in his own premises. This required six trips -- six trips by the contractor, four trips by two men and two trips by one man in a truck, spread over a period of several weeks.

> "From this number of trips surely the correct data could have been collected from the nameplates of the following appliances: 1-refrigerator (sealed unit), 1-¼ H.P. pump motor, 1-1/3 H.P. pump motor, 1-washing machine motor (belt drive), 1-range timer, 1-clock, 1-record

player, 1 fan-driven air heater and 1-time clock."

I suppose in East York and Scarboro that might have been just an ordinary customer. He said:

"Next on March 9, 1950, with great publicity both on the radio and in the press it was announced by Chairman Saunders that Scarboro municipality was the first to have been completely changed over. This caused considerable surprise to the consumer owning the above equipment and many others situated over large areas of the municipality since it was a case of Mr. Saunders being terribly misinformed or otherwise.

On March 9th, 1950 a start was made.."

MR. CHALLIES: What year is that?

MR. DENNISON: 1950, March the 9th. Just last March 9th. He said on that day a start was made, --

" to change over this equipment which was not to end until August 2, 1950. This consisted of 2 men and truck changing the sealed unit in refrigerator (see later development regarding this). March 10th the power supply was changed from 25 to 60 cycles with the following taking place on that place:/

now, listen to this, - -

"(a) 1 man 1 truck tagging items to be changed

"(b) 1 man 1 truck changing house meter

"(c) 2 men 1 truck attempt to change pump motor."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON:

"(d)"(d) 4 men 1 truck and 1 passenger car look at pump motor (new motor shaft ¼" out of line of shaft of direct coupled gear pump)

"(e)" 2 men 1 truck pick up clock and again look at range timer.

"(f) 1 man 1 truck pick up time clock."

Then three days later, March 13th:

"2 men 1 truck listen to refrigerator."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: March 14, listen to this:

"(a) 1 man 1 truck return time clock (but it wasn't operating)

"(b) 2 men 1 truck install pump motor and find that motor supplied for other pump is not suitable. It should be noted that householders' water supply for septic tank, etc. off from March 10th to 14th.

"(c) 2 men and 1 truck install motor for washing machine. (Motor turned wrong way so rotation was changed over by customer)."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON:

"(d) 2 men 1 truck remove range time.

"(e) 1 man 1 truck install motor in record player."

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Were they the same two men?

MR. DENNISON: Next day, March 15th --:

"Hydro notified of hum and noise on radios.

"March 21:

"(a) 2 men 1 truck attempt to install motor in fan heater (new motor not suitable).

"(b) 1 man 1 passenger listen to radio (no action).

"March 23, 2 men 1 truck 2 trips change heater motor.

"March 29, man and truck again pick up time switch.

"April 3rd man and truck return time switch (still not operating).

"April 12 man and truck pick up time switch again.

"April 28 man and truck return time switch (now operating but part missing)."

MR. CHALLIES: Did it work?

MR. DENNISON:

"May 10 received a nice letter from Robt. H. Saunders which reads as follows:-

'I am advised by our officials that some few weeks ago your electrical service was converted from 25 cycles to 60 cycle frequency. This work was done by the Hydro Electric Power

Commission of Ontario in co-operation with your local Hydro system. It is my sincere hope that you were not seriously inconvenienced during the cut-over period and that your electrical equipment involved in the change-over is performing satisfactorily'

Apparently Mr. Saunders was poorly advised and neglected to inform the consumers who are paying the cost about the part Canadian Comstock are playing in this operation."

Eight days later, --

"May 18 2 men and truck install new motor on other pump.

May 22, investigation showed that in installing unit in refrigerator thermal insulation and 4 other parts had not been put back in and were required. Householder informed on March 9th these parts were not required. Hydro notified.

May 25, 1 man and car make enquiry only regarding refrigerator.

May 30, 2 men and truck complete refrigerator.

June 8, 2 men and truck install range timer (which now makes a continuous noise like a motor boat).

July 28, 1 man and car return clock picked up March 10th and after trying to

make it operate for one hour took it away again.

August 2, 1 man 1 truck return clock (second hand missing)."

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Is this somebody's diary?

MR. DENNISON: This man summarized the results as follows:

(1) Supply voltage so low at times that consumer unable to operate certain appliances.

(2) Noisy range timer.

(3) Part still missing from time clock.

(4) Second hand still missing from other clock.

(5) Radios noisy."

MR. CHALLIES: Who is he? Let us know.

MR. SALSBERG: Who is he, anyway?

MR. DENNISON: Well, I---

MR. CHALLIES: Come now.

MR. DENNISON: I do not know whether I should give his name, or not.

MR. CHALLIES: Yes, you should. Who was he, and where does he live?

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: (Leader of the Opposition): He is an engineer.

MR. DENNISON: He lives in Scarboro.

MR. CHALLIES: Scarboro is a big place.

MR. DENNISON: He is an engineer.

MR. CHALLIES: Who is he? Where does he live?

MR. W.U. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): You cannot demand that.

AN hon. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will have to accept the assurance of the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) as to this man. He happens to be a professional engineer.

MR. CHALLIES: That is all the more reason we would like to get the record and find the facts.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, these are the facts.

MR. CHALLIES: You will not give the man's name, so it does not look very well on the evidence.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It certainly does not look very well.

AN hon. MEMBER: You can say that again.

MR. DENNISON: I would give the name privately to the hon. Minister (Mr. Cha llies), because I think this situation should be checked into.

MR. CHALLIES: You are a little late giving it to me, and this is a poor way to give it.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): I think it is a very proper way.

MR. DENNISON: It is the recommendations which I think are the important things. He makes these suggestions:

> "In view of the fact that it was reported in the press dated December 13, 1950 by Chairman Saunders that $40,000,000 were already used up in the changeover and that there will be "some increase" over the

$191,000,000 original figure the following questions should be answered--"

and then he asks:

Why give it to a contractor?

Why are the cars and trucks and the office trailers and so on supplied to the contractor by the hydro?

In view of the many months of operation when his particular house was changed over, why the ineffeciency?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up my remarks this afternoon. I believe the Department of Hydro has a terribly important problem on their hands. It is perhaps one of the most important and serious problems facing the Hydro and that is: we have embarked on a project which in 1947, while we still had some of the price controls, was going to cost $191,000,000; in the meantime, without asking this Legislature, without consulting the people of this country, the Federal government "pulls the plug" out of price controls, "blows the lid off" price controls, or in whatever way you like to express it, and they have left us in a situation where prices are no longer stable, where prices are rapidly increasing, where there is a continuing inflation, and I think that it is therefore doubly necessary that this conversion programme should be very carefully watched, not only by the opposition but by the hon. Minister for Hydro (Mr. Challies) across the aisle.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

And, Mr. Speaker, I might say that I have given these details this afternoon not in any spirit of criticism of the basic principles of the Hydro. I believe the Hydro is a very efficient organization but I do not think that the contractor they have engaged to do the job is quite as efficient as the Ontario Hydro and, therefore, I would respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister, (Mr. Challies) that the Hydro check up more carefully on the efficiency of that operation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington, North): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee, Mr. Patrick in the chair.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Private Bills, Order No. 8.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, House in committee on Bill No. 1, "An Act Respecting the city of Niagara Falls", Mr. Houck.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Ninth Order.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 4, "An Act Respecting Wycliffe College", Mr. Murdoch.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 4 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Tenth Order.

GENERAL TRUST OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 8, "An Act Respecting General Trust of Canada", Mr. Chartrand.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 8 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Eleventh Order.

BROCKVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 28, "An Act Respecting the Brockville General Hospital", Mr. Reynolds.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 28 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Twelfth Order.

BARCLAYS TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 3, "An Act Respecting Barclays

Trust Company of Canada", Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive.agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Thirty-eighty Order.

THE DAY NURSERYS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 50," An Act to amend the Day Nurserys Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 50 reported.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

THE ADOPTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-ninth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend The Adoption Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 51 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 41.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-first Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act", Mr. Porter.

Section 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 46 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 40.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fortieth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act", Mr. Daley.

On Section 1.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the first point which arises in my mind in connection with this Bill, is the remark of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of the other day when he said he wanted to get this Bill through as soon as possible, and in effect as soon as possible. That was one of the arguments advanced against sending it to the Labor Committee. Yet, in this first section, we meet at once the provision

that it is to be effective --

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I agree in advance with what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is going to say. I agree to let this Bill stand over for a few days.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is much more than six minutes between now and January 1, 1952.

MR. FROST: I said I would let this stand over until January 21st, when a deputation is coming to see me. I will let it stand over.

Bill No. 66 stands.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) give us some idea of whom these people are.

MR. FROST: I would not like to say that. They are one of the large labor organizations.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, before we leave that; I think that is quite true, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will be glad to see them and hear them, and give them a courteous reception. But I do think he should release himself from this inhibition he has about labor organizations. He said "labor organization and others". The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does not have to be bashful about that. If the labor organization is going to be specified, then the others should be specified also.

MR. FROST: I do not think there are any others.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): The C.F.A. had their innings earlier on that.

MR. FROST: Oh no. They are outside, with their

hats in their hands.

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report certain Bills and progress on another Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes (Mr. Speaker in the Chair).

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendment, progress on another Bill and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the House meet tomorrow afternoon at 2:00 o'clock. We have now quite a list of speakers and aspiring speakers --

MR. PARK: And perspiring.

MR. FROST: We would like to go ahead as rapidly as we can, so I would move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that when this House adjourns its present sittings thereof, it stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and that Rule No. 2 of the Assembly be suspended insofar as they might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: I am very glad to see that some of the casualties have returned to the Assembly. We now have another list. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) are amongst those absent, and perhaps some of the vacant seats on the other side are vacant from the same cause. But I am glad indeed that some of the other casualties are back today, and I hope that will

soon be the case with the others.

I think tomorrow afternoon we can go ahead with the Throne debate, and if we find it possible to work in a Bill at the end, we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at six of the clock p.m.

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 20, 1951, et seq.

0

Volume XIV

Tuesday, February 20, 1951.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XIV

TUESDAY, 20th. FEBRUARY, 1951.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House. Yesterday, when I moved that we meet at 2 o'clock today, I overlooked the fact that a number of my colleagues had made appointments which would keep them a little on the late side.

I discussed this matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and he agreed we should go ahead with routine matters, and I think the present shortage will soon be rectified.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mending fences?

MR. FROST: We keep our fences in repair all the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. B.L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Cathcart, from the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presents the following as their Second Report.

(Page A-3 follows)

To the Honourable

The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its Second Report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

Bill No. 5 - An Act respecting the Jewish Congregation Anshe-Sholem of Hamilton.

Bill No. 12- An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.

Bill No. 15- An Act respecting The Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Niagara.

Bill No. 16- An Act respecting the Jewish Community Centre of Toronto.

Bill No. 20- An Act respecting The Windsor Utilities Commission.

Bill No. 29- An Act to incorporate the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 5, An Act respecting The Jewish Congregation Anshe-Sholem of Hamilton; Bill No. 15, An Act respecting The Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Niagara; Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the Jewish Community Centre of Toronto; and on Bill No. 29, An Act to incorporate the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) Bryan L. Cathcart
Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answers to questions No. 59 and No. 110.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Third readings. Order No. 1.

THE CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls", Mr. Houck.

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No 1, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 4, "An act respecting Wycliffe College", Mr. Murdock.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Murdock, I move third reading of Bill No. 4, "An Act respecting Wycliffe College".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

GENERAL TRUST OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act respecting General Trust of Canada (Trust General du Canada)", Mr. Chartrand.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act respecting General Trust of Canada (Trust General du Canada) ".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE BROCKVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting The Brockville General Hospital", Mr. Reynolds.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Reynolds, I move third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting The Brockville General Hosp tal"

Motion agreed; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order No. 5.

BARCLAYS TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting Barclays Trust Company of Canada", Mr. Blackwell.

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCK (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting Barclays Trust Company of Canada".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 46, "An Act to Amend the Vocational Education Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I move third reading of Bill No. 46, "An Act to Amend the Vocational Education Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order No. 7.

THE DAY NURSERIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; third reading of Bill No. 50, " An Act to Amend The Day Nurseries Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of Bill No. 50, "An Act to Amend The Day Nurseries Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

THE ADOPTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; third reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to Amend the Ado tion Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to Amend The Adoption Act".

Motion agreed; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

(Page A-8 follows)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, resuming the adjournment debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I do so,partially as a matter of duty, and also as a matter of considerable pride in the opportunity to extend to you and some of the other hon. Members my deed appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, for your curtesy in many ways, not only in the House and out of it, but in the full capacity of your office, curtesy which you have extended to myself and the hon. Members of our group, as well as to all the hon. Members of the House. We certainly deeply appreciate it.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply, the hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White), who moved the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, who did a very excellent job. Some of the material was questionable, however it was fairly well done.

And to the hon. Member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) who upheld the traditions as the Scotch always do. There are several reports about what else they hang on to, too, but he certainly maintained his part in this debate.

I would also like to extend my greetings to the two hon. Members who were ill last Session, but who are now with us, and I refer to the hon. Member for Russell (Mr. Nault), and the hon. Member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell). We are glad to see these two hon. Members back in their places again.

We are also somewhat concerned about the former hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley), the Member for Hamilton, who has not yet been able to return to his seat, and I am sure we would all like to see the hon. Member (Mr. Kelley) back in his place and to have regained his health sufficiently to bring that about.

We would also like to see the hon. Member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) return to his place, and regain his usual posture again.

I am sure that we miss all of these hon. Members.

Now, as the Member for Wellington North, I was a little concerned today when the House opened, for fear the Government might be defeated. It seemed to have very little support. In fact, I wondered whether the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would have any, but I see there are now two hon. Ministers sitting in their places, so with the usual strength of the Government, I suppose they will be able to carry on.

I have rather a peculiar Riding. I have the honour of having the official Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) as a voter in my constituency. He lives in my constituency, and I am very proud indeed to have him there. I believe he lives on the old homestead, and that is traditional to a great many people in North Wellington, that they live and remain on the old homesteads, which is something of a traditional value which I think possibly we have lost the sight of in the trend today of so many farms changing hands, and so many people coming in.

I know in my own territory, I have never seen as great

a change as there has been in the last two years. I do not know but if in another four or five years, if that trend continues, the complexion of the Anglo-Saxon race will be changed completely in that grand, old section of the country. We hope the newcomers will make good citizens, and I think we all ought to do our part to assist them in that respect.

The County of Wellington is a very noted county. I think I should again bring to the attention of the public that I represent about three-quarters of the county of Wellington in area, and about two-thirds of the County of Dufferin. I think perhaps the riding should be termed, "Wellington-Dufferin", instead of "Wellington North". I do not know what will happen if there is a re-distribution, if a re-distribution takes place sometime in the near future. We are pretty much in the shape of a jig-saw puzzle right now. But it will be very interesting to see what can be done to either better or make worse, the situation there.

We know that the urban municipalities are increasing greatly in their population, and the rural areas are decreasing. It seems rather strange, with the production which has taken place in rural Ontario, that the population is steadily decreasing.

I don't know how far it can go on in that direction. It seems to me that centralization has gone possibly a little too far and a little too fast.

Wellington County contains some things which are very notable. It is the home of the Ontario Agricultural College, the Ontario Veterinarian College, MacDonald College, the Ontario Reformatory -- we can take care of them both ways -- and it also is the home of a former Leader of the Government, Mr. Drew.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Are you bragging about that?

MR. McEWING: It is the county which his father represented at one time. You can take it for what it is worth. I think it is an honour, all right.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McEWING: I will say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a great many years ago that Mr. Drew represented that county, and a great many changes have taken place, and as well as a great many improvements.

This county has had the first conversation dam project, I believe, in the Province. Two more are in the making, the Luther Marsh, and the Conesoga Dam -- all three of them are in the riding which I have the honour to represent.

I believe a number of other plans are under way in the Province, but we were the first to have adopted it. We are one of the first counties -- if not the first -- to have adopted the By-law regarding the prevention of cutting trees. I think we are the first county to organize the Council of Agriculture, and one of the first to have formed a Committee of Agriculture, which was started by the hon. Leader of the Government some years ago, during wartime. I am not passing any remarks today, particularly in regard to those things, but I am pointing out that we are the County which is the foremost in all of these movements.

We have taken an active part in reforestation. The County owns 1150 acres of land, and in a settled area,

that is a considerable amount. In some counties that may not mean so much, where they are sparsely settled, but we have not much of that kind of land, and we consider 1150 acres under reforestation as quite a large acreage. In that section we have planted about 3,400,000 trees, under that programme.

I doubt if there is any movement which has come forth which should receive such serious consideration as reforestation, conservation, and other aspects to relative projects.

A matter which concerns me a great deal is agriculture, because I represent a riding which is an agricultural one, as we have no cities in my riding at all.

One thing which concerns me a good deal in the field of agriculture is the effect of the entry of margerine. I believe this has had a very damaging effect on the dairy industry; in fact, the production of butter in the Province since the entrance of margerine has gone down by five and one-half million pounds. That means a considerable loss of revenue to the producers of butter. Not only as it affected them in that respect, but I think it has played a great part in the price the consumer is paying today for beef. Some people might think that is farfetched, but we find a great many farmers who had dual-purpose herds, and who were raising beef cattle and producing milk, who decided that when margerine came in, and the price of butter went down, they would cease producing butter. The result that the herds producing the beef were reduced, and the final result is that we are going to pay much higher prices for beef, because beef is going to be scarce; the number of beef cattle on the hoof is reduced

considerably over last year, and it will cost the consumer more for his beef, because he thinks he is getting margerine cheaper than butter, as everybody has stated.

The manufacture of margerine is another step in centralization of industry in this Province, and I think it would have been far better if we had had a great number of creameries dotted over the Province, than to have two large plants manufacturing margerine, which gives them an almost total control both of the manufacture and the price of that product, which will eventually come under its influence.

Hon. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Kennedy) has, I think, in the main been greatly interested in anything that affects agriculture. Sometime ago I was quite interested in a statement he made -- I believe in 1948 -- in which he said he was concerned about the difference between the cost of production of food stuffs and the prices the consumers were paying. He made quite a definite statement, that he was going to have a Committee set up to enquire into this spread of prices. He also followed that up by stating in the House, in quite a lenghty speech, that he was setting up a cost department, in the Department of Agriculture, which would determine what those articles should cost, to prove to the consumers and the producers what was fair. That was in 1948.

We are now in 1951, and so far I have not seen the results. I do not know whether the 1948 statement was an election promise. It was an election year, I grant you.

One of the indications is that I have not heard the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) make any promises this year, and probably there is some significance to that.

We are looking forward to that enquiry, because there is considerable spread. As he gave the figures at that time, about two-fifths of the prices the consumers were paying was above the prices the producers were getting. I have the figures here as he gave them in the House, but I have not, so far, as I say, seen any results from that.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Another thing that has entered into the cost of living which may have had something to do with the delay of the committee or the appointment of it was the fact that increased freight rates have entered into this picture materially. Many provinces were greatly concerned about it. I believe seven provinces out of the Dominion entered a joint protest against the increased freight rates. Now, increased freight rates have a great bearing on the cost of commodities both to the farmer, and the material he buys and the product he sells. There is hardly anything that any householder buys that is not affected by the increase of rates, it may be steel from the plants, or ore from the mines to the plants and then steel from the plants to the rolling mills and from the rolling mills again as freight to the manufacturing plant and then through freight again from the manufacturing plant out to the farmer. Several times they have an opportunity to tack on. I think it certainly does enter it materially. I think that is one place the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) might serve the farmers of Ontario. I urged upon him before and I would urge him again if he would do something about this. I am not offering these things as being entirely critical, I am offering them as suggestions that I think would be an advantage to both producer and consumer. It is actually I hope constructive criticism. Freight rates increased without any protest on behalf of the government of this province. It seems to me rather strange that when anything that affects railways or large packing plants in this province that the government is strangely silent in its protests.

Whether there is any reason for that or not I do not know but I think possibly they could have served this province, particularly agriculture, had they taken a definite stand with the other seven provinces in opposing the increase. The increase in freight rates, they claim, was brought about by the increase of wages. Immediately the increase on the freight rates was granted organized labor asked for another increase in wages because the cost of living had gone up because of the increased freight rates. Immediately organized labor asked for that then the railway comes back and wants a further increase. Now, just what is this? It seems to be a cycle going round and round and all the time we are going up. Some day there is going to be a coming down and probably it will not be quite so funny then.

In regard to the conservation committee which was appointed two years ago and which, I believe, did their work a year ago, I think they did one of the finest jobs of any committee that was ever appointed, did it in record time and did it without much fuss or disturbance. I think they gathered all the information that was possible and made a splendid report which should have a very far-reaching effect. I was on a committee that was appointed a couple of years previous, we made a report and the government brought in some amendments to the Ditch and Drainage Act which I think were long past due. However, I do not believe we went quite far enough. This conservation committee that was appointed had greater powers and went a great deal further and I hope the government has taken their report seriously

enough and not allow it to go the way that the agricultural report, the Hope report and a number more of them have gone but I hope they take definite action and bring in some recommendations before this session is over that will put into force and implement some of these recommendations on which that committee spent so much time. Public sentiment was behind it and the finest time in the world for the government to carry this through, public sentiment, as I say, is behind them, public support is behind them and a great deal can be accomplished if it can be done now. It will not be so easy five years from now and that seems to be the length of some of these things.

Another thing that affects agriculture, of course, is the much discussed stockyards. The only reason I am discussing this today is the fact that the report of the Board was tabled in the House a few days ago and some of us have had an opportunity to study this report. I might say it was rather interesting but there are some things that are lacking in this report that I think the public should know. Just a brief summary of some of the items will give you an idea of what I have reference to. It says in the report, "operating income received from the operation of the Ontario stockyards $33,595.55, operating expenses as $303,103,33 leaving $28,492.22". Then, they go on a little further, "Incomes received from rentals of outside property, interest on investments", I did not know the stockyards were even out of debt let alone making investments, "$32,492.95, other expenses $31,317.14". "Other expenses" it does not give any idea what they may

be, they may have even had a trip to the old country, the Board, I am not saying they did but there are a lot of things it may include that I think we possibly ought to know. And then, completing this report it says that the total earnings for the year were $32,017.16, the outstanding debt was reduced by $66,947.32. Where did the difference come from? It does not say, I do not know whether they took it from the consolidated revenue to pay for some of the debt or what. For that reason, there are a few questions that ought to be answered. I would like to table in the House an enquiry of the Minister: first, what were the profits from the sale of the assets? Two, what are the original costs of assets disposed of and the amount of depreciation provided therein to date of sale: three, what is the amount of depreciation contained in operating expenditure; four, what are the other expenses mentioned in this report? I think it would clear the report a good deal if that information was tabled in the House.

Another problem which concerns rural Ontario is the highway problem. Now, this is quite a large question. I had hoped the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) would have been in his place but I understand he is sick and has a nurse in attendance. We hope he will recover as soon as possible. We have in our county one of the best agricultural areas, I claim, and we have need of roads, of good roads. We have some packing plants in the city south of us, Kitchener, and a tremendous amount of livestock all up through that area goes to Kitchener and there seems to be an excessive

amount of traffic leading north of Kitchener to the northern part of Ontario. That is, the northern part of that part of the province, I do not mean up in northern Ontario but in the Georgian Bay area a good deal of it leads that way and we are in need of a highway from Elmira north. There has been a demand for that road for years. The county road that is there is not sufficient to carry this heavy traffic. I think there is, as there is all over the province, too heavy a traffic for our roads. I will refer to this a little later. In this particular instance we are in need of a highway and I would ask the government, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), Mr. Speaker, to seriously consider the demands that have been put forward to them on several occasions for this connecting link of a highway.

Another problem that is confronting us in that area is the problem of snow removal and that has got to be quite a serious operation. Experience recently has been that these counties make an allocation of what they think will be required and by the time they get through the winter with the snow removal programme that is demanded for this a great portion of their allocation is spent. The result is that when summer comes for their road programme they have to extend their expenditure and they have found in the last year or two that when they come to the Department of Highways for their 50% grant on that expenditure the Department says, "No, you have had your allocation and we cannot give you any more". The result is that many of these townships and the county both have had to carry over quite an item of expenditure until

the next year and it has been piling up so that they have to cut down their programme and they cannot meet the demands. Now, I maintain in these areas where the snow belt is well known that the cost of snow removal, the share of the government be increased to at least 75%. That would not interfere greatly because even in the summer some of the counties are receiving 75% of their road programme that are not snow bound. This is because of their particular situation. Well, we are in a particular situation when we are in the snow belt and if we are going to keep the roads open for the rest of the province it entails a great deal of expense and I think that the cost is partly borne now by the extra gas that is required in the work, the extra gas that is required in propelling these heavy trucks through these heavy roads and that the government receives a great deal of extra revenue. I am not saying it will pay for it all but it will pay for a great part of it and the benefit the rest of the province will receive by being able to get through that snow belt area would compensate them. I think the government should pay 75% of snow removal in the province of Ontario.

There is another problem that faces us and it is very serious. I said I would come back to it and that is the matter of heavy transportation trucks. I think this has been mentioned before, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) mentioned it and it is a serious situation. This is something that we have to deal with, it is not something that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) or the government can brush off

and say, "Oh, forget about it", because the cost of building these roads is a very costly expenditure today and to allow an excessively heavy truck with possibly 40,000 tons to travel over roads that are not built for it and bridges that are not built for it, somebody is going to pay the bill. Now, would a railway allow its heavy equipment to travel over its branch lines? It simply does not allow it, they can travel over their main lines but it must be the light equipment that goes over the branch lines. I think that should also be in connection with our highways. Our township roads are not built to carry the loads that the class A roads are. A transport will start out of Toronto here with a full load and when he arrives up there he has part of it to deliver to some farmer and regardless of where he is he drives right up that secondary road damaging it probably far more than his licence alone would ever mend. We have restrictions for March and April, well, if those are all right for March and April why are they not all right for January or February when a thaw causes the roads to break up? I think they should be applied. Sometimes in the summer after excessively heavy rains the same thing is true, roads are unable to carry these excessive loads. I think some townships are erring in this matter. They let trucks for gravel work, the gravel contractor will have a big 8-yard truck -- you take 8 yards of gravel weighs, I think it is about 2½ tons to a yard and then a big steel truck he will be driving right down their roads and destroying them and I think the townships themselves must come alive to

this. I think no contractor should be allowed to go on after an excessively heavy rain until the road superintendent says it is all right because he does more harm than good even with all the gravel he hauls.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, would the hon Member (Mr. McEwing) permit a question?

MR. McEWING: If it is not too long.

MR. SALSBERG: No. I want to help.

MR. McEWING: Yes, I know.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to be clear on this. Could not the counties cope with this problem through the enactment of by-laws and regulations governing roads in their respective area, or is provincial legislation required? I do not know, and I would like to be clear on that.

MR. McEWING: Mr. Speaker, I think in the first place it would require provincial legislation--in the first place.

I might say that our County held a one-day Session and called in all parties who might be interested, to discuss this very angle. They are taking it very seriously. The matter of policing the road to control it; the matter of trying to break it down; what roads should be allowed, and what not, was discussed. The matter of trying to build township roads to a standard that would carry it was discussed, and no township felt that they could bear the cost of that. However, they felt that some solution must be arrived at, or we are going to pay too great a cost for the damage which is being done.

A local county may put in certain regulations, as the hon. Member (Mr. Salsberg) suggests, but you must remember that the traffic, there is so much through traffic under provincial license that they feel that

they can travel right across the province. The matter of weigh scales and the control of the weight in these loads was discussed, and that, while it has been in operation, has presented a lot of difficulties. There seems to be a great, private source somewhere or other that these truckers can become aware of where and when the sale is in operation, and there is another route around somewhere and the scale misses them. I do not know, it is either one or the other. How you are going to do it I do not know, but we must find a solution and I think it is up to the Government to take this thing seriously, because it is a provincial matter. These townships have got to have a great deal more money, they have got to have a greater share of gas tax if they are going to keep the roads up. When you think of trying to build every township road up to that standard, I do not know how it is going to be done. I think education in the matter would be a wonderful thing, and asking those truckers to police themselves somehow--put them on their honor; today we are not putting them on their honor, in fact we are kind of winking at them a bit when they can get away with it.

I would like to see the Government take this matter seriously and study it from the angles the railways look at it and have practised it for years. I think the people themselves would be willing to co-operate. I think the consumers would be willing to co-operate by going to main roads and picking up this stuff where it would be delivered by those heavy trucks. Whey we should

allow a truck to go rolling down on our concession roads which is heavier than box cars used to be on a railway, I cannot understand, because after all our roads are not built to carry that weight.

I will leave this matter with the Government in the hope they take it seriously. My experience has been that this Government is very good at taking suggestions, and a little later on I will express my appreciation in that regard.

There is another matter that is giving us some concern and that is the busses that are travelling our highways. We have a problem created recently in our locality--and I think the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) can bear me out in this--busses are beginning to take away the railways' business, the railways which we own and which we know are in the "red" and which we are trying to help out of it. We are allowing the bus business and the truck business to take the business away, without putting more restrictions on them to pay their way. The railways plow their own snow, has their own maintenance crews that bears that expense. A bus pays bus charges,--I claim it is not heavy enough--they are not concerned about plowing the roads at all, they do not have to share that, it is a problem which has been created recently, when they are attempting to follow and touch every town in picking up this traffic, and I think that is a thing that if the busses are going to continue must bear a greater share.

Recently the railwaymen have visited our section

and are planning, I believe, to cut off the passenger service north of Palmerston. I hope it does not happen, but the traffic is not heavy enough, with the passengers travelling by bus, to warrant them continuing, they claim.

I would like to devote a few minutes now to the matter of welfare and the Welfare Department. Considerable headlines have been given recently by the press to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) of this Province in his remarks regarding the new scheme of pensions, pensions over 70 without a means test and pensions of 65 to 69 with a means test. The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is taking a great deal of credit, and the papers have given him a great deal of credit. For the part he has played, he deserves whatever credit is due him, but we must not forget that the Government at Ottawa under this new scheme is going to pay 100% of those pensions over 70 and it will pay 50% of those between 65 and 69, and I think a good deal of credit should go to the hon. Mr. Martin, the Minister of Health at Ottawa, for the part that he has played in this programme. This group here is wholeheartedly behind this plan. We have been behind this, we have recommended it for some time, and we will be wholeheartedly in support of the Government when they bring in legislation to this effect.

I feel that some of the objections to the means test which were brought to the attention of the public recently really need not have occurred. I believe if some of our investigators had been a little more diplomatic

in their work in investigating the personal application--it would appear as if they had been probably employed by the Income Tax branch and had got their education there--I feel that there would not have been as much difficulty, as I say, if they had been a little more diplomatic. I think the Welfare Department here in that branch under the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is doing everything in its power in this office. In any case that I have brought to their attention, the officials have been most generous in their consideration, and I want to express my appreciation to them, for that work.

There is a matter I would like the hon. Minister (Mr.Goodfellow) to consider seriously and that I would like this Government to consider seriously. That is the matter of a pension scheme for totally incapacitated persons. There is no plan at the present time to care for these people other than the work that is being done by service clubs and what might be done under direct relief, and I think it is too bad that a wealthy province, as we are in Ontario---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): We have a new Prime Minister.

MR. McEWING: Congratulations.

MR. MacLEOD: When did it all happen? A putsch, a putsch.

MR. McEWING: It may be an improvement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Order, please, Mr. Speaker.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that through you I can impress on this Government the need of a pension scheme for those persons. As I was saying, there is no present method to care for them. These people are totally at the mercy of their friends and relatives, and it is humiliating in many cases and it seems too bad that we cannot set up a pension scheme that would take care of those totally incapacitated persons. Their number is not so great, nothing in comparison to the old-age pensioners or those on family allowances or anything of that kind, and I would urge the Government to seriously consider setting up a pension plan for those people. I think it would be one of the finest things they have done for quite a while. I think it would be accepted probably as a greater act of humanity than the old-age pension changes, and I hope to see the day when we have such a scheme in the Province of Ontario.

One other item along that line which affects possibly jointly the Welfare Department and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) is the need of nursing homes in this Province. We are told by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) that it costs about $12,000 per bed to construct and equip a hospital. Now, when it costs $12,000 a bed, the charges and pay for nurses today makes the cost prohibitive for the ordinary individual, particularly people who are in the class of pensioners. We are in need of nursing homes and I would point out to this House that in my own riding an equipped nursing home

or hospital, whichever you want to call it--it is not a fully equipped hospital, it is a nursing home--with most all of the equipment that is required, was established at a cost of $2,000 a bed and is filling in that community a much wanted need. I grant you that it may not comply entirely with the desire of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) or his department, for this hospital found it quite difficult and found many obstacles placed in its way to securing a license, so that it would appear that it did not have entire approval. However, they are operating now and I believe that it will be an example, and that we should have many more somewhat similar to this over the Province of Ontario.

I would like to say a word or two in regard to education. I see the hon. part-time Minister (Mr. Porter) has come into his place. I do not know whether he is anticipating that there is something coming, or not.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): It is entirely fortuitous.

Mr. McEWING: I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there is too much money spent and too little for it, under our new scheme of education. I do not think that can be denied. Another thing that has happened,--

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, could I just ask the hon. Member (Mr. McEwing) if perhaps he would exemplify that a little, and perhaps give us some examples in his own constituency where he thinks they could do with a cut.

MR. McEWING: Yes, I could, Mr. Speaker. I can give some instances. There is a little matter here I

would like to deal with, and then I will explain why I think that.

Hon. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Do not let me get away from it.

MR. PORTER: Do not get away from it too far.

Mr. McEWING: Then I will take it now.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. McEWING: There is the matter of construction of schools, and that is a big expenditure right now because the cost of building a school is one of our big costs, you will agree--capital expenditure is a big item.

MR. PORTER: I do not know what they do up in your constituency, but I am expecting you to explain how you can do these things for less cost than elsewhere, and all the rest of it. What do you want to do? To cut or not to cut, that is the question.

MR. McEWING: I will tell you one thing I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) or this Government to do, and that is in the construction of schools that they have a proper inspector. They have been building schools, there was one right in my own locality--you asked me for an instance from my own locality, and I will explain--the only inspector there was there was the architect, and he was so busy that he was seldom there.

There is another school built within 10 miles of my home quite recently and some of the same things happened in the construction of it.

MR. KENNEDY: What were they? What were they? What---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: What, what, what.

MR. McEWING: But I maintain---

MR. PORTER: What was wrong?

MR. McEWING: An inspector---

MR. PORTER: Well, but the architect, the inspector, it is done by the local board, is it not? Are you criticising the local board?

MR. McEWING: No. When the local board lets the contract, it is then under the architect, because under the regulations of the department, it is the architect. Is that no so?

MR. PORTER: No, they do not need an architect at all.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh yes, yes.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Oh, you do not know your own department.

AN hon. MEMBER: That ain't the way I heeerd it.

MR. McEWING: They built a school in Drayton, and through somebody's mistake--I am not saying it was the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)---

MR. PORTER: I hope not.

MR. McEWING: And that is the reason I claim there should be a proper inspector. Now, if all highwayd departments built their roads and their buildings in the same manner that the Department of Education is allowing, there would be a lot of bridges like there was in Quebec.

MR. PORTER: The hon. Member (Mr. McEwing) knows---

MR. McEWING: Mr. Speaker, I will explain this, I will explain it right now.

MR. PORTER: The Department does not build schools, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McEWING: I will give you the reason. They built a school in my own town---

MR. PORTER: Who did?

MR. McEWING: Well, the hon. Mr. Drew was Minister of Education, and he---

MR. PORTER: Did he build it?

MR. McEWING: ---told us practically everything we had to do.

AN hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Who built it? Let us get down to it.

MR. McEWING: A contractor in Toronto and an architect in Toronto.

MR. PORTER: Who retained them?

MR. McEWING: Who retained them?

MR. McEWING: On the recommendation of the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: But who retained them?

MR. McEWING: Who retained them?

MR. PORTER: Yes, who retained them?

MR. MILLARD: That is a lawyer's term.

MR. PORTER: Who employed them?

MR. McEWING: I think we had two or three officials of the Department of Education up there every time there was a meeting.

MR. PORTER: Who employed the architect? Who let the contract?

AN hon. MEMBER: The school board.

MR. McEWING: The whole thing was under the supervision of the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: I said who did it?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: The whole thing was under the supervision---

MR. PORTER: I guess he will not answer it. I guess he will not answer it.

MR. McEWING: You can hardly build anything connected with the Department of Education without the Department of Education overseeing it.

MR. PORTER: Just a moment. You were saying we should do more inspecting.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: What do you want?

MR. McEWING: They proceeded to build this school.

MR. PORTER: Who did?

AN hon. MEMBER: You.

MR. McEWING: The Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: No, we never built it at all.

MR. MILLARD: The part-time Minister.

MR. McEWING: Alright, let me explain it.

MR. PORTER: Alright, alright.

MR. McEWING: The Board had a definite plan of what they would build.

MR. PORTER: A single-track mind over there.

MR. McEWING: The Board had a definite plan of what they would build, and they came down here to see the Department, and the hon. Mr. Drew told them--I was in the office, he was Minister of Education and I had the deputation there, and he said:

> "You can't build a school of that type, you have got to build a school of much less construction--a smaller one than that."

MR. PORTER: Less costly?

MR. McEWING: Less costly.

MR. PORTER: Yes, then what are you complaining about the cost for?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: Because we built it according to what he wanted, and it started to fall down, that is why.

MR. PORTER: Has it fallen yet?

Mr. McEWING: It is starting to fall, the bricks are decaying and starting to fall down. I am going to tell you something about this that probably you will not want to hear. The hon. Mr. Drew as Minister of Education refused to allow them to build the type of school they wanted in the size they wanted, so they built it according to what he advised them to build, and he called in a special architect from the University over here to show them how to build it and what to build. They met in what is now the Government Members' room over there, I know because I arranged to have it for them for

the meeting.

MR. PORTER: You are not complaining about that, are you?

MR. McEWING: And the local board had very little to say about it, but they were paying the bill, and they are paying pretty sweet right now.

MR. PORTER: What percentage are they paying?

MR. McEWING: They built the school, and for the lack of proper inspection, when they put in the foundation they found that the drain which was put in first was 22 inches below--was not low enough. The foundation was 22 inches too low. So they had to dig up all the drain and practically destroy all that glazed tile.

MR. PORTER: May I ask the hon. Member (Mr. McEwing) whether this is the same school that he described a couple of years ago?

AN hon. MEMBER: Still falling down.

MR. PORTER: Still falling down?

MR. McEWING: Yes. There are more things coming to light, though.

MR. PORTER: It is the same school, though, is it?

MR. McEWING: More things are coming to light.

MR. PORTER: But it is the same school?

MR. McEWING: Yes.

MR. PORTER: The subject was gone into three or four years, I believe, and it has not fallen down yet.

MR. McEWING: Wait until we get through.

MR. PORTER: It is a slow fall.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. McEWING: They had to put in new drains. This contractor went on to build, and one day when the men were away, one of the walls blew down in the wind.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Still blowing? What sort of wind do you have up there?

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

MR. SPEAKER: There will be no applause from the gallery, please.

MR. McEWING: Under his contract, he was to level the ground so many feet around the school. Be built 20 inches too low, and when he finished, he had to get a bulldozer and lower the ground 20 inches, and the result was the school was sitting in a basin, and the water ran in, instead of running away.

The next thing they did was to put in a heating system. This was the first school of this type, which Mr. Drew recommended, in the Province of Ontario, and he did a great deal of boasting about it, as being such a "modern school," and that everything was being done according to the recommendations of the Department. It was not the recommendation of the School Board. They did not know about this new idea at all.

They put in a heating system in the extreme south end of the building, and they found after the first Winter came, that they could not heat the school, and they had to call in a plumber to tell them what was wrong with it.

MR. PORTER: Are you sure they did not have two plumbers?

MR. McEWING: They might have had three plumbers under that system, or four. Who know?

The next thing that happened was that they built a perfectly flat concrete roof, which leaked repeatedly at every rain, and they could not stop it.

MR. SALSBERG: All in all, it seems to be a fine structure.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: They wanted to get lots of light in, so they put windows all down one side, with steel sash, and they lowered the windows, so the pupils could see out. The school is along the roadside, and the teachers claim they have no attention from the pupils when a vehicle pass along the road.

They cannot allow the pupils to sit beside these windows on a cold day, because of the drafts, and there is one room on the north side of the building which on a cold day, they cannot use at all.

Then they put in the lighting system, and in the days when fluorescent lights were going into almost every building, they put in the old dim bulbs, not modern and up-to-date.

Another thing they did was do build under this flat cement roof very heavy beams to carry the roof --

MR. PORTER: Did they fall in?

MR. McEWING: No, but the echo in that room is such that the pupils in the back seats can hardly hear what the teachers are saying.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Is there anything good about the school?

MR. McEWING: This was all done under the supervision of the Department of Education.

They put in a sewer system, which is required, according to the recommendations of the Department, but on account of the surface soil all being taken off, this was put in to clay soil. When it started to function --

MR. PORTER: What you might call "weeping tile"?

MR. McEWING: Yes, and it wept very badly, because it

all ran out through the ravine, by a residence, and the school board was compelled to go to the expenditure of getting in a bulldozer and taking it all out, and hiring truckers to bring in soil which would absorb, and to put in a wholly new system.

The school board had to assume that cost, and the department of Education, jointly with the Department of Municipal Affairs, stipulated they could not spend any more than so much money as far as debentures were concerned. I think $46,000 was all they would allow.

But after a number of these things happened and they had to raise more money, then they allowed them to spend another $6,000 or $7,000 by way of debentures, which if they had done that in the first place, and made it right, this trouble would not have happened.

These things are going to continue, I claim, for years to come. That school was an experimental school saddled onto the taxpayers, and they are paying the cost of all those mistakes.

We cannot say the Department does not know anything about it, because the whole school board resigned, and, more than that, the school board wrote down to the hon. Minister giving him the whole picture, and they never got an answer.

MR. PORTER: When was that?

MR. McEWING: I cannot give you the exact date.

MR. PORTER: Was it two or three or four years ago?

MR. McEWING: You were not the Minister at that time.

MR. PORTER: I am glad of that.

MR. McEWING: I am glad you do not want to assume that. You seem to assume a great many things.

MR. SALSBERG: That may have come in, during the half time.

MR. McEWING: The Government should have an impartial inspector who is an architect, and knows about building, who can go around and inspect the building of these schools. There is too much money spent without the proper supervision. You do not catch our Highways Departments or other Departments spending money in that manner. So I would ask the Government to appoint a properly qualified inspector to inspect the building of these schools, and I think we will save a lot of money in the Province of Ontario -- a lot of money.

I would ask in all fairness that the present hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) would consider that part of it, because I think it is certainly high time we had it.

The taxation of our schools today -- I do not know about one of those 22 points discussed here so much a few years ago -- but I do know that the taxes for schools and education have gone sky high.

MR. McLEOD: It is supposed to have gone up by 50%.

MR. McEWING: The High School areas being brought into being have become very costly, and if you do not come into them, it is more costly than ever. This sytem of pitting one municipality against another by way of competitive rates, or seeing if one can get the pupils from another school, providing bus transportation, when one bus crosses another bus, is very costly, and they are scrapping the old schools in a mad race to build new ones, and in many cases the last debentures are not paid for. If the farmers of this Province tore their buildings down the way this

Government does, they would go broke in a very short time.

MR. PORTER: How is the hon. Member (Mr. McEwing) blaming the Government for this situation, which is merely a continuation of the policy laid down many years ago. High School districts are nothing new.

MR. McEWING: You took a good deal of credit for this new system, whether you claim you started it or not.

MR. PORTER: We pay a big share of the cost of it.

MR. McEWING: You create one mad race, of expenditures, at a time when you are getting so little for it.

Here is the case of a school which did not quite conform to the regulations in the high schools area. The expenditure was $6,000, and they got a grant of $3,423.00; the mill rate was 14 mills. Then they thought they would like to go into this school area, and they wanted to participate in it, and they wanted to control their own schools, and they started in. The result is the mill rate is now 44 mills, and the Department --

MR. FROST: Did the hon. Member (Mr. MeEwing) ever figure out how much the cost to the rate-payers would be if the grants were the same as they were under your government, seven years ago?

MR. McEWING: You can put everything else into the same proportion.

MR. FROST: Surely everything else is not as bas as that.

MR. McEWING: I think our school happened to be the one which bore the brunt of the experimental plan.

I think the Province should make some contribution to remedy the situation. I see the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter

is shaking his head negatively.

I think the taxes for these High School area are not quite fair. Considering the basis of my own township, and comparing the urban municipalities with the rural, for urban municipalities pay $1.00 per person of population, while the rural area is paying $2.40. That is in the Township of Maryborough. In the Township of Erin, I think the rural area is paying $4.00 as compared to $1.00 in the urban municipalities. It may be possible that the assessment is wrong, but there is something which is not quite right in that respect. I think we should look into it.

I hope our pupils are the better for all these expenditures, although the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) made a statement recently, in which he said:

> " In recent years, Ontario secondary schools have been turning out students who can act in plays, cheer at football games, but they cannot write nor spell properly, and they read nothing but crime comics".

Is that the result of all this expenditure? I hope not.

I did not intend to go into all the details regarding that School. So much for that.

The problem of rural telephones is something upon which I would like to speak for a few minutes, and then I will close.

Last year I introduced a resolution in the House asking that a Committee be appointed to study during the recess all factors relating to the serious conditions concerning the rural telephone companies in Ontario, such

Committee to have the authority to send for papers, persons and things, and report its findings at the next Session of the Legislature.

I was glad the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) intimated at that time, Mr. Speaker, that he would certainly consider the situation, and he has, as borne out in the Speech of the Throne wherein it is suggested that they would take steps to deal with this situation -- quite definitely stated. And I am glad that he has because this is a serious situation, and I do hope this is not just a half-hearted weak attempt, because the whole Province of Ontario is concerned. I think the barometer of the Province in the rural sections can be gauged somewhat by whether they have telephones, or Hydro, and other improvements, which we,in this age,feel we should have.

I think if assistance could be given so that every farmer in this Province would have a telephone, it would mean a great deal; it would add a great deal to the wealth of the Province, and add a great deal to the confort of life in the Province. How far the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is prepared to go, I do not know. He will have every assistance and cooperation which this group can give him, or that I can give him personally. It is not, to my mind, a political issue at all. There are a number of problems which concern the rural people in regard to this telephone question, which I do not know how we can solve, unless some plan is devised whereby all these small companies -- and we have about six hundred independent companies in the Province of Ontario, all bargaining separately with the Bell Telephone Company for agreements -- can be brought

together, and see what results they can get, which they cannot get independently.

There are about 350 switching service companies which have a plan -- at least the Bell has a plan, whereby these companies must do all their collecting, and are feeders of business for them, and they can get practically no remuneration at all. Therefore, these Companies are unable to expand their systems; they are unable to make enough money to enlarge their systems, to add to the service for the public. They cannot compete with the Bell.

Unfortunately there are a lot of areas in Ontario today which have no chance of getting service, unless something is done. The services are over-lapping; in some cases they have no proper crews to keep their lines in shape. I know in connection with a company with which I am connected, they went out and extended the rural service, and went into the territory of another company, and in the territory bordering onto two or three other towns, where they should not have gone. Traditionally the other towns are where they should be doing their business, and not in our town, but that was the only place they could get service.

I went to the Bell Company in one of those towns and asked if they would not take over these lines which were within easy reach of their lines, but they would not consider it, and yet there were eight people asking for service, but as we have twenty on one line we could not give them service. We would have to go 15 miles before we could give them service, and how could we build 15 miles when they are only four or five miles from the other place. These things I think can be solved

along with numerous others.

I would impress upon the Government the necessity of doing everything possible, and anything they do along this line will be a step in advance for the Province of Ontario. I am not suggesting the nationalization of the telephone systems in Ontario as a whole, but if we had all these small companies joined up together, and make one definite and reasonable agreement with the Bell, then the people could get service and those who have money in it would get some remuneration which, under the present system, is impossible.

I hope the Government will bring down something which will fill this much wanted need.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken a little longer than I intended. Again I would say that as far as I am concerned, and our group here, we are prepared to assist the Government in anything which we think is for the betterment of Ontario, and will continue to do so.

I thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(PAGE D-8 FOLLOWS)

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those of previous speakers to you upon your assumption of your office as Speaker, where you dispense justice tempered with mercy. After hearing that Mrs. Davies has lived with you for 29 years, and knowing her so well, I can well understand why you are able to fill this position so capably.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SCOTT: I would like to congratulate the mover (Mr. White) and the seconder (Mr. Villeneuve) on their contributions to the debate in reply to the Speech of the Throne. It really gives some of our Scotch hearts, as the hon. Member for Wellington North mentioned (Mr. McEwing), a thrill to see a Scotchman on the Throne, and I think it would be a very good gesture if a Glengarry bonnet were provided for him for future occasions, when he has to take the chair as the Deputy Speaker.

The hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White), the mover of the reply, referred to the setting up of a House Committee on Lands and Forests, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that this be implemented, because our department thinks that is a very interesting development.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SCOTT: But the immensity of it is such that we can only touch on the fringe of it in the House. I think it might be well, both for the hon. Members of the Government and the hon. Members of the Opposition, to have the opportunity to meet with the officials of my Department and myself to

get a clearer view of some of the problems which may be in their minds, and I trust that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) may see fit to implement this suggestion put forward by the hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White).

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): He was not the first to suggest it.

MR. SCOTT: He had more political pull.

MR. MACLEOD: He has more influence, I admit.

MR. SCOTT:

Extract from "The Canada Year Book, 1950". Chapter XII, "Forestry" - Section 5, "Forest Administration," Subsection 1 - "Administration of Federal and Provincial Timber-Lands." Page 462, Para. 6 and Para. 7.

"The forest resources of Canada as a whole are owned and administered by the Provinces.....

The general policy of the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments has been to dispose of the timber by means of licences to cut, rather than to sell timber-land outright. Under this system, the State retains ownership of the land and control of cutting operations. Revenue is received in the form of Crown dues or stumpage (either in lump sums or in payments made as the timber is cut); ground rents and fire-protection taxes are collected annually. Both ground rent and Crown dues may be adjusted at the discretion of the Governments."

Extract from "The Canada Year Book, 1950." Chapter XII, "Forestry" - Section 5, "Forest Administration," Sub-section 1 - "Administration of Federal and Provincial Timber-Lands." Page 463, Para. 1.

"The Maritime Provinces did not adopt this policy to the same extent as did the rest of Canada. In Prince Edward Island practically all the forest land has been alienated and is in small holdings, chiefly farmers'

woodlots. In Nova Scotia 71 p.c. of the forest land is privately owned; nearly one-half of this is in holdings exceeding 1,000 acres. In New Brunswick nearly 50 p.c. is under private ownership. The percentage of privately owned forest land in the other provinces are as follows: Quebec, 7 p.c.; Ontario 6 p.c.; Manitoba, 13 p.c.; Saskatchewan, 12 p.c.; Alberta, 8 p.c.; and British Columbia, 3 p.c.

Extract from "The Canada Year Book, 1950." Chapter XII, "Forestry" - Section 5, "Forest Administration," Sub-section 1 - "Administration of Federal and Provincial Timber-Lands." Page 464, Para. 3.

"National Forest Inventories. - Following the War many of the provincial forest services have been particularly active in their programs of forest inventory. The Department of Lands and Forests of Ontario has made great strides in its five-year plan of forest inventory covering a strip of country which comprises about 125,000 sq. miles of the forested lands of the Province. The plan includes the taking of air photographs with the particular purpose of building up inventory records, the preparation of a basic map, and finally the production of forest inventory maps from air photographs supported by field sampling."

The general policy on forest ownership in Ontario is, therefore, to keep the crown forests in the hands of the Crown. There have been advocates of alienating the forests into the hands of private individuals or industrial corporations. They state that by so doing we would get better management of the forest. We do not

believe this to be so for two reasons.

First, we have before us the example of Nova Scotia. They disposed of much of their Crown forests to private ownership many years ago. These forests in the hands of private corporations were no better managed than were the Crown forests. They have been purchasing back these forests and putting them once again into state forests. In Ontario this is further substantiated by the statement in the Report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. I read from Page 73 of this report.

> "The public are inclined to criticize the methods of operation of Crown lands and their administration. I can truthfully say that the operations on Crown lands, now and in the past, have rarely exhibited any instances of such poor forestry methods, or so little thought or consideration of the future, as is today exhibited on more than 75 per cent. of the farm woodlots throughout the Province. There is, it is true, a pitifully small minority of woodlot owners who manage their forests wisely and well and are reaping a rich harvest from them. I estimate this group to include less than two per pent. of the woodlot owners."

So that in Ontario we thus have an opinion on the matter based on some observation of a recent Commission, of the experience on forests that have passed into private ownership, that confirms the early decision of Nova Scotia as being an incorrect one. Secondly, and more

important to our minds, is the fact that faces us squarely that if such a plan of alienating the peoples' Crown forests and passing them over to private corporations for gain and management succeeded, "the directors of these corporations would become the masters of the Government, form a new and absolute ruling class in the Province and control the resolutions of the Legislature."

And so again we may say in answer to those who for short term gain would have us parcel out the public domain among individuals or corporations as absolute grants, that this Government will follow the policy that has been traditionally followed in Ontario and other large Provinces of Canada, and continue to hold as public domain the Crown forests that are entrusted to us to manage for the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there comes - or should come - a time in the life of every government and of every department in that government when an accounting should be made of the stewardship vested in that government or department by the people it serves.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Hear, hear.

MR. SCOTT: I expected something from that.

That pleasant duty falls on me, as Minister of the Department of Lands and Forests. And let me say, the question sometimes is asked: "What is the Department of Lands and Forests? What are its responsibilities? Under what legislation does it operate? How is it equipped to handle its responsibilities? What facilities has it to carry them out?

It is my hope to be able to give to the people of Ontario, through their elected representatives, the members of this Legislature, the fullest possible answers to these questions.

Responsibility of the Department: The Department of Lands and Forests is responsible for all the renewable resources of the province, its timber and water, its fish and game. Ontario contains the largest solid block of forest lands in the northern hemisphere, excepting Quebec, and the undeveloped resources of Russia, and lies in the population centre of the North American continent.

Value of the Resources: This forest is dedicated, with its resources, to multiple use - that is the use of forest, water and soil for the purposes for which they are best fitted. At present, more than one hundred million acres of forest land are under the protection and supervision of the department. From this area a wide variety of wood products brings hundreds of millions of dollars into this country. They flow through many channels into the pockets of the Ontario workman, who today is producing a large percentage of the total world supply of industrial wood products.

This, however, is only part of the value of the forest to Ontario. The hydro-electric system depends upon the preservation of forests for its water supply. The tourist industry is dependent upon game and fish; while protection of soil from erosion and other important economic factors require adequate forest stands.

The policy for the management of these resources is simple. We plan:

1 - To give adequate protection to what we now have.

2 - To see that these resources are wisely and fully used.

3 - To improve what we have by research and management.

4 - To replace what we have lost.

In other words, the policy of the government is to balance the amount that will be cut to the growth of the forest.

Empowering Legislation: To achieve our purpose it is of course necessary to have empowering legislation on the statute books. Briefly, here is an outline of this legislation:

With the incorporation of the Department of Game and Fisheries into the Department of Lands and Forests as the Division of Fish and Wildlife in 1946, the renewable natural resources of the Province were for the first time brought under one administration.

The Department of Lands and Forests is charged with the administration of the public lands, forests, water, and fish and wildlife resources of the Province, and the 29 Ontario Statutes governing the administration of these resources may be allocated among four main groups as follows:

Group 1 - Public Lands

The Provincial Land Tax Act

The Provincial Parks Act

The Public Lands Act

The Town Sites Act.

Group 2 - Timber Management

(a) Crown Timber:

The Crown Timber Act

The Cullers Act

The Forest Management Act

The Forest Resources Regulation Act

The Forestry Act

The Mills Licensing Act

The Provincial Forests Act

The Pulpwood Conservation Act

The Woodmen's Employment Act.

(b) Forestry on Municipal and Private Lands:

The Municipal Reforestation Act

The Nursery Stock Act

The Private Forests Reserves Act

The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act

The Spruce Pulpwood Exportation Act

The Trees Conservation Act.

(c) Forest Protection:

The Fires Extinguishment Act

The Fire Guardians Act

The Forest Fires Prevention Act

The Railway Fire Charge Act.

Group 3 - Surveys and Engineering:

The Beds of Navigable Waters Act

The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act

The Surveys Act

The Water Powers Regulation Act.

Group 4 - Fish and Wildlife:

The Game and Fisheries Act

The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.

Public Lands: The Public Lands Act is the parent Act in land administration. By it the management, sale and disposition of the public lands and forests are conferred on the Minister, subject to the regulations made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. New regulations were passed in 1942 with a view to improving administration policy and practice. Since that date the regulations and the Act itself have been kept up to date to keep pace with administrative needs. Today lands available for agricultural purposes must first be inspected to determine their suitability. Recognition of the interest of a settler in land located or sold to him many years ago, but for which he had not received his patent because of failure to comply to the letter with conditions of settlement and residence, is indicated in the relaxation of these conditions by legislation so that the deserving settler can get his patent. A further step in aid of the settler is the provision by legislation whereby he is given the property in pine reserved in patents issued prior to 1880. Provision is made whereby he can obtain the pine reserved in patents issued after that date provided he qualifies under the Act.

I might say to the House I intend bringing in further legislation this season to try and clear up further numbers on this pine legislation. To date we have fixed up about 500 cases which were standing on the books to which the settler had no right.

Free grants to former members of the Forces are provided by an amendment to the Act in 1948. Regulations were passed setting up the conditions under which free grants are made. Regulations pertaining to disposition of summer resort lands were framed to attain uniformity throughout the province and to ensure completion of the sale and the issuance of patent without undue delay.

The Provincial Parks Act was re-enacted in 1950 to dispense with obsolete provisions and to bring it into line with present administrative practice. There are six Provincial Parks created under the Act, and the principles of conservation of land, timber, fish and wildlife, and enjoyment by the public, remain unchanged. The regulations section has been extended to provide the means to meet modern conditions in the administration of the parks.

Timber Management: The Crown Timber Act governs the granting of rights to cut Crown timber. Amendments in recent years authorize the making of contracts for the salvage of killed or damaged timber, making it an offence to commit wasteful practices in forest operations and empowering the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to define wasteful practices in forest operations. The enforcement provisions relating to unauthorized cutting and powers of seizure have been strengthened and clarified.

With the increasing importance of management of the forest resources, so as to achieve the maximum utilization for the benefit of the province consistent with the maintenance of the forest resources as a perpetual asset, The Forest Management Act was enacted in 1947.

By it timber operators on Crown land may be required to submit estimated inventories of the timber on the cutting area respecting age, species, size and type, and management plans concerning the utilization of the timber. To implement the policy to replace what has been lost in the past, legislation directed to reforestation on municipal and private lands has been passed. The Trees Conservation Act, enacted in 1946, is permissive legislation for county councils to pass by-laws respecting the cutting of wood on private wood-lots. By an amendment in 1946, The Municipal Reforestation Act was extended to give to councils of townships the same powers enjoyed by councils of counties relating to the acquisition of land for reforestation purposes; the management of the land; and the entering into agreements for the management, care, protection and development of such land.

The Forest Fires Prevention Act was re-written in 1948. It consolidated the former Act and amendments, the principles remaining substantially the same. The creation of fire districts, travel permit areas and closed areas was clarified, and the privileges granted by work permit were better defin ed.

Surveys and Engineering: Use of the water in the navigable lakes and rivers of the province for timber-driving and water-power development and the construction of works incidental thereto is governed by The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act and The Water Powers Regulation Act. The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act was amended in 1949 by enlarging the provisions relating to pollution of waters by refuse and effluent to

include all mills.

I see there have been a number of questions on the Order Paper regarding the investigation of water pollution in the Spanish River and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table reports 1, 2 and 3 which are progress reports we have received from the Research Council on that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Those are all the reports to date?

MR. SCOTT: That is all, yes. They are now carrying on a study of winter conditions to see whether anything from the pulp operations would form a coating under the ice and cause lack of oxygen. We will not have that till later. In the same year The Water Powers Regulation Act was amended to empower the Minister to fix the terms and conditions upon which water powers and the adjacent land necessary therefor are sold or leased. At the same time the provision in The Public Lands Act concerning the disposition of water powers was repealed.

Fish and Wildlife: Following the war years, hunting and angling has increased steadily, creating a heavy demand on the fish and game resources of the province.

I might say in the last year 80,000 resident deer licences and 18,000 non-resident were issued. The kill is just about the same, they are not the hunters we used to be.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): How many hunters were killed?

MR. SCOTT: We have no records of that, that comes

under Vital Statistics.

The Game and Fisheries Act was re-enacted in 1946 and extensive regulations set up. Annual amendments to the Act have been made to improve administration and to promote conservation. In 1950 the regulations set up in 1946 and subsequently amended and added to from time to time were consolidated so as to facilitate reference to them. In addition, regulations dividing Crown lands into trap-line areas occupied under trap-line licences were set up to effect a policy of trap-line management for the more efficient adjustment of the take of furs to actual production.

This works out very satisfactorily in the north. We had a group of trappers in last week and they are very satisfied the way it has worked right across the province.

Administration of fish and wildlife resources, with particular reference to enforcement matters, is governed also by two Acts of the Government of Canada. These are the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Fisheries Act. It is under the Fisheries Act that the Special Fisheries Regulations for the Province of Ontario are made.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

Having, therefore, this authority, the Department is equipped to carry out its responsibilities because, first of all, it has one of the be t trained and most experienced staffs in the world. Ninety per cent. of its senior officials started at the bottom---as temporary or permanent rangers. It employs the largest staff of graduate foresters of any state service in North America. I might say that we have at present 140 graduate foresters on our staff, as compared to 52 seven years ago. So well is Ontario known for the excellence of its forestry organization that countries in many parts of the world send their representatives to this country and to this province to see how we do the job.

These men, then, are the backbone of Ontario's forest administration. Some years ago, the entire department was streamlined and reorganized into eleven divisions, each of them headed by a man of wide experience and skilled in knowledge. These divisions, in turn, are broken down into 22 district organizations. I will give you in full the divisions that each man covers and I am asking Hansard to include it in such a way that hon. members of the House, when they are wondering to whihh division in the Departments they should go, will be able to refer to Hansard and see there under whose responsibility comes the problem they have in mind.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): How do we find the index in Hansard, then?

Hon. MR. SCOTT: That is not my department, I just furnish the paper.

Briefly, here is the administrative setup and a thumbnail sketch of the men who carry out, through me, your instructions:

DEPUTY MINISTER

Employment History

NAME: MacDOUGALL, F. A.

Date of birth: June 16, 1896

Commenced employment with Department: May 15, 1923

Appointed Deputy Minister: June 1, 1941

University of Toronto - B.Sc.F.

A pilot; he claims to be a cook, but my advice to you gentlemen is to take along some canned food. However, he is a grand chap and I do not think there are very many places in the province that he has not a personal knowledge of.

Responsibilities of Deputy Minister:

Administration of the Department of Lands and Forests under authority of the Public Service Act and the Legislation giving authority for the various operations of the Department of Lands and Forests, which consists of twenty-nine Acts of the Legislature.

ACCOUNTS DIVISION

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: McMILLEN, J. G.

Date of birth: February 5th, 1902.

Appointed to Treasurery Department: Jan. 6, 1936

Transferred to Lands and Forests: Jan. 1. 1942.

Appointed Division Chief: Aug. 12, 1942.

Graduate of Central High School of Commerce, Toronto

Chartered Accountant--Member of Ontario Institute.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

ACCOUNTING, for all Divisions.

COLLECTION of Departmental revenue.

PAYMENT OF Departmental expenditures.

ADMINISTRATION of Land Tax Act.

PREPARATI N OF:

Budget estimates

Financial Reports

Permanent Staff payrolls

Main Office pay lists.

Departmental staff salary records

Data for Public Accounts report

SUPERVISION OF:

Accountable Warrant Funds

Field Office trust funds

Items held in safe-keeping

Collateral securities

Field Office accounting

Budget for main and field offices

Checking of receipts and disbursements.

ISSUE OF:

Fish and Wildlife licences.

MAINTENANCE OF ACCOUNTS OWING THE DEPARTMENT FOR:

Timber dues

Ground rent

Fire tax

Land sales

Rentals for leases

Fees for Licences of Occupation

Water power leases

Provincial Land Tax

Permit operations

Accountable advance

Fish and Wildlife licenses.

I thought it was appropriate that we should have a Scotsman at the head of this Department, but I discovered

he was an Irishman. An order-in-council was thereupon passed, making him a Scotchman.

DIVISION OF AIR SERVICE

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: PONSFORD, G. E.

Date of Birth: October 29, 1895.

Commenced employment with Department - July 25, 1934, as Division Chief.

Commercial Pilot's Licence.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

PROVISION OF:

Flying to meet all requirements of the Department, and also special requirements of other Ontario Government Departments, and mercy flights, as requisitioned by authorized officers of the Department.

MAINTENANCE OF:

Department aircraft, including supervision of maintenance staff.

SUPPLY OF:

Engine and aircraft spare parts to assure serviceability of aircraft at all times.

SUPERVISION OF:

Pilots on all flying operations to assure that all flying requisitions are met, as flying conditions permit.

APPROVAL OF:

Sites of all bases.

CO-OPERATION WITH:

Department of Public Works inthe construction of Air Service buildings.

CONTACTS WITH:

Department of Transport , in Ottawa.

DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE:

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: Harkness, W. J. K.

Date of Birth: April 28, 1896

Commenced employment with the Department: June 3, 1946 as Division Chief.

University of Toronto - B . A. in Zoology
M. A. in Zoology

University of Ohio - D. Sc. 1946

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

ENFORCEMENT:

Convictions and fines

Recording and handling seizures.

WILDLIFE:

Management and propagation

Trapline management

Game preserves and special hunting areas - open seasons

Fur farm licences - records

Fur dealers' licences

Fur production records

Bounties

Surveys and investigations.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES:

Commercial fishing, dealers, and net dealers licences.

Fish production statistics.

Establishment of seasons.

POLLUTION:

Pollution control inspections.

FISH DISEASES AND PARASITES:

The study, prevention and control of fish diseases and parasites.

GAME AND FISH HATCHERIES:

Game a fish management.

Supervision of hatcheries and spawn collection

Distribution of yo ng fish

Removal of coarse fish

Establishment of seasons

Closure of fishing waters

Biological studies

Surveys and investigations.

DIVISION OF FOREST PROTECTION

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: MACKEY, T. E.

Date of Birth: June 12, 1903

Commenced employment with the Department: May 17, 1926.

Appointed Division Chief: November 1, 1946.

University of Toronto- B.Sc.F. 1926

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

FIRE PROTECTION PLANNING:

Preparation of instructions and assembly of data for compilation of protection plans.

FIRE PREVENTION:

Issuance travel fire and work permits within the Fire District.

Removal of fire hazards.

Fire weather forecasting.

Public warnings of existing and impending fire danger.

FIRE SUPPRESSION:

Provision of fire fighting personnel, equipment, supplies and transportation facilities, including aircraft.

IMPROVEMENTS:

Construction and maintenance of telephone lines and a province-wide radio telephone system of portable, tower and ground stations.

Buildings to house staff and provide for office space and storage and maintenance of equipment.

Development of lookout tower detection system.

Construction of roads, trails, portages, docks and camp sites.

CO-OPERATION:

Railway fire protection by arrangement with the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Forest insect and disease surveys in co-operation with Federal Department of Agriculture.

Major building projects are constructed by the Department of Public Works as specified.

Agreements with organized municipalities respecting fire suppression responsibilities, co-operative fire prevention and suppression arrangements, with woods operators, tourist camp operators and other forest users.

DIVISION OF LAND AND RECREATIONAL AREAS

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: CRAM, W. D.

Date of Birth: November 19, 1892.

Commenced employment with the department: May 19, 1923.

Appointed Division Chief: March 1, 1947.

University of Toronto - B.Sc.F. - 1923.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

SELLING, LEASING AND LICENSING OF CROWN LANDS FOR:

Farming and allied uses, summer resorts and all other purposes, excepting for dam sites, rights-of-way for electric power and telephone lines, or for hydro-electric power developments.

Issuance of vesting orders to Government Departments.

Collection of fees.

ADMINISTRATION OF ALL PROVINCIAL PARKS:

Leasing and licensing of land for summer resort use.

Collection of fees

Directing administration

LAND USE PLANNING:

For summer resort, agriculture and other uses.

LAND INSPECTIONS:

To ensure proper use of land

Eligibility to acquire patent lease or licence.

PREPARATION OF:

Land manuals, pamphlets, forms, legislation, patents, leases, licences of occupation and land transfer

MAINTENANCE OF:

Records of all land dispositions

Examining and checking all documents issued.

Issuance of instructions to Field Offices.

Interpretation of the Acts.

<u>DIVISION OF OPERATION AND PERSONNEL</u>

<u>Employment History of Division Chief</u>:

NAME: RHYMAS, P. O.

Date of Birth: February 11, 1904.

Appointed to Dept. of Labour: November 7, 1940.

Transferred to Lands and Forests: June 4, 1941.

Appointed Division Chief: January 1st, 1945.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT:

Interviewing, selection, appointment, classification.

Staff welfare, salary rating

Administrative statistics

Attendance, staff and permanent records

Workmen's compensation.

Maintenance-Messengers

Training, Orders-in-Council.

OFFICE MANAGEMENT:

Purchase and distribution of all equipment and supplies, and stock control.

Inventory, locating and expediting supplies

Duplicating, Issue-Receipts.

Distribution printed matter

Servicing - Space adjustments.

INFORMATION AND EDUCATION:

CORRESPONDENCE:

General inquiries.

DEPARTMENT ROUTINE PUBLICATIONS:

Editing, writing, rewrites, printing, distribution.

PUBLIC APPEALS:

Principally in forest fire prevention and fish and wildlife conservation.

Lecture tours in schools, logging camps, outfitters' camps, fish and game associations, on conservation.

Photographs, slides, motion pictures for lecture tour purposes.

Articles, press, radio, exhibits, signs and posters on conservation and fire prevention.

SCHOOL WORK:

Co-operation with educational authorities on text books, teachers' aids; poster, radio and essay contests as required by them.

Then we have the dean of the Department, head of the Division of Reforestation---"Ed" Zavitz.

Date of birth;;;---well, it was the 19th century.

Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, 1905-1912.

Joined Lands and Forests: November 7th, 1912.

Appointed Division Chief: August 12, 1942.

McMaster University - B. A. 1903.

University of Michigan - M.Sc.F. - 1905.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

ADMINISTRATION OF:

Provincial Forest Stations

Forest Tree Seed Supply

Seed collection, extraction, germination and storage

Forest Tree Nurseries.

Experimental and Demonstration Forest Plantations

Forest Tree Distribution

EXTENSION WORK THROUGH ZONE FORESTERS:

Municipal reforestation

Inspection of private woodlands and plantations

Rural school plantations

Roadside windbreak planting

Lectures on reforestation to schools, county

councils, service clubs, etc.

DIVISION OF RESEARCH

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: JOHNSTON, R. M.

Date of Birth: September 16, 1894.

Commenced employment with Department: May, 1917.

Appointed Division Chief: January 1st, 1944.

University of Toronto - B.Sc.F - 1917

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

RESEARCH IN:

Forest Management: Regeneration, Cutting Practices, Growth Studies, Volume Tables, Yield, Drains.

Forest Protection: fire, Insects, Disease, Smelter Fumes Investigation.

Fish and Wildlife: Inventory Management, Genetics, Stream Pollution, South Bay Experiment.

Soil Surveys: land Use Surveys, Chemical, physical and Biological Analysis of Forest Soils.

Wood Utilization.

Forest Economics.

Mechanical-Electrical Developments: pumps, Hose, Nozzles, Communications Equipment, Reforestation Equipment, Woods Utilization Equipment.

Co-operation with:

University of Toronto, National Research Council, Science Service, Defence Research, Ontario Research Foundation, etc.

OPERATION OF:

Southern Research Station.

DIVISION OF SURVEYS AND ENGINEERING:

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: BEATTY, F. W.

Date of Birth: July 12, 1892

Commenced employment with Department: May 1, 1946. as Surveyor-General, and Division Chief.

University of Toronto -Bachelor of Applied Science in Civil Engineering - 1913.

Dominion Land Surveyor - 1914.

Ontario Land Surveyor - 1920.

Responsibilities of Division Chief:

GROUND SECTION ADMINISTRATION OF:

Waters powers and stream control

Selectionof official Geographic names.

Matters relevant to Provincial Boundaries.

PLANNING, INSTRUCTIONS AND INSPECTION OF:

Provincial Boundaries, Retracement and Municipal Surveys, and all surveys of Crown Lands.

EXAMINATION AND CHECKING OF:

Plans, descriptions andreports of all types of surveys of Crown Lands, Dams and other structures as required by the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

PREPARATION OF:

Maps issued by the Department.

Plans of Crown Land Surveys.

Description of areas for Government Departments.

Water Power Leases

Licences for transmission, telephone and railway rights-of-way, flood areas and dam sites.

PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF:

Provincial, Township and Topographical Maps.

CUSTODIAN AND RECORDER OF:

Original survey notes and plans, selected

Geographic names.

That is why we have a Township named "Salsberg."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Thank you very much.

Hon. MR. SCOTT:

SUPPLYING OF:

Photostatic copies of maps and survey records and other data to Government Departments and the public.

AIR SURVEY SECTION:

Photography required for Forestry, Highway and Power purposes.

Processing films and preparation of types of maps required.

Supplying prints of areas photographed to various Departments and the public.

DIVISION OF TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Employment History of Division Chief:

NAME: SHARPE, T. J. F.

Date of Birth: November 1st, 1896

Commenced employment with Department: May 15, 1922

Appointed Division Chief: January 1st, 1944

University of Toronto - B.Sc.F. - 1922

Responsibilities Of Division Chief:

TIMBER SALES AND LICENCES:

Applications, Sales, Tenders

Licences and renewals.

Transfers , additions, extensions, abandonments.

Statistics, Map records.

TIMBER RETURNS:

Preparation timber dues accounts

Statistics, record of cut

PULPWOOD EXPORTS:

Analysis of contracts

Records of wood export

MILLS LICENSING:

Saw mill, pulp and paper and other mill licences.

Record of mill production.

SCALING:

Courses and examinations.

Registration of scalers

SURVEYS AND INVENTORIES:

Organization and supervision

Preparation of maps

Maintenance of inventory

MANAGEMENT PLANS:

Master and annual plans required under agreements.

SUPERVISION OF WOODS OPERATIONS:

Inspection and supervision

Logging methods - technique

Costs, compilation-analysis

Integrated operations

Liaison between government and industry.

That, Mr. Speaker, comprises the qualifications of the heads of the divisions who administer our forest resources. However, I would like just to touch on one with whom most hon. members come in contact. I am not going to say when this party joined the government employ, but Miss Eva Harrison was appointed to the office staff of the then Minister of Lands and Forests in the 20s, in fact I see that her salary was increased to $75.00 a month when she joined our Department---much overpaid,

at that time.

MR A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I'll bet that was a Tory government.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: She has been continuously employed by the Department of Lands and Forests since the early 20s and was appointed secretary to the Minister as of December 31st, 1942 and has continued to act as secretary to each Minister since. You who have come in contact with this girl will realize the wonderful grasp she has of the Department as a whole, and I would just like to pay tribute to her at this time for the very, very capable manner in which she administers the duties of her office.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have reversed the process, I have given you the men and I would like now to give you the tools.

What facilities have these men, and your Department with which to carry out their responsibilities and their duties? We operate the largest forest fire fighting organization in the world. I might say this is quite apropos following the address of the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) the other day on---what was it?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Civil defence.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Civil defence, because we have offered all our facilities to that body.

In round figures the organization uses:

Six thousand portable hand pumps

Nearly a thousand portable power pumps

Two million two hundred thousand feet of hose

Sixteen hundred tents

Over twelve thousand pairs of blankets

More than one thousand canoes

Sixty motorboats

Four hundred trucks

Five hundred outboard motors

Nearly four hundred pairs of binoculars

Two hundred and eighy-six high steel towers have been built throughout the north, most of them equipped with radio.

In addition, there are fifty-six wooden towers, making a total of 342.

We have a total of more than four hundred radio sets.

Four thousand five hundred miles of telephone line.

Five hundred and thirty-eight cabins for ranger use.

One hundred and forty-nine storehouses

Sixty boathouses

Seventeen combined storehouses and boathouses.

The Department fights an average of twelve hundred forest fires each year with eighty per cent. of the fires confined to less than five acres.

We have a staff, and machines known as "flying fire engines" of which every citizen of Ontario is proud--- The Division of Air Service, one of the safest, most efficient and largest aerial forest fire fighting organizations in the world. It has a fleet of forty-five aircraft.

Ontario is rightly proud that the men of its air service, in co-operation with officials of one of Ontario's largest aircraft organizations, together developed and built the Beaver aircraft---the finest airplane for bush use in the world and one which is now being adopted by the United States Air Force. Our own men have also developed and are presently testing a radar landing

device for use in glassy water landings whichmay be of incalculable value to pilots using float machines in any part of the world. It is surprising to think that very very calm water is really the most dangerous to land on, and the idea of this radar landing device is that it will give the pilot a definite idea just how far he is off that perfectly still water.

Let me say, too, that Ontario has investigated every modern means of combatting the forest fire menace and has not hesitated to adapt to its use any device or method available and useful to it. We have investigated the use of "smoke jumpers" or fire fighters equiped with parachutes, but have found Ontario's northern terrain too dangerous for their general use. Helicopters and auto-gyro aircraft have also been tried out in Northern Ontario and experimental work is being continued withthem. Meantime, the phenomenal landing and takeoff ability of the Beaver has increased the water area which may safely be used for our purposes by at least twenty percent.

Whether our efforts to prevent and extinguish forest firest have been successful may best be judged from the following figures. Since 1940, or in the past ten years, there have been only two seasons when more than two-tenths of one percent of our one hundred million acres was burned over. Every hon. member of theHouse knows that in 1948, because of unduly and unseasonably dry weather, we had many forest fires in the north of which the Chapleau-Mississagi blazes were the worst. But, I am happy to say, through vigorous and prompt measures, we were able to salvage millions of feet of this fire-scorched but otherwise useful timber before forest insects could ser-

iously damage it.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) would have the figures of the amounts of the area that he has been able to salvage?

Hon. MR. SCOTT: I do not quite understand the hon. member's (Mr. Dennison) question.

MR. DENNISON: Well, have you been able to salvage, say 75% of the area, or of the timber?

Hon. MR. SCOTT: The process is still continuing. We are salvaging approximately 200,000,000 feet plus the pulpwood. The pulpwood salvaging is not completed yet.

Now let me turn to a subject in whihh I know you are most interested---the Royal Commission on Forestry. As you know this government appointed a Royal Commission, headed by Major General Howard Kennedy, with full power to enquire into and recommend means to bring about the best possible administration of our forest resources.

The report of the commission, as presented to this House, contained seventy-two recommendations. A great many of these are already in practice, either in whole or in part.

Ever since the report was tabled, every recommendation has been carefully studied to determine how and when it could be implemented, for in the complex field of forestry dealing with crops of one hundred years, the evolution of changed practices has often to be gradual. You cannot tear up the trees at short intervals to see how the roots are growing.

A complete new policy on the export of unprocessed wood has been put into practice which will largely, if not completely, eliminate the export of wood from Ontario in an

unmanufactured state, unless our forest inventory shows there is wood going to waste that might for a time be profitably sold outside the Province. This change in export policy, incidentally, is already resulting in new mills being erected in the Province.

I have referred to the forest inventory. Let me amplify that for a moment. The Province has undertaken and is bringing to its conclusion one of the largest forest inventories ever attempted in the world. Using the latest serial and ground survey techniques more than seventy-five million acres of Crown lands of Ontario have been photographed, cruised and tabulated. As the results are compiled the areas are being placed under more intensive long range forest management plans. The work in many cases is being done in conjunction with the companies holding timber licenses and leases, and represents one of the soundest examples of government and industry co-operation on record.

The Commission recommended expansion of reforestation facilities.-There has been great expansion of the nurseries through the enlargement of the nurseries of St. Williams, at Orono and at Midhurst, and the development of new nurseries at Hemptville and at Fort William. Cooperative plans with the conservation authorities have also enlarged the scope of waste land planting and the development of new technique of air seeding, seed spotting and mechanized methods of planting, all to bring about increased efficiency and better results for the same money.

Integrated operations between pulpwood and lumber operators were also recommended. There are many places in the Province where the operations now are so integrated, with sawlogs and pulpwood being taken out in the same operation and

exchanges made between the two parties concerned. Here, specifically, are some cases: Dryden and Marlinger; Ontario and Minnesota Paper with Matthieu; Howard Smith and Fogg; Howard Smith and Hicks; Abitibi and Merwin; Kalamazoo and Mervin; Great Lakes Paper and Northern Wood Preservers, Longlac and Northern Wood Preservers.

Road construction has, of course, been suggested. We all agree that it is desirable to build as many roads as possible into our forest areas. But may I point out

(take G follows)

that there are, right now, about twenty thousand miles of what are called connecting roads in Ontario which the government is being asked to take over. The cost of making these roads into standard highways would be about five hundred million dollars, so that there must be a great deal of study given to the long-range aspects of building roads in the sparsely settled parts of the north.

Furthermore, we have a policy whereby the operator who bids on timber includes in his bid the cost of the road, so that any road building program policy change would automatically change the price paid for timber. This is the case in the Petawawa area where we built a road and it is charged against the timber as cut.

One of the most important recommendations made in the Royal Commission's report, in our opinion, was the suggestion that an advisory committee to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) be appointed. The Commission declared: "Its membership should consist of one representative of each of the following groups or interests: education, railways, labour, forest engineers, pulp and paper industry, lumber industry, mining, building industry and finance."

This committee has been appointed and has already met. Its membership meets every requirement of the Royal Commission's recommendation. Here are the members and their various capacities: Dean J.W.B. Sisam, Dean of Forestry, University of Toronto (Education); Archibald Freeman, General Manager, Ontario Northland Railway (Railway); Andy A. Cooper, representative United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of American (Labour); Major General Howard Kennedy, Commissioner, (Forest Engineers); Douglas W.

Ambridge, President and General Manager, Abitibi Power and Paper Company (Pulp and Paper Industry); D. A. Gillies, President, Gillies Bros. & Co., Ltd., (Lumber Industry); --

There is an interesting case right there. Mr. D. A. Gillies, representing the Gillies Company of Braeside, a firm which has been in the lumber business for over 100 years, and has been taking off, in some cases, a third and even a fourth crop -- I thought it was fitting that Mr. Gillies should be on this advisory board. He is getting along in years, but he can give us some of his vast experience in the continued cropping of their areas.

-- R. Leslie Beattie, Vice-President and General Manager, International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd. (Mining); Robert Drummond, President and General Manager, A. W. Robertson Co., Ltd., President, Canadian Construction Association (Building Industry) and Burnham L. Mitchell, Vice-President and Director, The Royal Bank of Canada (Finance).

It was further recommended that the committee should have a permanent secretariat, and a secretary has been appointed. The Commission declared in making the recommendation "the minister need not necessarily accept the advice of the Committee, but could receive much benefit from their discussion of and reaction to any major projects he might have under contemplation." I agree that the advice of an outstanding committee such as that I have outlined will be of tremendous help and benefit to me as the Minister of the Department and I welcome their appointment.

It is not my intention to hand them a hot platter to hold.

MR. MacLEOD: What about hot potatoes?

MR. SCOTT: That is a small problem.

I have asked them to look into some of our statutes -- that is one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission -- and they are discussing that at the present time, and have met twice already, and I understand they will have another meeting next week.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) permit a question? May I ask if the minutes of these deliberations are available? Are they public, or secret?

MR. SCOTT: There could be some confidential data to it, which it would not be well to circulate too widely.

The Commission also recommended further study of forest insect work. The Department has an agreement with the Federal Government covering the study and possible control of forest insects in the province. At Sault Ste. Marie there has been erected a laboratory spoken of as the most recent and farsighted of its kind in the world. Here is centred the work on the insects of the forest in this province. This agreement has been the forerunner of a large number of co-operative agreements with the Federal Government in other sciences, with private associations, with industry, with municipalities, so that the number of such agreements for sharing experience, eliminating duplication and lowering costs of operation is great. There are agreements covering the fur trade, the operation of commercial fisheries, forest protection on private lands, reforestation on county forests, as examples of the kind of work being dealt with in this manner.

Then in forest research we have long been alert to the need for forest research, and the problem of such research has been developing at the new station at Maple, a few miles north of Toronto. Here is being grouped in one area the related sciences pertaining to fish, soils, forest protection, tree breeding, woodlot management and seed extraction, forest pathology and many other sciences that deal with the biology of the forest, the stream and the life which inhabits them.

Research is endless, of course. But from our workers have come such things as pumps that weigh seventy-five pounds instead of a hundred and twenty-five; a means of drying cones from which seed are extracted in four hours instead of fifty; a motorized pack carrier to remove some of the burden from the back of the ranger and a hundred and one other devices and improvements of use to us in carrying on our work. It may not seem important at first glance, but experts at the Southern Research Station, Maple, are now studying the best varieties of trees to supply food for our birds and fur-bearers, among other things. I am sure that lovers of wildlife and apiarists will appreciate that.

Throughout all our efforts, we have never overlooked the importance of youth in Ontario's future. Our junior ranger programme has been the subject of a great deal of interest in other countries, anxious to emulate the example of Ontario. The juniors are school boys 17 years and up in age, who, during their summer holidays, are given useful employment and experience in the forests of Ontario. They are placed under the supervision of wise, experienced rangers.

That is one thing we are very careful of, to see that the chief in charge is of the proper temperament.

Under their guidance they learn how to construct and repair telephone lines, build and repair cabins, boats and canoes; how to take care of themselves in the bush; how, on occasion, to fight forest fires. No one has to teach these growing youngsters how to eat -- but the cooks at the ranger boarding houses view them with alarm and mingled pride. All of them gain in weight, stature and physical strength before they return to the town and cities from whence they came, and they form a valuable reservoir of future manpower when they have completed their schooling. Many of them are now employed on the permanent staff of the department -- starting to climb up the ladder just as did the senior officials to whom I referred earlier in this address.

Another important branch is information and education.

To further our work among the young people of the province, the information and education section of the department has carried on an extensive program, but has also set its sight at us older people too. Prevention of fires, with consequent saving of timber and wildlife habitat is, of course, the most economical method of handling the forest protection problem since it attacks it at its source. The section has specialized in the preparation and distribution of department publications; in conducting lecture tours, utilizing motion pictures of conservational appeal; in the design and construction of feature exhibits and in a regular schedule of news releases to newspapers, magazines, radio stations and writers. The work, particularly in the schools and among youth organizations, has been valuable indeed.

I trust some of the hon. members were able to see our picture "Out of the Smoke", which is typical of some of

the pictures we have been using.

In conclusion, I should like to sum up some of the tremendous strides made in the administration of Ontario's natural resources in the past seven years. The most important of the hundreds of forestry reforms we have instituted are: first, in forest management. In forest management the first great complete inventory of our resources is now nearing completion. That is referred to as "counting the trees". The evolution from inventory to forest management is coming about as rapidly as the inventory is completed for each part of the province. Management foresters have been established in each of our fifteen northern districts. The province now has one hundred and forty technical foresters on its staff. By close co-operation with the foresters from the forest industries, which employ about 300 master foresters, master plans are largely completed for most of the larger areas under licence.

In business management of timber, we have stopped trafficking in timber limits and placed a limit on the size of new sawmills to prevent overcutting any area and the formation of ghost towns.

We have promoted the building of three great new pulp mills, Marathon, Longlac, Red Rock, and also several lumber industries. Two former ghost towns, Espanola and Sturgeon Falls, have been completely rehabilitated.

It is a case of adopting their processes to forest conditions, such as exist at the present time.

We have established an export policy to help domestic industries.

During the term of office -- and this is referred to in the report -- of this government, we have standardized

the scaling of Crown timber and, for the first time, uniform measurement practices are in effect in all parts of Ontario. This has been brought about by the issuance of the Manual of Scaling Instructions in 1943 and the appointment of a general supervisor of scaling for the province, along with the appointment of a scaling supervisor for each district. Further control over the scaling staff generally has been brought about by requiring scalers to obtain licenses annually. This assures that only scalers with licenses in good standing can measure crown timber in Ontario. These reforms have done much to improve scaling practices in the province and assure better returns to the people of Ontario for the timber cut.

Much as these measures have done to improve scaling practices in the province, the government still has under contemplation additional far-reaching reforms. As you probably already know, the present system of measuring logs was established away back in 1879. Throughout the years, it has been changed as conditions warranted and has served the province well on the whole. With the inauguration of forest management in the province the question arises -- should we not at the same time change the method of scaling logs to bring them in harmony with present day advances in forestry as a whole? Gradually over a period of years the proportion of wood scaled in the province in cubic foot measure has increased. Today, 74 per cent. of all wood scaled by the department is scaled on the cubic basis. The balance for the most part is scaled in feet board measure Doyle scale, a small amount being scaled in linear feet or by the piece. The proposition now before the Department is -- have we not arrived at the time at which we should abandon

the board foot. linear foot or piece, as units of measure-measurement and measure all timber cut on Crown lands in cubic feet, and for the sawmilling industry, establish a system of log grades to take care of difference in value of logs of various sizes and quality? This is rather a radical change from traditional methods, and methods currently in vogue for the measurement of sawlogs in Ontario. It involves not only the abandonment of the Doyle rule but also the abandonment of the board foot, linear foot and piece as units of measurement, -- the cubic foot.

The board foot as a unit for the measurement of standing timber, timber in the log and lumber in the retail trade is firmly established on the North American continent. The board foot is used for the measurement of saw timber in every province of Canada and throughout the United States. Should Ontario abandon the board foot as a unit of measurement, it will be the only area on the North American continent so doing. Should the change be made to the cubic foot for the bush scale we cannot expect that a similar change would follow in the retail trade.

In Europe, and as far as we are aware, in all other timber producing areas of the world, outside of North America, the cubic measure for standing timber, logs and in the retail trade is used exclusively, the cubic metre being the most widely used unit. Typical of European practice is the grading of logs, the better grade of logs carrying higher stumpage rates. Grading of logs takes care of size and defect in logs, there being no system of reduction for cull as practised generally in Canada and the United States.

Very careful study is being given by the department to this problem before any final decision is made. Naturally such a change would not be made without consultation with industry and a full consideration of all factors involved, and be a subject for discussion with the advisory board.

In reforestation, we have expanded the existing capacity of our nurseries and built new ones until now we have five nurseries with a potential capacity of sixty million trees a year. Our annual production at present is twenty million trees. Our forest tree nursery system is being completely mechanized, and seeding from the air has been started to cover large areas.

In forest protection our air fleet has been modernized and we now have a total fleet of forty-four machines. The fleet also serves as an air ambulance system working through the department of Health. Hundreds of cooperative agreements for protection with municipalities and annual conferences with industries are producing noticeable results in better protection. Protection manuals, completion of the tower lookout system, training of key men at our new Ranger School, development of new equipment, loud speakers on aircraft, water bombing, province-wide radio network, use of helicopters and young rangers, are but a few of the paths along which we are going to better forest protection.

In addition to the research mentioned previously, experiments are now going forward in tree breeding with a view to production of an improved type of white pine; in a study of the seeding habits of coniferous trees, aimed at production of a good strain of regular seeding red pine.

At the present time our great trouble with red pine is

we only get a good seed crop about once in every seven years.

Methods are being sought to devise a means of treatment which will appreciably increase the ability of native seeds to reproduce under adverse conditions. Complete knowledge of regeneration conditions in the natural forest following fire or logging is under survey, as is determination of the best cutting age for principal commercial species. Another survey project aims at the classification of all provincial soils, with the object of defining permanent forested area.

The government research station at Maple is fast expanding into one of the great forest research stations on this continent, and we should like at this time to extend a cordial invitation to every hon. member of this House to visit the station and see what is being done.

I might say if the Whips would agree to get together on this, we would be only too happy to arrange a trip up there to see just what we are doing at this research station at Maple.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion -- oh, I have used that word before, have I not? I will say "finally".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SCOTT: It would, of course, be possible for me to talk for many hours on almost every phase of the work carried on by my department. But lest I bore the hon. members of the House, I shall refrain from talking at greater length other than to say this: I believe that this government has honestly and to the best of its ability tried to administer the forest resources of Ontario wisely and well so that in the future, as at the present, those resources will continue

to play their part in the economic well being and happiness of our people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(G-12 follows)

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate today, I will ask the indulgence of the House. I think I have caught a cold from my good friend and colleague to my right (Mr. Harvey, Sault Ste. Marie) who is confined to his bed today, so if I have a little difficulty with my voice, I hope the hon. members will bear with me.

I had hoped to be able to start my remarks by congratulating the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), but I find now that I have to congratulate him more for how he made his speech, than what he said in it.

MR. SCOTT: Just as long as you congratulate me, that is all right.

MR. ROBINSON: The first part of his speech sounded like a combination of Who's Who and The Canada Year Book. Parts of his address I found very interesting, but I did not find the meat in the speech which I had hoped very much would be there. At one point in his remarks I thought he was going to give us the meat, and I grabbed a scratch pad, but so far have not written anything on it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBINSON: I have always found the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) a very fine fellow, one of the finest in the Cabinet, and I always enjoy listening to his remarks. I would not want to be misunderstood, I think he covered the points of view from inside his department very nicely, he did a grand job on that, but he did not measure up to what is required in this province and tell us definitely what he and his staff are going to do for what is needed, and there was nothing in his speech to indicate the steps

were to be carried out.

I do want, before I get too deep in my favourite subject -- forests -- to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the excellent way in which you conduct and govern the business of this House, and also to the very delightful practice you have developed of entertaining the hon. members at various times in your apartment.

I am very sorry the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is not in his seat, as I would have liked to congratulate him upon the policy he followed in choosing the site for the Home for the Aged in the lakehead area. The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) insisted that a local joint committee should choose the site, and that is a very wise procedure in that part of the country. What actually happened, after all, was that certain municipalities interested in the project got their heads together, a site was chosen, and I would say without question the site was the one which anyone disassociated with government or any disinterested person, knowing the facts, would have chosen. It is a beautiful site in the City of Port Arthur, overlooking Thunder Bay; it is situated on the top of a hill, within a mile of the centre of the city; there is a paved road right up to the door; it is served by sewers and water, and it is right next door to the beautiful park and recreation ground of Boulevard Lake.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

It is also across the road from the General Hospital so if any of the friends of the old folks happen to be hospitalized they will be close to them. In short, it is a perfect choice of site for this home for the aged and we do hope an early start can be made on this building.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) used good judgment and the committee made the proper choice.

I would like also at this time to commend the announcement made in the Speech from the Throne of the intention to assist in the installation of rural telephones through the medium of Ontario Hydro. I have often spoken on that angle in my part of the country and I feel most definitely that is the proper method of handling the rural telephone situation in northwestern Ontario. Hydro has the poles, the lines are already in existence, they have trained men and so on, so I do sincerely hope that Hydro goes into this field on a scale which will meet the problem. It is a most welcome announcement.

I would like to say a few words about civil defence. I appreciate the assistance that the two levels of government have given the municipalities on the question of civic defence. They have given us some guidance as to how committees should be set up and how you should zone a city and so on, but I think it is up to both levels of government to tell us something about how far a municipality can go in civic defence. At this time there seems to be a lot of hesitation on that point. In other words, a city may set up a civic defence, may

choose the best co-ordinator they can get, may gather around the key men, as has been done in my own city and lay out a plan on a zone basis, can mark out their watermains and hydrants and so on, can mark all the important points in the city that enter into civic defence and when they get that far they say, "where do we go from here?" I think we should get guidance along these lines, assistance in organization is good but we should get guidance as to how far we should go in the light of present world affairs today. Should serious thought be given to air-raid shelters? How much should they be putting into the annual budget if they are going to keep their city properly set up in civic defence? At the present moment those are questions that are very definitely being asked by every municipality. The assistance, I repeat, that we have been given in the organization of the basic framework of civil defence is appreciated and we did receive much assistance from the hon. Minister of this Department (Mr. Welsh) but the municipalities still find themselves in the dark as to how far down the road they should travel, what actual preparation in the carrying out in the basic policy of civic defence at this time and I do appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), as I know he is in consultation with the Federal authorities from time to time, to give us some guidance on that very important point.

MR. FROST: We are just as much in the dark ourselves.

MR. C.H. MILLARD(York, West): You do not have to be.

MR. ROBINSON: As I understand the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), perhaps we should take our request to the Federal Government, is that the point?

MR. JOLLIFFE: They will probably say they are in the dark, too.

MR. FROST: On the 23rd we hope to, we have a great long list of questions which looks like the Order Papers, the questions we have.

MR. ROBINSON: I appreciate the position the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is in but I think he will appreciate the position the municipalities are in, not knowing just where we go from here. Every wideawake municipality wants to be out in front with civic defence and we need some guidance from higher up as to the practice to follow.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) when he said he thought there was a danger of Canada becoming an industrial colony of the United States. I would not want to be misunderstood, I think there is a wonderful relationship existing between these two countries and I would like to see it sustained and expanded. It is impossible for us to even exist these days without that but I have had come to my own attention and in my own part of the country, too many glaring examples that you cannot pass over this wuestion lightly. One of them I mentioned in this House last year and that was the question of the pipeline which was to come from the -- which now exists from the province of Alberta to what the newspaper insists on calling the

lakehead and it has caused much confusion to people who live away from the Canadian lakehead, they assume the pipeline has come to the Canadian lakehead which is not the case. The pipeline crosses the border to the American lakehead in the City of Superior. I would like to give a short history of what took place because most of us in the City of Port Arthur were very active in trying to avoid what I think was an error in the history of this Canada of ours. The pipeline at the time it was under consideration, I was in Ottawa attending a hearing of the B oard of Transport Commissioners and trying to have it terminated on the Canadian side. We were told most definitely at that time and have it in writing from some of the Federal officials that there was not any chance of a refinery being constructed at the lake end of the line. In this short period of time that has passed the refinery is constructed at the lake end of the line and the second refinery is now under consideration. Now I should add to that that I realize it is not quite that simple, that if you refine the products on Canadian soil and have to market them on American soil, the duty on so-called white products, refined products, would make that prohibitive. My argument at that time before the Imperial Oil officials and I say it still holds good, this pipeline should have terminated in Canada on Lake Superior and then the crude oil transported by tanker to American ports where it could have been refined to cover the northwest states. By their own figures, it is cheaper to transport oil by boat than pipeline. That is my argument and I say it still holds good.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another interesting development, we have the possibility of a pipeline for natural gas from Western Canada to Eastern Canada. It has been discussed already in my City and we should be very careful this time that the same thing does not happen. I would say that not only our part of the country but all of Ontario should be right on its toes to see that this pipeline stays on Canadian soil. It carries with it a very definite possibility, a distinct possibility in my part of the country because we learned from an expert that it is possible to smelt ore with natural gas -- that came from an expert very closely associated with Cyrus Eaton, and he should know what he is talking about, so you see the tremendous possibilities if natural gas could be piped to the lakehead and brought in beside the steep rock ore. At the present time there are enormous possibilities there so I plead with this government to keep their eye on that pipeline and let us not lose this one the way we lost the last one.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I associate myself with the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) Canada cannot become the type of country that its possibilities prophesy unless we are more determined that we are going to stand on our feet and control our own destiny. I think if we did that and insisted that Canadian natural resources were controlled by Canadian capital to the greatest possible degree, public funds if necessary, if private funds are not forthcoming, so that we might

build a Canada in keeping with the framework we have to work with. I say if we did that the first people to admire us would be our good friends south of the border. I think there should be more of that trend of thought in Canada today. We are too eager to permit our natural resources to be exported in the raw state or semi-finished state. I realize it is not an easy problem but I feel the determination to change this at the earliest possible moment and constantly keeping that thought before us and in the public eye is not emphasized enough and I feel that Canada is going to come out on the short end of things if we do not change that policy.

Now, I would like to spend the rest of my time, Mr. Speaker, devote the rest of my time to the forests. There is a great deal of confusion caused today in this interesting subject by the volume of material that is turned out by the Department of Lands and Forests, by the pulp and paper companies, by the sawmillers and a dozen and one other people and I do say this, that in spite of the confusion, underneath the deep surface of it, a portion of the problem, a great portion of the problem, is the failure of this government and previous governments in Ontario to get down to the real meat of the situation which is causing most of the trouble. I would like to go back over the past ten years, seven out of the ten the Conservative Government was in power in this Province and I would like to remind the House of George Drew's part that he played in the preparation of a minority report that was brought forward by a select committee in this Legislature. In 1941 Mr. Drew forcibly

recommended a Forests Resources Commission to exercise full control over and I quote,

> "the administration, conservation, reforestation and industrial utilization of forest resources".

Going on to 1943 we find the Conservatives in power and point number 7 of their election platform reads as follows and I quote:

> "Our vast forest resources which under proper administration are capable of creating employment of hundreds of thousands of new workers will be placed under the control of a Forests Resources Commission which will operate under long term policies on conservation, reforestation and soil control".

At the first Session of the Legislature following this election the Speech from the Throne has this to say and I quote again:

> "The Ontario Forest Resources Commission will be appointed to assume the responsibilities for supervising this great development which is now becoming the largest single source of our provincial income".

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are definite, clear-cut promises made to the people of Ontario and I feel that the reasons why they were not carried out should be more definitely explained to the people of this province.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Robinson) knows

that subsequently the Royal Commission on Forestry which was taken by General Kennedy recommended against us. I think on page 88 of that report it recommends against it. Is the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) in favour of the Kennedy recommendation or is he in favour of what--as some people, including Mr. Drew, apparently thought--was the proper policy seven years ago? Would the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) tell us what he is in favour of.

MR. ROBINSON: I will be glad to, I think you are stretching the words of the Kennedy report, it does not say that.

MR. FROST: It certainly does, would the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) get the Kennedy report and read it?

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, no, it says he doubts the value of commissions and what they can accomplish.

MR. FROST: That is my feeling, General Kennedy is right in his recommendation and we propose to follow it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You were wrong in 1942?

MR. ROBINSON: It is an admission the government was wrong in 1942.

MR. FROST: If the Commission is shown a better way of doing things it is always open to a better way of doing things.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, is it not fair to say that for the first time the government has come out and stated their proposals?

MR. FROST: You did not read what we said six months ago or when we appointed the Committee. My friend

should read these things.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Two and one-half years appointing a committee contrary in law.

MR. FROST: What was that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: It took the government two and one-half years contrary to law, two and a half years to appoint a committee. The law said there shall be a committee and it took two and a half years before you obeyed your own law.

MR. FROST: I do not think that was contrary to law at all. I should think the hon. members would be glad to see that committee appointed, I should think the hon. members would be complimenting the government on appointing the committee instead of that I have heard nothing but disgruntled objections from them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If I were in a government which sponsored a piece of mandatory legislation and had so little respect for it I neglected it for two and one-half years, I would apologize.

MR. ROBINSON: I am beginning to wonder, Mr. Speaker, who is making this speech.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBINSON: I would say this, and I think hon. members of the House will agree with me, that this type of exchange across the House shows you how vital this question is to Ontario.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Robinson) has not got down to General Kennedy's recommendation, to tell us whether he is in favour of that or not.

MR. ROBINSON: You have not given me a chance.

I have no desire to enter into an exchange across the floor of the House, what I am saying today I sincerely believe and I would not want to be misunderstood. What the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said in associating himself with an advisory committee, I think it is a good idea.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST: General Kennedy recommended that, and not a commission. He says he does not agree with a commission. Neither do I agree with a commission, I do not think it is worth it.

MR. MACLEOD: You voted for it.

MR. ROBINSON: My hon. friends during the period of years they were both in opposition and government demanded the Forest Resources Committee. They were very emphatic about it, and even placed legislation on the Bill books from this Province -- so there should be no misunderstanding on that point -- which is quite a change in thinking along forest lines. I am not bound here to follow the Kennedy Report exactly, and I think before I finish my remarks that will be quite evident, and I do not set myself up on a pedestal as any forest expert, but I have spent hours and hours of my time with people who do understand the forests and know something of the things that need to be done to correct the difficulty, and I would like, in a calm atmosphere, if I can, to leave some of those thoughts with the House for what they are worth.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is quite correct; in 1946, after two years had gone by, during which entire period the thought of the people of Ontario was that the government still supported the idea of a Committee, the Royal Commission was appointed to look into the forest question, and there is no need for me to acquaint this House with the Kennedy report. I have said it before and I say it again, that the Kennedy report met the situation head on and with a solution in keeping with the magnitude of the problem. Now that does not say that everybody --

MR. FROST: And that is the course we have followed. We have followed the Kennedy report in this --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us hear the speech, and we will find out.

MR. ROBINSON: In reply to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I cannot urge too strongly that hon. Members of this House read over and over again Chapter 21 of the Kennedy Report, which is the final chapter of the Report and which is headed: "A Solution", particularly the cardinal principles laid down at pages 185 to 192 of this chapter, covering limit allocation and forest operating companies. I ask hon. Members to read that chapter two or three times and then to ask themselves if it is fair to say that this government has adopted the Kennedy Report even in any major factor.

I say that the Government has s tudiously avoided the solution laid down in the Kennedy Report.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I would say this also, that the solution laid down in that chapter, after pages and pages of reading through and pointing out all the discrepancies in our present method of operation, pages and pages and pages, that it finally comes to the solution, and --

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) knows this --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) knows -- just a moment, I want to point this out to my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson), because I know he wants to be fair -- or, at least, I hope he does. General Kennedy's recommendations would take a generation to work out.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, who has the floor? I rise to a point of order.

MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was sitting over with my hon. friend the Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson(half the afternoon "cooking up" this speech, and I just like to "debunk" it, that is all.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On a point of personal privilege, may I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) he is entirely wrong about that. I did not sit with the hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) for more than five minutes, and I know a number of people on this side of the House can confirm that.

The hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) difficulty is that what has just been said, and perhaps what is going to be said, hurts.

MR. FROST: It does not hurt at all. I just --

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is trying to introduce here a "red herring", which is quite discreditable to him and his government.

MR. FROST: I would never think of such a thing. I just want to keep the records straight.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A red herring.

MR. ROBINSON: I hope, Mr. Speaker, it is the speech I am presenting and not my personality or method of presenting it that is causing all the crossfire in the House.

MR. FROST: Oh, no, you are a nice fellow.

MR. ROBINSON: I am most anxious to complete my remarks with the least possible interruption, if I can. I might

point out in reply to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the Leader of our party (Mr. Jolliffe) sat down beside me, and he was there I'd say less than five minutes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, that is right.

MR. ROBINSON: I would say it would be closer to three minutes that he sat beside me, and he wrote on the pad: "the most important changes, inventory and scaling", in the remarks of the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) and which I agree are the most important changes. Now, that is not reflecting anything on what the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) said, but I just want to have the whole situation in proper perspective. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has never seen this speech or gone over it in any way, so anything I say can be pinned onto me, and not onto him.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I knew it would be a good speech. And it is obvious that it is.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I want to go back again, if I may, to the question of the solution offered in the Kennedy Report and to point out that Mr. Kennedy, in offering his solution, did not say it would take a generation to even begin to bring it into operation.

MR. FROST: Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) can quite see --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Oh, now, now. I mean it takes time to do this, it is a matter which obviously is going to take time and patience.

AN hon. MEMBER: So is the speech.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that we were unravelling the mistakes of a hundred years. That is what we are doing now.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): and making more.

MR. FROST: We have to have time to do all that.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can end all the debate on this question by asking the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost): Is it the intention of the government to set up the forest operating companies as suggested in the Kennedy Report and cancel the present agreements?

MR. FROST: I would say quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that the portion of General Kennedy's Report relative to forest operating companies, I think will be agreed by most people -- most fair minded people -- as a highly doubtful experiment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Of course I can quote some people in answer to my hon. friend's (Mr. Robinson) question, I can quote some people who have not been altogether friendly to this government but who have taken a dispassionate view of some of these things. For instance, I read a very worthwhile editorial in the "Toronto Star" just about a month or six weeks ago, relative to that question, and perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has read it. I would say there was a lot of food for thought in that article.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to you that in the carrying out of that recommendation, that the reason it would take probably years to work out is that commitments have been made by many concerns, many companies, many individuals, and you cannot change those things --

MR. MILLARD: There is more of them being changed all the time. You never will.

MR. FROST: You cannot take these contracts and repudiate or alter them, you have to take time to permit the carrying out of those arrangements. I would say that with the objects in General Kennedy's recommendation we are in entire agreement -- and this is in answer to my hon. friend's (Mr. Robinson) question -- in the objects we are in entire agreement; with some of the methods he suggests, we would not be in agreement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, you are not going to do it.

MR. FROST: Oh, I would not say that at all, I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Joliffe) that we are going to carry out and we are going to achieve the objects in the Kennedy Report, we are going to achieve those things and if my hon. friends just have a little confidence and patience, they will see that done.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBINSON: I will say you have to have patience to make a speech in this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Well, the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) asked us a question, did he not? Surely he would like to have a reasonable answer.

MR. ROBINSON: In connection with what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has suggested, is it not interesting that they were so quick to accept General Kennedy's remark that he did not believe in a forest resources commission? That was the impression they gave, and in the next moment they give the impression they do not intend --

MR. FROST: I did not say that. My hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) wants to distort and mislead.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, the impression you gave was that there were a lot of things wrong with this idea of forest operating companies, and the impression a person would gain from that is that you did not intend to follow that road. Now I think that would be a fair conclusion for a person to come to.

MR. FROST: I had better send my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) some of the speeches I have made on this subject.

AN hon. MEMBER: More speeches?

MR. PARK: What about the speeches on housing last year?

MR. FROST: I listened to a speech you made last night that was not a very good one, though.

MR. PARK: You listened all right.

MR. FROST: Oh, yes, I always do.

AN hon. MEMBER: There is hope for you as long as you listen.

MR. MACLEOD: What did you think of the first speech?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBINSON: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said that the companies -- some companies -- have made some very big commitments. Before I complete my remarks on the subject, I would like to point out that this Province, too, has made some very big commitments.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: And I think the people are very, very definitely interested in those commitments, and where we are going in this situation, so again I ask hon. members of the House to read that final chapter of the Kennedy Report

in which a solution to correct all the evils he takes most of the Report to put before those people who are interested enough to read his Report after pages and pages and pages of that, in the last chapter he lays down a solution, and that is the keystone of the Kennedy Report.

I would say that the situation, for instance, of the supply of saw logs for the Great Lakes Lumber and Shipping Company is not a separate problem, I think we would all agree on that, it is a problem that will be solved when the basic changes in forest policy that are needed are made, then we will automatically solve that problem. And any effort to solve the problem by letting one cutter cut wood on the limits of another cutter I think is doomed to failure. I would like to read what the Kennedy report says of this idea of permitting one operator to cut on the limits of another:

> "Such arrangements are at best a make-shift and must be highly irksome to all concerned. The saw mills lack assurance of continued supply and the pulp and paper companies involved cannot accurately estimate the effect that possible cutting programmes for saw logs may have on their future sources of pulpwood supplies".

And this is the interesting part:

> "I am convinced, particularly in times when woods labor is scarce, that any effort to provide saw logs under the terms in existing agreements will meet with similar inconclusive results and that the problem can best be solved by the application of the recommendations in

the final chapter of this Report".

That again refers to the chapter I was just speaking about, which contains the solution. Inside the framework of that chapter is the solution of the saw logs-pulp wood argument.

I would say too much attention has been paid to this one particular problem because it has been greatly emphasized and advertised across the Province, but it is only one of dozens of similar problems that exist in our forest situation as it is operated today.

Just brieflt to go over the history of this pulpwood-saw log dispute, and the history of it and what has come from it and resulted from it over the years, is interesting. In 1943, I believe -- I may be wrong there -- the Guthrie Commission was set up to enquire into the pulpwood-saw log situation and tried to end the dispute between the saw loggers and pulpwood men. They found it was beyond the scope of their enquiry and they failed to table a report of any kind. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why a committee which was recently set up in Port Arthur, and during the visit of our good friend the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) -- we are always most anxious to have him up there, he is a very delightful guest to have with one at any time -- he came to Port Arthur on January 27th of last year, and they set up a committee which was supposed to try to solve, among other things, the pulpwood-saw log situation.

MR. SCOTT: Oh, no.

MR. ROBINSON: This committee is made up of one member from each city council, one from each Chamber of Commerce -- that is, Fort William and Port Arthur -- and one representative of labor.

Now, that committee has done nothing to solve the problem, and in all fairness to them, they could not be expected to solve a problem of this magnitude with a committee of that kind.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Would the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) permit me - -

MR. ROBINSON: Surely.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: - - to just remark that it was definitely stated that this was not an advisory committee, but this was a liaison committee to keep the Lakehead informed on what negotiations were going on here. We have carried that part of it out. In all fairness now, was that not definitely what was intended?

MR. ROBINSON: I would reply to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) by asking him to read the newspaper reports at that time.

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Oh, well.

MR. FROST: Oh, now, my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) is wiser than that. Come out in the open now, and be frank about it.

MR. ROBINSON: I am being very frank, because here is the point: If that is wrong, then all the people at the Lakehead have been given the impression that among other things -- not entirely, but among other things -- one of the tasks of that committee was to look into this saw log pulpwood dispute and see what they could do towards finding a solution.

MR. FROST: Well now, are you straightened out on that?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, yes. Indeed I am.

MR. FROST: Well, that is an improvement.

MR. ROBINSON: I am learning a lot. It might be interesting to just read one heading at that time.

"Scott hopes for solution soon to the pulpwood saw log dispute"

That is the headline in the Port Arthur paper.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is that right?

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Still hoping.

MR. ROBINSON: Is it any wonder the people got a wrong impression?

MR. FROST: Well, I do not see why they should. After all, of course we hope to get those things solved.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Sure, sure.

MR. FROST: Of course we do.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, there was at that time four or five lengthy news items in the press and there were at that time two editorials in the press. I have the among my material but I do not want to delay the House while I search for them, but I would be glad to place them before either the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) or the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost).

MR. MacLEOD: Oh, he has seen them.

MR. ROBINSON: I would do that to point out that the impression I received -- I am not a member of the committee -- and the impression the public have received from the reports given in the press is that this was one of the duties of that committee, and I am only bringing that forward to point out that they could not possibly hope to solve that problem, and I accept the government's statement that they did not expect them to, but the public have got

the impression that they were expected to.

I do not think that the present method of trying to combine saw mills and pulpwood in their operations is really going to solve the problem. It may improve the present situation but it does not get down to the root of the problem and before I have finished my remarks, I think that I can make that clear from my point of view. However, I would only say this, Mr. Speaker, that down through the years the public have, rightly or wrongly, got the impression that there are powerful forces that want the forst industry and the forest management to stay pretty close to the scale and the framework on which it has been operated down through a long period of years. In saying that I do not want to take any credit away from the present government at all in any changes for the better they have made, but the main framework is what I am talking about there, and the impression the public has is that there are powerful forces very, very anxious to maintain that framework.

MR. FROST: Who are those forces? Could you tell us?

MR. ROBINSON: I would say they are the people who gain the most from the present situation.

MR. FROST: But, for instance, who are you talking about?

MR. ROBINSON: Well, the big saw milling interests, the pulp interests, the paper interests and so on. I would imagine that they would not like to see, for instance, the Kennedy Report applied in its fullest degree.

MR. FROST: Well, I have made it plain, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of this Government is to be on the side of the people on this question and not on the side of any special

interests.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: And that is our policy.

MR. MILLARD: That is worth another headline.

MR. ROBINSON: At least the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) statement does say there are two sides.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) that there is only one side as far as we are concerned, and that is the people's side.

AN hon. MEMBER: That is right, only one side -- big business.

MR. ROBINSON: When you said it, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), you did not say "On the only side", you said "The side," so we assume there are two sides.

MR. FROST: No, there is just the people's side.

MR. ROBINSON: I think we would be very naive if we did not know there were two sides.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Does my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) think that there are only two sides to this question? I can tell him that there are 25 sides.

MR ROBINSON: Again we are muddying the well up. There are two sides to the question we are talking about, the interested forest projects and the side of the people. That is two sides.

MR. FROST: And I said we are on the people's side.

MR. ROBINSON: Perhaps I should ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to name the other 23.

MR. FROST: Well, you come from that country. You

should know.

MR. ROBINSON: Again I say I do not want to start any personal exchanges across the House at all, but I would like to make my remarks in all sincerity, because there are many glaring examples of the power of those interests. The hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White) unfortunately is not in his seat, but he mentioned some astonishing deals which the Liberals inflicted on the people.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

He mentioned among others the General Timber Company, the Soo Pulp Products, the Pulpwood Supply Company, and others, but he did not finish the story. Let us take a look at these astounding deals made by these same companies in the name of their parent American companies in more recent times.

He mentioned the Pulpwood Supply Company, which was a Canadian subsidiary for the Kimberley-Clarke interests, as the hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White) stated -- and again I wish he was in place this afternoon -- that the Liberals obligingly built a canal from Long Lac, to divert the waters into Lake Superior, but that was all the hon. Member (Mr. White) had to say about the canal, which was such an item of interest a few years ago.

But he did not finish the story, because the present Government was not satisfied with the canal, they went the "whole-hog", and obligingly built a power house, costing around $15,000,000 and using the water for diversion.

But that is not the whole story.

Mr. Frost did that no result in the building of the Town of Terrace and Terrace Bay?

MR. ROBINSON: Not necessarily.

MR. FROST : Oh yes, it did. Do not slip around. The hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) had better go up and look at it.

MR. ROBINSON: Had the Pine Portage development been gone ahead with the power for the Pulp and Paper Mill would have been taken care of, and also the people in

Terrace and Schreiber --

MR. CHALLIES: One year after.

MR. ROBINSON: No. The figures I received from Hydro showed there were four months difference in the building of these two plants.

MR. CHALLIES: And you would have been short in the Thunder Bay District by 24,000 kilowatts.

MR. ROBINSON: The facts do not bear out the case. There was only a few months difference in the construction time of the plants.

MR. CHALLIES: You were told in the Report that the Aguabason was twelve months shorter than the Pine Portage.

MR. ROBINSON: You made the statement, but I disagree with it.

MR. CHALLIES: That is a Report by the Hydro engineers.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, but what is the difference in the actual construction time of Pine Portage and the Aguabason?

MR. CHALLIES: You would have got power into Terrace Bay for twelve months after the Aguabason, and you would have been short 24,000 horsepower -- 5,000 in 1947, and 24,000 in 1948. The Aguabason came in 1948, and Pine Portage could not come in, in 1948.

MR. ROBINSON: The actual construction time varied by only four months, so the paper interests would have had to wait four months while the power plan was developed. But the building of the power plant supplied the company with river improvements, and with a log pond, on which

to store their logs, which would have cost them a huge sum of money to construct. But that is not all the story. The Company is being supplied with power at least $5.00 horsepower below the cost of production---

MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) a question? Were not told -- and it was supported by the Hydro Report you got here -- that up until this year the power at $16.00 per horsepower was paying for the cost of power including the reserve? Now, be fair.

MR. FROST: The hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) does not want to be fair.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. I would like that imputation withdrawn. We have been very tolerant at the interruptions by sensitive Ministers who appear to know how vulnerable they are, and I think if we are going to have any more remarks of that order, they should be ruled out of order, and withdrawn.

MR. CHALLIES: May I just ask---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask for a ruling.

MR. CHALLIES: I was just going to ask---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish a ruling that no more interruptions of that sort will be tolerated.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) objecting to?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The statement by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) does not want to be fair.

MR. FROST: Well, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) objects to that, in order that we may make headway, I will withdraw it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A most ungracious withdrawal.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can do to please my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe). He is always upset. I withdraw, of course.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The only ones who are upset this afternoon are the two hon. Ministers (Mr. Frost and Mr. Challies) over there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHALLIES: If I may now read the question and the answer.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are not speaking in this debate. You will have your chance.

MR. CHALLIES: The hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) gave me the opportunity to do that. Who is getting sensitive now?

Here is the question:

> "What will be the losses on power sold to system customers in the Thunder Bay system in the year 1950?"

And here is the answer:

> "As of this date, we are able to say that there will be no losses on company loads this year. This year, as in former years, the revenue received will cover actual expenditures including standard provision for reserves."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I had a copy of that question --

MR. CHALLIES: Then just stick to it.

MR. ROBINSON: If it pays to supply power at $16.00 or $17.00 per horsepower, why did the Hydro raise the rates to the customers in my constituency to $23.50.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Just answer that one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: The answer is plain.

MR. CHALLIES: The fact is that over 70% of the reserves in the Thunder Bay area have been accumulated from the reserves which have been set up by the system, and 30% by the municipalities, and these are on a ten-year contract, and the rate was set on the instructions and at the request of the municipalities of Fort William and Port Arthur, as far back as 1943, 1944, or 1945. That is why the rate was $16.00.

Now, the reserves were accumulated by this Company, of which 70% have been accumulated out of the price of power sold to its system customers.

MR. FROST: There are none so blind, as those who will not see.

MR. ROBINSON: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made a remark a few minutes ago about being fair. Let us be fair.

MR. FROST: Let us get down to business for a while. I am in agreement.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to clarify the first point raised by the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies), and of the percentages that the mills had arranged for reserves in the city, the municipalities have $2,132,612.69, and the mills have $2,251,433.59, a difference of around 3%. Those are the figures we have up in our country.

In connection with the request of the municipalities to have the cost of power reduced, in all fairness let this be said, that that request came forward back in the days of the depression, when there was every desire to keep the wheels of industry turning at all costs, but the contracts about which we are speaking were signed in 1948, and I do not think it is fair to measure a 1948 contract by the economy which existed at the time the rates were reduced.

MR. CHALLIES: May I interject another point there?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, it is quite true the final eontract was signed in 1948. It was negotiated by the Commission in November, 1945, and a draft contract was submitted to the Long Lac, and the draft contract was signed in May of 1946, to carry out the undertaking where they were investing a $30,000,000 to establish a new community, and delop the North, and the Commission carried out the contract, and there is no loss in power at all.

MR. FROST: And, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in 1944 and 1945 your Leader was in the Assembly telling about the great depression and the unemployment that was going to take place in this Province.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I was quite right.

MR. FORST: It has not happened as yet, and this is 1951. You have been under a good government; that is why.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBINSON: Again I say I do not wish to enter into any cross-fire across the floor of the House, with any feeling at all, because I am most anxious to present the situation as it exists, and I still say that all I have said so far has been substantiated.

Now, one of the most interesting things about this situation is this; we talk about the contingency reserve fund from which this discrepancy in price must be found, and again I say, if there is a discrepancy in price, then why has there been such a heavy increase in the cost of power to other customers than the mills? It is hard to resolve that situation. If there has been a discrepancy -- and I am inclined to agree with that -- when we asked about the loss of power sold to customers, we were told it was $130,000.

MR. CHALLIES: There it is again, the question you asked in December, and I may point out that in March they may have been estimating a loss, but, as I said before:

> "As of this date, we are able to say that there will be no losses on company loads this year," and in answer to question 4,

we said: "If and when losses do occur, they will be met from the contingency

reserve, approximately 65% of which has to date been built up from direct company revenues".

MR. ROBINSON: That is correct. The point I wish to emphasize again is if there were no losses in the power generated for the company, we can generate and sell power then at $16.00 per horsepower for power taken at 110,000 volts, and $17.00 for power taken at 22,000 volts, with the 3 mills, I think for power used over 85% load factor.

The interesting point is if we can generate power for that money, and put some money into the reserve fund, why are we charged $23.50 per horsepower to our customers? That is a point I cannot get clear.

But the most interesting part is this; if it is necessary to draw from the contingency reserve which has been built up gradually, just about equally by the municipalities and the mills -- if it is necessary to draw from that reserve, then this company which held an agreement signed in 1948, as a ten year agreement, and is the only pulp mill in that part of the country, which has a ten year agreement.

MR. CHALLIES: May I say that in the initial stages, each and every company had a contract for ten years, and this was the same as the others. There was no difference between this and the rest of them.

MR. ROBINSON: The point still remains, Mr. Speaker, that this company holds a ten year contract for power. This expires in 1958, and they paid nothing into the contingency reserve; they were not in existence at that time.

And so again, if -- and again I qualify my remarks until I get more information, in the light of what has been said here -- if it is necessary to draw from this contingency reserve for the ordinary papermill, for every dollar drawn out, there as a subsidy on the price of power, the little fellow would put in 50 cents. In connection with this company which holds a ten year contract, and it might be necessary to draw from the fund for years, (if we are drawing from the fund at all. I still have to have that verified.) They would take the $1.00 out, because they have no equity in the contingency reserve, so we have to meet that interesting situation.

I do not blame the Company so much. I think they must have been pretty good negotiators, but I do blame those called upon to protect the interests of the people of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I would say that the hon. Member for Kenora (Mr. White) was so busy looking over the fence into the messy backyard of the Liberals, that he failed to notice he was up to his knees in it, in his own backyard.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBINSON: And, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness---

MR. PORTER: One place where there is purety.

MR. MacLEOD: Over here. It is white on the map.

MR. ROBINSON: As I was going to say a few minutes ago, we were told on the first request that the loss of company power would be around $130,000,000. That I believe was last March. Last October I was told in answer to the same question that the loss would be in the neighbourhood of

$200,000. In December of this year -- and I will agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) we were told there would be no loss of this power. I would like more details as to this, if there is no loss, if they actually generated power at that cost? If not, how are we going to make up the discrepancy?

MR. CHALLIES: If you will allow me, I will say this. You cannot estimate in March what the balance of the fiscal year or the calendar year will be, for nine months, ending the 31st of December. As you know, we had a tremendous increase in the load in the Thunder Bay area, which had brought in areas which otherwise was not anticipated, and were not in a figure given to you in December, which definitely stated that at this time we were able to say -- which we could not say last March, and which we did not definitely say to you that there would be a loss -- but they say in December they are now definitely able to state that the contract for Long Lac paper company and the rest are paying for their power.

MR. ROBINSON: Then I would be safe in saying this, that we can expect a substantial rebate on the power sold to the other type of customers, in order to bring their rates down. Would that be fair?

MR. CHALLIES: Oh no. You are on a competitive basis. If at the end of the year's business there is a credit coming to you, you will get your credit; if there is a deficit, you will have to pay it. I think you will find there is a substantial credit coming to you.

MR. ROBINSON: The difference between generating power

at $16.00, and the cost we are now paying of $23.50? So we would have a very substantial rebate coming to us now, and we have found the company is getting power at that low cost.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR.ROBINSON: Eighteen months ago, Hydro advised the Thunder Bay System of the necessity of increasing the price of power sold in the Thunder Bay system. In January, 1950, the domestic users suffered an increase of over 30% in the price of power.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) said you would get a substantial rebate on that.

MR. CHALLIES: I did not use the word: "substantial". I said you would "get a rebate".

MR. ROBINSON: You would not ask us to pay more for power than any others?

MR. CHALLIES: The breakdown is between the $16.00 and whatever your rate was. Apparently there is not much use in pointing out the reason, because you think you are right and the Hydro engineers are wrong.

MR. ROBINSON: Wrong on what?

MR. CHALLIES: Wrong on everything. On these figures you said---

MR. ROBINSON: Which figures are the ones you are referring to?

MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR.ROBINSON: I want to be fair. I do not know the figures the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) is referring to.

MR. CHALLIES: You say you do not believe these figures.

MR. ROBINSON: What figures?

MR. CHALLIES: The figures I gave of the price of power to the system customers at $16.00, for 1950. The remark by the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson) was that the figure was not right, and he did not believe it.

MR. ROBINSON: I do not want to be misunderstood. I am most happy to find out we can generate power at that price, and I would look forward to the fair way in which I know the Hydro treats the people. I would assume the other customers would be sold power at the same price. All I want to do is to get the cost of generation.

MR. CHALLIES: There is always a reserve for system customers.

MR. ROBINSON: The question I put forward is giving them power in large blocks.

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

But I know a paper mill that is buying 10,000 horsepower at $16. a horsepower, at 110,000 volts and the municipality of Port Arthur is buying 30,000 horsepower at $23.50 where I would say we are taking a larger block of power than that paper mill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: So, I want to be fair --

MR. CHALLIES: May I ask this, are you saying that the government is wrong when they arranged $16. horsepower rates for customers in the Thunder Bay district? Do you think they were wrong, you want the price put up?

MR. ROBINSON: No, I thought they were wrong --

MR. CHALLIES: I say they are right.

MR. ROBINSON: Since the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) has assured me they can get it, I most entirely agree. I say whether they were wrong or not, I was under the impression, apparently wrongly, that they could not generate power for that cost, but since I have been assured they can and the written report says they can, all I appeal for now is that you give the boys on the other side of the fence the same deal.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is fair enough.

MR. CHALLIES: If they feel they are overcharged they get a credit.

MR. ROBINSON: And in reply to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) when he says that I will not agree, the only other figure I disagree with is the 65 per cent figure on the equity the mills had in the contingency reserve fund.

MR. CHALLIES: I say that is in answer to question 4.

MR. ROBINSON: I have the figures prepared by our own commission which shows they are almost 50 - 50, however, we can go into that some other time also.

I find in the course of the exchange across the floor we have covered a considerable amount of --

MR. CHALLIES: Water.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, that is the stuff you make hydro power from. I would say this in conclusion of this part of my remarks, that the commission from both the cities will be in Toronto on the 28th of this month and I sincerely hope that some arrangement can be made where we can sell our customers, other customers, power at this same price and we can give some thought to the amount of remuneration which will be coming to the customers that had been overcharged during the year 1950. The commissions will be down here and I will sit in with them as a member of the commission and I would be most interested in what is said, and I would say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) we will be most grateful for any adjustment that can be made to this situation in our part of the country.

MR. CHALLIES: That will be different, to be grateful.

MR. ROBINSON: I do not think I have been insulting or personal in my talk, and yet for some reason or other a remark of that kind, "that will be something new, to be grateful" --

MR. CHALLIES: I will explain myself. The

commission has gone to unlimited trouble to give you answers to all the questions that you have asked, personally, or that your commission has asked --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not?

MR. CHALLIES: We are not complaining about that but at least you might say we are at least frateful for the amount of trouble but there is criticism about building a dam on the Aguasabon to form an artificial lake for logs. How can you take a river and get the power without a dam? The cost goes into the cost of power and the people who buy power Aguasabon helps pay for the dam as well as the plant.

MR. ROBINSON: I would only say this to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) that I would agree with him most definitely, you cannot build a power dam without building an artificial lake.

MR. CHALLIES: Will you agree with me that the price of the dam will be paid out of the sale of the power?

MR. ROBINSON: That is right.

MR. CHALLIES: We are making progress.

MR. ROBINSON: But the artificial lake that was created by this dam is of great value to the pulp company and if they had operated on that site with power provided as they should have been --

MR. CHALLIES: In your opinion?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MR. CHALLIES: But not the hydro engineers.

MR. ROBINSON: Perhaps not of them, but I can only say this, that in my opinion that log storage dam was created, if it had not been created for them they

would have had to create it themselves.

MR. CHALLIES: For the plant on that dam about 12,000 to 20,000 of horsepower of the proportion of power they take from that plant they will pay for the dam.

MR. ROBINSON: That is true, I am not arguing. They got an artificial log storage pond which they would otherwise have had to build themselves. They are in that much, that is the point I want to make.

Now, I would also say this, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will agree that I have argued against the Aguabason power development in this House dating back to 1945 when I learned it was to be built and the Hansard records of this House record that. I am not making any changes in my own policy at all at this time or in my thinking. I do not wish to thresh old straw, but I would like to point out that the whole situation here today is closely related to the story of this power plant. Speaking in the Throne Speech Debate on March 20, 1947, I closed my remarks on this question, with these words:

> "The question is, did the advantages to the pulp mill interest in any way influence the decision to have the plant at this point? I am not saying that this is the case, but the reluctance of authorities to give out information on the question has created the suspicion in the public mind, and allowed them to wonder if the mill has been given preferential treatment."

That was in March, 1947. Later on in the same day the then Prime Minister, Mr. Drew, in summing up, in making his summary of remarks on the Speech from the Throne Debate, had this to say, and I would ask all hon. members to listen closely, this was Prime Minister Drew who was speaking at this time:

> "We heard the very useful speech from the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) for Port Arthur. I am not going to engage in any argument with him on the technical aspects of whether the power site of Aguasabon or other rivers were placed at the right points. I must confess I am rather in the position of being compelled to rely on the trained engineers in decisions of that kind. But outside of the possible argument about the wisdom, or otherwise, of relying upon these engineers, I want to say very definitely that I agree with a great deal of what he said".

Now, that is interesting.

MR. CHALLIES: The Commissioners for Port Arthur and Fort William agreed to the Aguasabon development.

MR. ROBINSON: I think the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) described it last year as a "shot-gun wedding", they agreed and disagreed according to the pressure put on them at different times. Up there they disagreed; when they came down here they agreed, but is not this true, that the very fact that those who were closer to the situation at the Lakehead were by no means clear in their mind. They had their minds made up one day and somebody talked to them and swung it the other

way, which shows confusion in the minds of the people about this very interesting point.

MR. CHALLIES: The Port Arthur-Fort William Commission can be influenced.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, people can be influenced rightly and wrongly, I would say most definitely, yes. They are reasonable people. They go along with an argument, they came down here and supported it and went back home and sent down a resolution opposing it, so I do not see that it is an open-and-shut case. I am going to read that sentence of Mr. Drew's remarks again. Mr. Drew said:

> " Outside of the possible argument about the wisdom, ior otherwise, of relying upon these engineers, I want to say very definitely that I agree with a great deal of what he said".

I think that can be said to at least bear some support to the argument I am putting forward.

MR. PORTER: We do not know what you said.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, I opposed the building of the Aguasabon.

MR. PORTER: You do not know whether he is talking about that.

MR. ROBINSON: It is all recorded in Hansard on that date. I will give you the date again, look up Hansard March 20, 1947. I think it is fair enough.

MR. FROST: You are probably both wrong, read it again.

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

MR. ROBINSON: Well, the first man I was talking about was George Drew.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: So I would agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) at least to that degree that he was probably wrong.

MR. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): You are having a field day, Freddy.

MR. ROBINSON: But now that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost is back in his seat again, I will appeal to him--

MR. FROST: You are not going to stir all this up again, are you?

MR. ROBINSON: No, I am not.

MR. FROST: I thought it was a contribution to good feeling.

MR. ROBINSON: Are you interested in hearing what I have to say? Because I am most anxious to appeal to you to go into the details of this power situation at the Lakehead, and I would like the hon. member for Grenville -Dundas (Mr. Challies) to sit in with us, if he can, when the two Commissions come down here on the 28th of the month, because it is a very, very important question in that part of the country.

I would like now to go back and complete my remarks on forestry.

MR. CHALLIES: May I ask if you till are of the opinion you would like to see Aguasabon in the Northern Ontario properties?

MR. ROBINSON: My personal opinion, are you seeking?

MR. CHALLIES: Well, that is probably yours, of course.

MR. ROBINSON: Personally, yes, I would most definitely. I think they made a proposition a year ago.

MR. FROST: All right, we will do it tomorrow.

MR. NIXON: Two years ago.

MR. ROBINSON: I think a year ago the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made the same remark: "We will take it over tomorrow."

MR. FROST: Well, we find in your country some people want to keep it, and we aim to satisfy.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, and that is why I qualified my remarks and said: "Are you asking my personal opinion?", and I made that definite in my reply that my statement was my personal opinion, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said: "All right, we will take it over tomorrow," so he must have agreed to respect my opinion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: If we take it over, would you support us in taking it over?

MR. ROBINSON: I beg your pardon?

MR. FROST: If we take it into Northern Ontario Properties, would you support that? Would you advocate that at the Lakehead, or would you say something else up there?

MR. ROBINSON: I will support you.

MR. CHALLIES: Here and there.

MR. ROBINSON: It makes no change in my remarks at all.

MR. FROST: Well, I know you would not want to cause us any trouble.

MR. ROBINSON: I may say I have gone over this question in my own part of the country many times, and the people are very familiar with it.

I would like now to say a few words on exports and to try to seek some information.

I believe the Marathon Company agreement of 1944 permits export equal to the quantity of wood used in the mill, which would I imagine be in the neighborhood of 150,000 cords. The export policy announced by the then Premier Mr. Drew in October 1947 would reduce this export 10% per year for ten years, when it would be wiped off entirely. Am I correct, then in assuming --- if the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) could tell me -- that the export of the Marathon Company has now been cut by 30%?

Hon. MR. SCOTT: Not having the figures in front of me I could not tell you exactly what it is, but I will be very glad to get you those figures.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you.

MR. FROST: You agree with our policy in that regard do you?

MR. ROBINSON: I will qualify that. I will answer that question if you will give me just a moment.

MR. CHALLIES: Can we put that away? (Indicating)

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, you can put that away. The export policy as announced in 1947 by the then Premier (Mr. Drew) included spruce, balsam and jack pine. In January 1950 the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott) visited Port Arthur and surprised us by stating that no one was denied the right to export jack pine. I quote from the News-Chronicle of that date, January 27th, 1950, which had this to say:

> "A surprise announcement which came out of the parley from Mr. Scott was that no one had been refused permission to export jackpine. Contractors here apparently were under the impression that jack-pine was included in a general ban on wood export."

The news item naturally drew me to try to clarify the situation, so I asked a question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) which

is recorded in the press in this way:

> "Mayor Robinson referred to an announcement by Mr. Drew in 1947 that export of spruce, balsam and jackpine would be cut off. He asked if it has ever been made public that jackpine could still be exported. Mr. Scott said that no restrictions had been placed on the export of jackpine as yet. He did not know if this had been announced publicly."

I just point that out to you, Mr. Speaker, to show the confusion that the present policy is creating in the minds of people who are very, very close to the woods business.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the balance of my remarks on the basic forests question. I would say this, that Ontario has a big job ahead of them. I think that would be supported in all ranks, and I firmly believe that Ontario has the greatest opportunity of any similar area in the world to become a model for mankind in forest management.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: And I would say most definitely the more I watch this picture unfolding that the only way to really accomplish that is by adopting a complete forest management and harvesting plan under public authority.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: I had the honour to appear before the Royal Commission on Forestry and lay the principles of such a plan before that Royal Commission on behalf of the C.C.F. Party. The need for such a plan becomes more evident from day to day. It is interesting to compare the brief which I submitted with the Kennedy Report. They parallel each other in calling for the cancellation of all present agreements and

licences and so on, and both call for the guarantee to supply domestic mills with suitable wood throughout the lifetime of the mill. I think that was the basis also --

MR. SCOTT: At what capacity?

MR. ROBINSON: Pardon?

MR. SCOTT: At what capacity?

MR. ROBINSON: Well, at their present capacity. Is that not what you are doing? They must now be supplied with wood up to their present capacity, that just answers itself, does it not, so that if a mill has a certain accepted capacity, I would say it should be supplied with wood to carry on in that capacity unless there is some thought of reducing the capacity. Without getting into the pro and con of that argument, I would say, assuming a mill was a legitimate mill and using a legitimate amount of wood, then it should be supplied with suitable wood throughout the lifetime of the mill.

The C.C.F. brief proposed the management, development, and harvesting of the wood under public authority, under the guidance of a Forest Resources Commission. The harvesting might be done either directly or by contracts, which ever worked out the best in practice, but the cardinal point would be that the control of how, where and when the trees would be cut, how they would be classified, would constantly rest in the hands of the public authorities. This plan would eliminate the confusion and controversy and complications that we are raced with today.

I was interested in the beginning of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) remarks to see him support the idea of the Crown lands system that is used in the Province of Ontario and I have a little piede from a broadcast that he made on

November 1st, 1948, that I would like to read. The hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) said:

> "First of all our forests came to us by purchase from the Indians of Canada."

MR. MacLEOD: "Purchase"?

MR. frost: Who said this?

MR. ROBINSON:

> "It is to the credit of the administration in Canada that 85% of all our lands and forests are owned by the people, they are in public hands. Now what are we going to do with with it?"

And so on.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: And I most heartily agree with that remark by the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott), but I say that supporting the idea of public authority that far, the real solution lies in going down the road the rest of the way and cancelling all the agreements and terms as they exist today and taking over the conservation, management and harvesting of our woods under public authority. Under an over-all plan placing the forests under a public authority under a Forest Resources Commission would eliminate complications that plague us today. We can calculate the cost of the wood laid down at the mill or at some point agreeable to the mill operators, taking into consideration all costs for conservation, protection, reforestation, harvesting, etc. Under such a plan efficiently carried out, we could supply wood to the manufacturer at a fair price. The very nature of this plan would permit savings not possible under the present system because of its disjointed, piecemeal nature, torn by the desires of opposing factions.

(Take M follows)

The wood would be selected and channelled into the field best suited by experts interested only in sound forest practise, and not in any specific manufacturing operation. I think that is a correct statement to make. This would solve the problem of forest roads. Who builds the roads? Who maintains them? Who will control them? It will solve the problem of river improvements, but who will build the improvements? Who will maintain them? Who will control them? As the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott) well knows, it would solve the problem of who gets what, and where, and on which limit? That would immediately weed out the snags we run into in our presentmethods, and it would fit our forest plans more closely into those of Hydro, roads, tourist trade,fish and game, mines and so forth.

And in answer to the arguments we have heard here about the security of tenure,---all those arguments would disappear because when the state is the holder of the limits it is the one factor which goes on forever.

I would say this also, Mr. Speaker, that too often the great strides of science in this field are lost sight of in the smoke screen of arguments put forward, and I would like to quote from a broadcast by Mr. George Drew on March 12th, 1948:

> "Then came new uses of wood. In the early part of the century the demand for newsprint increased enormously. Pulp mills and paper mills were built in various parts of the province. Still, however, the forests seemed limitless, and few dreamed that we could ever overcut our growing trees.
>
> Later came the uses of wood fibre for the making of such things as rayon and other textile

products. More recently we have seen incredible new uses of wood through the mirables of science. The use of plywood, the

miracles of science. The use of plywood, the

manufacture of various types of plastics and a wide new use of the wood by-products has given new value to trees which seems of little or no use."

MR. MacLEOD: A smart man.

MR. ROBINSON: There is a great deal of food for thought in that. I would like to read to the House from a report of the New York State College of Forestry---and I do not doubt but what the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) has read it---outlining the process of producing pulp from hard wood---and when I say "hard wood," I mean poplars and birch, and so forth, of which we have an abundance in our forests, and I would point out this, that the processes apply to our so-called "trash trees," which we have in abundance, and which grow very rapidly, and differs from some of the processes which up until this point have always depended on trees of a slow-going nature. This Report says:

"In addition to the greatly superior quality of chemigroundwood pulp and the very obvious advantage of utilizing wood species which are cheaper and more readily available than the conifers, this process has several additional factors distinctly in its favor.

1. Aspen and birch pulp may be manufactured with an expenditure of approximately 60 percent of the power required for the manufacture of spruce pulp. On a cost basis this represents an economy in electrical energy of more than $2.00 per ton

of pulp manufactured. Beech and maple woods are pulped with even greater ease.

2. The production rate for aspen pulp is approximately 20 percent and for birch pulp it is over 30 percent greater than it is for spruce pulp. This factor would enable existing equipment to increase its production by an equivalent amount when griding these hardwoods and reduce the investment in new plants by a like percentage. Beech and maple woods are pulped at a considerably higher rate than is aspen or birch.

3. The greatest economic advantage of the chemigroundwood pulps is the fact that the density of the most available hardwoods enables them to produce approximately 25 percent more pulp per cord of wood than can be obtained from the coniferous woods like spruce. Birch wood, for example, yields approximately 2900 lbs. of chemiground wood pulp per cord in comparison with not more than 2200 lbs of mechanical pulp from spruce. This 700 lbs of additional pulp produced by the dense hardwoods has a value of $22.75 at current prices of $65.00 per ton for spruce mechanical pulp. This single advantage is sufficiently great to more than several time absorb the additional costs of steam, chemicals and labor which are required for the manufacture of chemigroundwood pulps."

That comes from no less an authority than the two professors who delved into this question on behalf of the New York

State College of Forestry.

What must we learn from this? We must learn to make our newspapers --- that thing you pick up today and read, and then wrap up the garbage in it tomorrow or tonight--we must learn to make them from the fast-growing, cheaper trees, and maintain the slow growing spruce for the new processes, such as plastic, rayon, and so forth, for which they are admirably suited.

Today we have a semi-portable chipper--- and I realize these can only be used for the Kraft mills---some of the chippers are now being developed which will reduce the tops and branches of the trees. Also--and a very important point--these chippers could reduce the slabs in the portable saw mills, which have always been a headache. Mr. Kennedy gave an estimate I have forgotten the amount, but it was an astounding figure of the amount that is wasted in the sawmill slab.

MR. SCOTT: How ill they transport it? Will they bale them or how will they transport them from the chipper to the plant?

MR. ROBINSON: From what I could gather, they are shipping them in bulk in large trucks.

MR. SCOTT: I have discussed this with the manufacturers, and that has always been the problem, the transportation of chipped product, whether it be baled or not.

MR. ROBINSON: There may be something in what the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) has said. Perhaps they could be baled to reduce the bulk.

The point I want to make is this; we realize that the public is striving to get all they can out of our forests, and are much more interested in developing and pushing forward

processes of this kind, than the fellow who is in the forest, and giving service to the industry which employs him, whether it be a pulp mill, paper mill, or saw mill. We hear a great deal from these people as to how interested they are in this matter, but the facts do not bear out the case.

I say that the Government should be in a position to establish means of research, so that we could learn to use the vast amount of our forests which is wasted at the present time.

I say this, Mr.Speaker, that Ontario offers a challenge and a princely reward to those who have the courage to face up to this principle. It is nothing short of criminal to continue down the road we are following today. I do not mean there is anything wrong with it, other than the fact that we are not following the road which will give us the most from our forests. Changing over to public authority would be a big order; I am prepared to admit that. But it could be done on a gradual basis. I also say this; if you are going to follow that policy, or whatever basic policy you will follow, it should now be developed to a stage where we know what the basic, fundamental principles are which lie ahead of us, and every time the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) rises to his feet to speak, I am in hopes that he will make an announcement of which the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) could be proud--and announcement concerning these inventories--

MR. SCOTT: Only one inventory.

MR. ROBINSON: The things which are basic policy, surely the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) now knows what the basic policy of the government is, and as he said in his own broadcast, "Where do we go from here?".

I realize if you are going to change your forests from a public authority, you will step on some very big toes, but you have to do that, and these people must not be permitted to run the show,

I will close my remarks with these words, I had hoped that after the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) had spoken I would not have found it necessary to use them, but in closing I appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) to speak plainly and clearly and tell us about the basic forest plans of this Government, We have had enough of the trimmings; let us get to the meat, I urge the Government to give that information to the House. They owe it to the people of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page M-6 follows)

MR. J.M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I think the hon. Members might like to have the order in which we will call the Private Members' Bills tomorrow.

It looks to me that under one heading we have "hours of work and vacations with pay" - that is Bill No. 52; Bill No. 63, Bill No. 65, and Bill No. 86. These are all Bills relating to one particular subject matter.

Then we will take up the next item on the Order paper. There is one we cannot take, because of the absence of some of the hon. Ministers, but the next Order I would suggest would be Bill No. 60, which is an amendment to the Election Act; Bill No. 62 "The Minimum Wage Act", and Bill No. 70, "The Municipal Act".

It seems to me, if we can cover these seven Bills, we will be doing pretty well.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that perhaps we try this plan tomorrow. On some of these Bills, for instance, votes will be desired. Perhaps we could have the Whips arrange to have the votes on all seven Bills at the close of the day, which would save a lot of time. I think in that way what we might do is, if a vote is indicated, adjourn the debate and call it later on in the day, so that we would call all seven of these Bills upon which votes are required at one time. That would mean we would avoid the necessity of ringing the bell on each occasion, and

waiting for the hon. Members to assemble.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the order mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I would like to suggest to him -- although it would not be for me to say -- that I believe the last Private Members' Bill was an amendment to the hours of work and vacations with pay Act.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What has now been suggested is we go on tomorrow with three or four of them -- I forget how many --

MR. FROST: Yes, clear them all up.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps that is one way of doing it. I was, however, going to suggest that perhaps it is the turn of some hon. Members to the left of us, and the first Bill which appears on the Order paper, which was not mentioned by the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is Bill No. 39 -

MR. FROST:My difficulty is the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is ill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, I see. I hope he will soon recover. If he were going to be here tomorrow, I would have urged that Bill be called.

MR. FROST: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is ill, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr.Dunbar) is also ill.

I glanced at Bill No. 55, but I think perhaps we should hold this over, and proceed with the other Bills.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is quite certain the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.DALEY) will be available tomorrow?

MR. FROST: He is all right today.

MR. SPEAKER: I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.11 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -